



**THE FEDERAL
REDISTRIBUTION
SOUTH AUSTRALIA**

Submission CS9

Liberal Party of Australia (SA Division)

Redistribution Committee for South Australia
Australian Electoral Commission
Locked Bag 4007
CANBERRA ACT 2601

By email: FedRedistribution-sa@aec.gov.au

21 November 2025

Dear Committee Members,

Thank you for the opportunity to present comments on suggestions in relation to the proposed redistribution of federal electoral boundaries for South Australian.

We acknowledge that a total of 18 written suggestions were received by the South Australian Redistribution Committee. Each of these has been reviewed and our comments are contained below for your consideration.

In our assessment of the written suggestions received, several key themes are apparent.

Minimalist approach

In our written suggestion, we outlined a strong rationale for the Redistribution Committee to adopt a minimalist approach, making only those changes necessary to ensure each division meets the statutory enrolment requirements. This position is supported by several other submissions (S4, S6, S16), which similarly conclude that the current boundaries and available data justify only limited adjustments. We respectfully encourage the Commission to uphold this principle of minimal change.

Preferences versus statutory criteria

Written submissions present a broad range of views, geographic perspectives and levels of analysis. Some do not quantify the impacts of their proposed changes, while others focus on communities of interest without fully addressing all statutory criteria. In several cases, the overarching demographic and enrolment requirements appear not to have been fully considered. For example, the proposal to divide Grey into smaller electorates, based largely on its geographic size, does not account for

the resulting difficulties in meeting electoral quotas statewide and would therefore be unviable.

Transfer from Spence into Makin

The Liberal Party's proposal to transfer the suburbs of Salisbury South, Salisbury Downs, Salisbury, Brahma Lodge, Salisbury Plain and Salisbury Park from Spence to Makin is also supported by several other submissions (S2, S3, S4, S6, S7, S13, S14, S18). This adjustment represents a logical and proportionate refinement of existing boundaries and can be implemented without generating flow-on effects for neighbouring divisions.

Transfer of remainder of Mitcham LGA from Mayo to Boothby

The Liberal Party proposal to transfer all of Hawthorndene and Craighburn Farm, along with parts of Upper Sturt and Coromandel Valley, from Mayo to Boothby, thereby uniting the Mitcham Local Government Area (LGA) within a single electorate, is also suggested in submissions S3, S4*, S8*, S13 and S18.

*Submissions S4 and S8 go further by proposing the inclusion of the entire suburb of Coromandel Valley, including the portion within the Onkaparinga LGA.

The Liberal Party supports the transfer of the remainder of Mitcham LGA and does not support this broader extension, as it would result in the Onkaparinga LGA being split across three electorates and would increase Boothby's enrolment beyond the projected quota. This, in turn, would necessitate further adjustments to neighbouring electorates, creating unnecessary disruption. Such outcomes are inconsistent with the principle of minimising boundary changes in a redistribution occurring based on the passage of time, not from a representational imbalance or population shift requiring significant correction.

Transferring part of the Adelaide Hills or Strathalbyn and surrounds into Barker

Several suggestions (S3, S4, S13, S14) propose transferring electors from Mayo to Barker, ranging from the movement of the Adelaide Hills SA2, to shifting Strathalbyn and surrounding localities, through to the more significant proposal in S14 to place Murray Bridge within Mayo. Despite their geographic proximity, Mount Barker and Murray Bridge sit within markedly different communities of interest, reflecting

distinct social, economic and functional characteristics. The Liberal Party does not support this approach.

Concerns raised about the presence of Mount Gambier and Murray Bridge within the same electorate overlook the geographic realities of South Australia's size and dispersed population. Barker has, since its establishment in 1903, encompassed a large landmass extending to South Australia's southern and eastern borders. Both Mount Gambier and Murray Bridge have been continuously represented within Barker since 1934. While these centres are separated by distance, this has been effectively managed through two electorate offices, an arrangement that is common and practical in regional divisions of this scale.

By contrast, dividing the Adelaide Hills Council and Alexandrina Council areas would undermine well-established peri-urban communities of interest closely tied to Adelaide. These council areas function as coherent and interconnected parts of Adelaide's peri-urban region and maintaining them intact within Mayo is important for preserving effective representation.

Given this context, the minimalist adjustments proposed in the Liberal Party's suggestion for Barker and Mayo, that is, limited to the suburbs of Callington and Kanmanto, represent a proportionate and appropriate approach that meets the demographic and community of interest-based requirements. In comparison, the alternative options for Barker are unnecessarily disruptive and inconsistent with a minimal-change philosophy that best maintains existing communities of interest.

It is our view that the submission by the Federal Member for Mayo (S15) makes well-reasoned and community-centric arguments regarding the composition of the various communities of interest that exist within the Adelaide Hills, Fleurieu Peninsula and Kangaroo Island. Whilst our submissions differ insofar as which suburbs of metropolitan Adelaide should be first considered to be removed from Mayo, Submission 15 accurately summarises the key considerations that should be taken into account throughout this process as they relate to the Federal Division of Mayo.

Sellicks Beach, Aldinga & Aldinga Beach into Kingston

Two submissions (S6 and S15) propose transferring the suburbs of Sellicks Beach, Aldinga and Aldinga Beach from Mayo into Kingston. Both provide thoughtful, well-reasoned suggestions that engage directly with the required AEC criteria and present a coherent rationale for the proposed changes.

While the Liberal Party's suggestion initially considered transferring Sellicks Beach, Aldinga and Aldinga Beach into Kingston, recognising that these southern suburbs do not align with the communities of interest that define Mayo across the broader Fleurieu Peninsula, we ultimately determined that this approach would trigger substantial and unnecessary wholesale change. Implementing such a shift would require consequential boundary adjustments in Kingston and Boothby, and almost certainly in at least one of Adelaide, Hindmarsh or Sturt.

Instead, the Liberal Party's suggestion aligns with several other submissions in concluding that Mayo's projected enrolment can be resolved through a more contained and proportionate adjustment: transferring the remaining portion of the Mitcham LGA from Mayo to Boothby. This approach satisfies the statutory enrolment requirements while avoiding wider disruption across multiple metropolitan divisions.

Should the Commission pursue a more expansive or disruptive approach to this Redistribution, the Liberal Party would consider the relocation of Sellicks Beach, Aldinga and Aldinga Beach into Kingston as a possible, though not preferred, alternative.

Thank you for considering this comment on the submissions. The Liberal Party of South Australia extends its best wishes to the Commission in undertaking the important and complex task ahead.

Yours sincerely



Alexander Hyde
State Director
Liberal Party of Australia (SA Division)