



# Objection 321

Charles Richardson

5 pages

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Charles Richardson [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Friday, 11 May 2018 5:58 PM  
**To:** FedRedistribution - SA  
**Subject:** Objection - redistribution  
**Attachments:** RESA18O1.pdf

Dear friends -

Please find attached an objection to the Redistribution Committee's proposal for South Australia. Do not hesitate to contact me if you require any further information.

All the best,  
Charles

---  
Charles Richardson, Philosopher

[REDACTED] Phone: [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] Mobile: [REDACTED]

**Charles Richardson**

*LL.B., Ph.D.*

PHILOSOPHER

ABN 83 996 159 604

Phone: [REDACTED]  
Mobile: [REDACTED]  
e-mail: [REDACTED]

## **FEDERAL REDISTRIBUTION 2018: SOUTH AUSTRALIA**

### **OBJECTION to the PROPOSAL of the SOUTH AUSTRALIAN REDISTRIBUTION COMMITTEE**

**From CHARLES RICHARDSON**

I am grateful for the opportunity to make objections to the proposal for the federal redistribution of South Australia, as released by the Redistribution Committee on 13 April 2018. I am an independent analyst and election expert; I am not a member of any political party and have no political interest at stake in the redistribution process. Although I am a resident of Victoria, I have spent time in South Australia and have always been fascinated by its distinctive geography and demography. My hope is that the Commission will find some of my ideas useful in its deliberations.

It appears to me that the Committee's proposed boundaries generally work well in satisfying the various legislative constraints. The objection I wish to make, however, involves wholesale revision of a substantial part of the Committee's work. For the reasons outlined below I believe it is worth the trouble, and of course it must be remembered that boundaries are being changed on a large scale anyway, due to the abolition of a division.

The Committee has paid heed to a number of suggestions that objected to the Barossa Valley being split between two divisions and consolidated the area into a single division. I support this move, but I believe the Committee chose the wrong division, *Barker*, into which to put it. I will explain the two separate chains of reasoning that lead to this conclusion.

The first relates to the balance between urban (or metropolitan) and regional (or non-metropolitan) divisions. This is an issue in most redistributions, but perhaps especially so in South Australia, given the divisive nature of the question in the past. Taking as a starting point the Australian Bureau of Statistics' distinction between the Greater Adelaide Statistical Area and the rest of the state, on the projected 2022 enrolments the former area has 7.74 times average

enrolment while the latter has 2.26. However, the ABS counts the whole of the Barossa Valley as non-metropolitan, which is at best somewhat dubious; the Barossa is closely connected to Adelaide, and similar peri-urban areas such as McLaren Vale and Mount Barker are classified as metropolitan.

If the level three statistical area of Barossa, with 26,805 projected electors, is added to the metropolitan area, it brings its total to 7.96 times projected average enrolment. Adding in the level two statistical area of Strathalbyn, on the south-eastern edge of the metropolitan area (5,543 projected electors), gives us just on eight divisions' worth. This leads naturally to the suggestion that it should be the basis for eight divisions, leaving the other two – *Barker* and *Grey* – as purely rural and regional divisions covering the rest of the state.

And indeed this is easy to achieve; move the whole of Barossa SA3 out of *Barker* and *Grey*, and instead give *Grey* the SA2s of Mannum and Waikerie (basically the Shire of Mid Murray and the township of Waikerie). Then move the remaining non-metropolitan areas from *Mayo* to *Barker*: the SA2s of Goolwa - Port Elliot, Kangaroo Island, Strathalbyn Region, Victor Harbor and Yankalilla. That leaves *Barker* on 99.9% of projected average enrolment and *Grey* on 99.6%.

The point is not that mixing urban and rural elements in a division is to be avoided at all costs, but that it is *prima facie* undesirable, and it creates particular problems in a state like South Australia where some of the rural areas are very rural indeed. The Barossa Valley is not out of place in a predominantly rural division, but I submit that it looks very much out of place in a division that stretches to Bordertown and Mount Gambier in the state's extreme south-east. Yet if it is not to be put into a metropolitan division, then either it will be in a division that stretches to one corner of the state (and there is no room for it in *Grey*), or else the different corners of the state would have to be united in a single division, “doughnut” style.

Similarly with *Mayo*: on the proposed boundaries it extends deeper into the suburbs, into the City of Mitcham, but it retains its rural tail down to Victor Harbour and Kangaroo Island. Not an impossible combination, but surely an undesirable one.

The second chain of reasoning involves looking at the proposed boundaries and thinking about what will happen at the next redistribution. *Grey* is in relative population decline, and the chance of that being reversed seems slight. That means it will have to grow next time, and where can it go? It is already hard up against the Adelaide suburbs at Virginia and Gawler, and if it moves into Mid Murray it would cut the Barossa off from the rest of *Barker*.

But on the configuration I suggest, *Grey* would have other options: it could expand into the western part of Barossa SA3, outside of the Barossa Valley proper (Lewiston – Two Wells and Mallala SA2s). In the event that *Barker* needs to take territory as well (less likely, since its relative population is currently stable), Strathalbyn will be there as an option. The next redistribution would therefore have the flexibility that the current proposal denies it.

If the Barossa Valley is to move into a metropolitan division, *Mayo* and *Spence* are the only possibilities, and I suggest that *Spence* is clearly to be preferred. Gawler is the natural jumping-off point for the Barossa, whereas communications into *Mayo* are somewhat tenuous. Excess electors will then need to be fed back through some of the suburban divisions and ultimately to *Mayo*, to compensate that division for the loss of its non-metropolitan areas.

The table on the next page shows one way of doing this; it involves restoring the old southern boundary of *Spence*, moving the remaining territory into *Makin*, shifting *Adelaide* and *Sturt* slightly northwards and moving *Boothby* into the south-western part of the proposed

*Adelaide*, allowing *Boothby* to shed electors to *Mayo*.

No doubt many other ways could be devised to accomplish the same overall transfer. For simplicity I have left the proposed *Hindmarsh* and *Kingston* untouched, but bringing them into the mix may well allow for better boundaries to be achieved. I would particularly note that the proposed *Kingston* has been set at a very low enrolment, just 97.2% of the projected average, and it would be good if the transfers could be managed in such a way as to allow this to be boosted.

Respectfully submitted,

Charles Richardson

11 May 2018

**TABLE: SUGGESTED CHANGES AS COMPARED TO THE PROPOSED BOUNDARIES, BROKEN DOWN BY SA2**

	<u>2017 Electors</u>		<u>2022 Electors</u>	
<b>From Barker to Spence</b>	<b>27,347</b>	<b>22.9%</b>	<b>28,705</b>	<b>23.4%</b>
<i>Consisting of:</i>				
Barossa - Angaston	4,377	3.7%	4,461	3.6%
Tanunda	3,494	2.9%	3,617	2.9%
Its share of Gawler - North	41	0.0%	41	0.0%
Its share of Light	5,566	4.7%	5,968	4.9%
Lyndoch	8,774	7.3%	9,203	7.5%
Nuriootpa	5,095	4.3%	5,415	4.4%
<b>From Grey to Spence</b>	<b>7,405</b>	<b>6.2%</b>	<b>7,617</b>	<b>6.2%</b>
<i>Consisting of:</i>				
Its share of Gawler - North	877	0.7%	883	0.7%
Lewiston - Two Wells	3,767	3.2%	3,899	3.2%
Its share of Light	679	0.6%	752	0.6%
Mallala	2,082	1.7%	2,083	1.7%
<b>From Barker to Grey</b>	<b>9,184</b>	<b>7.7%</b>	<b>9,536</b>	<b>7.8%</b>
<i>Consisting of:</i>				
Mannum	4,646	3.9%	4,836	3.9%
Waikerie	4,538	3.8%	4,700	3.8%
<b>From Spence to Makin</b>	<b>29,132</b>	<b>24.4%</b>	<b>30,891</b>	<b>25.2%</b>
<i>Consisting of:</i>				
Its share of One Tree Hill	7	0.0%	7	0.0%
Its share of Salisbury	41	0.0%	46	0.0%
Dry Creek - North	1	0.0%	1	0.0%
Paralowie	11,266	9.4%	11,800	9.6%
Its share of Pooraka	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Its share of Salisbury	6,833	5.7%	7,321	6.0%

Its share of Salisbury North	10,744	9.0%	11,475	9.3%
Its share of Virginia - Waterloo Corner	240	0.2%	241	0.2%
<b>From Makin to Adelaide</b>	<b>14,420</b>	<b>12.0%</b>	<b>14,768</b>	<b>12.0%</b>
<i>Consisting of:</i>				
Its share of Enfield - Blair Athol	575	0.5%	622	0.5%
Part of its share of Ingle Farm	6,441	5.3%	6,432	5.2%
Part of its share of Northgate - Oakden - Gilles Plains	4,270	3.6%	4,460	3.6%
Part of its share of Pooraka	3,131	2.6%	3,251	2.6%
Its share of The Parks	3	0.0%	3	0.0%
<b>From Makin to Sturt</b>	<b>16,438</b>	<b>13.8%</b>	<b>16,684</b>	<b>13.6%</b>
<i>Consisting of:</i>				
Part of its share of Hope Valley - Modbury	6,001	5.0%	6,102	5.0%
Part of its share of Northgate - Oakden - Gilles Plains	980	0.8%	1,013	0.8%
St Agnes - Ridgehaven	9,457	7.9%	9,569	7.8%
<b>From Sturt to Adelaide</b>	<b>19,302</b>	<b>16.2%</b>	<b>19,745</b>	<b>16.1%</b>
<i>Consisting of:</i>				
Part of its share of St Peters - Marden	5,171	4.3%	4,988	4.1%
Part of its share of Highbury - Dernancourt	176	0.1%	178	0.1%
Part of its share of Hope Valley - Modbury	379	0.3%	382	0.3%
Part of its share of Northgate - Oakden - Gilles Plains	3,938	3.3%	4,099	3.3%
Its share of Windsor Gardens	9,638	8.1%	10,098	8.2%
<b>From Adelaide to Boothby</b>	<b>35,808</b>	<b>30.0%</b>	<b>36,454</b>	<b>29.7%</b>
<i>Consisting of:</i>				
Its share of Goodwood - Millswood	8,111	6.8%	8,245	6.7%
Its share of Plympton	7,488	6.3%	7,750	6.3%
Its share of Unley - Parkside	10,759	9.0%	10,887	8.9%
Part of its share of Richmond (SA)	9,450	7.9%	9,572	7.8%
<b>From Boothby to Mayo</b>	<b>37,532</b>	<b>31.4%</b>	<b>37,764</b>	<b>30.8%</b>
<i>Consisting of:</i>				
Belair	3,615	3.0%	3,608	2.9%
Bellevue Heights	5,181	4.3%	5,235	4.3%
Its share of Blackwood	4,829	4.0%	4,908	4.0%
Part of its share of Colonel Light Gardens	5,863	4.9%	5,935	4.8%
Mitcham (SA)	12,072	10.1%	12,083	9.8%
Panorama	5,972	5.0%	5,995	4.9%
<b>From Mayo to Barker</b>	<b>33,891</b>	<b>28.4%</b>	<b>35,632</b>	<b>29.0%</b>
<i>Consisting of:</i>				
Goolwa - Port Elliot	9,196	7.7%	9,566	7.8%
Kangaroo Island	3,366	2.8%	3,537	2.9%
Strathalbyn Region	5,209	4.4%	5,551	4.5%
Victor Harbor	11,754	9.8%	12,188	9.9%
Yankalilla	4,366	3.7%	4,790	3.9%