

# **Public Objection Number 2**

**Dr Mark Mulcair** 

3 pages

From:

Mark Mulcair <markmulcair@gmail.com> Thursday, 8 September 2011 7:53 PM saredistribution

Sent: To:

Subject: Attachments: Objections to SA Redistribution 2011 Objections to SA redistribution 2011.docx

> Dr Mark Mulcair 2/26 Hopetoun Street Mitcham VIC 3132 0407 095 015

Dear Committee Members,

Please find attached my Objections to the 2011 South Australian redistribution.

If you have any questions or comments please do not hesitate to contact me.

Regards,

Mark Mulcair

### **OBJECTIONS TO THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN REDISTRIBUTION 2011**

With only 11 Divisions, general agreement between both major parties, and only minor changes necessary, this redistribution is fairly simple and uncontroversial. The comments below are not so much "Objections" as suggestions, recommending small changes to improve the boundaries of a number of Divisions.

## 1) Grey/Wakefield:

Although Grey requires no change, I suggest the opportunity be taken to unite Wakefield DC within Wakefield. Despite the concerns of previous redistributions, growth in Grey is robust, and can easily accommodate the loss of these 1300 electors. In addition to uniting a rural council, it seems logical to place Wakefield DC wholly in the Division of that name in order to avoid voter confusion.

The loss of Wakefield DC would leave a fairly narrow strip of land connecting the Yorke Peninsula to the remainder of Grey; however, this strip would contain the main lines of communication back to Port Pirie, Crystal Brook, and the remainder of Grey.

#### 2) Adelaide/Sturt:

While the proposal to unite Walkerville Council in Adelaide has merit, the municipal boundary runs along a minor road (Fife Street), through the middle of what appears to be fairly homogenous residential area. While municipal boundaries can often make good Divisional boundaries, in this case I think that Lower Portrush Road and Ascot Avenue would form a stronger boundary. These roads are a major traffic corridor that would form a clearer divide than both the existing boundary and that proposed by the Committee, even if it would mean Walkerville Council remains split.

This change would leave part of Walkerville within Sturt and instead transfer part of Marden to Adelaide. Both Divisions would remain within tolerance.

#### 3) Port Adelaide/Hindmarsh:

In addition to Seaton, I suggest that Royal Park also be transferred from Port Adelaide to Hindmarsh. This would allow the boundary to be straightened along the major roads of Old Port Road and Tapleys Hill Road, instead of making the deviations onto Frederick Road and West Lakes Boulevard.

This would result in Hindmarsh gaining a further 2000 electors, pushing it towards the higher end of tolerance. However, given Hindmarsh is projected to have the lowest growth of any

Division in the state, I believe it is appropriate for its enrolment to be placed significantly above average. Since Port Adelaide has relatively robust growth, both Divisions can accommodate this additional transfer.

## 4) Boothby/Mayo/Wakefield:

While the decision to transfer the Aberfoyle Park area was recommended by all submissions and should be supported, the proposed boundary between Boothby and Mayo continues to split Coromandel Valley. This has been objected to at previous redistributions, but the numbers have not permitted uniting the area in one Division.

I suggest it is more logical to place all of Coromandel Valley within Boothby, basically by transferring the remaining 1300-1400 electors in Onkaparinga-Reservoir from Mayo to Boothby.

Loss of these electors would cause Mayo to fall outside tolerance, so I suggest that Williamstown and surrounds remain in Mayo instead of being transferred to Wakefield. Ideally, this area would be placed in Wakefield, but it also has fairly strong links to the northern parts of Mayo, including those parts of the Barossa DC that are proposed to remain in Mayo.

All three Divisions could tolerate these changes without going outside quota.