THE FEDERAL REDISTRIBUTION SOUTH AUSTRALIA

Comment on objection 42

Charles Richardson

3 pages

Frances Roberts

From: [redacted]
Sent: Friday, 25 May 2018 4:40 PM
To: FedRedistribution - SA
Subject: [SA REDISTRIBUTION COMMENTS ON OBJECTIONS] Charles Richardson *WWW* [SEC=UNCLASSIFIED]
Attachments: vic-Charles Richardson-.pdf

South Australian Redistribution comment on objections uploaded from the AEC website.
Name: Charles Richardson
Organisation:
Address: ,
Phone number:
Additional information:

Charles Richardson
LL.B., Ph.D.
PHILOSOPHER

FEDERAL REDISTRIBUTION 2018: SOUTH AUSTRALIA

COMMENT on the OBJECTIONS RECEIVED to the PROPOSAL of the SOUTH AUSTRALIAN REDISTRIBUTION COMMITTEE

From CHARLES RICHARDSON

The proposals of the Redistribution Committee have received 321 objections. While this might at first sight seem to reflect a high degree of public engagement, in fact almost all of the objections are standard form complaints about the loss of territory from the south of *Boothby* to *Kingston* and/or *Mayo*. It is reasonable to assume they have been promoted by either the local MP or their political party.

Nonetheless, the question is worth considering on its merits. It is true that the Committee's proposed new boundary between *Boothby* and *Mayo* follows no clear community divide or natural feature, and splits the suburb of Craigburn Farm from its obvious commercial centre in Blackwood. I am less convinced about the merits of moving Flagstaff Hill and Aberfoyle Park; the proposed boundary follows the municipal boundary and seems reasonable, but clearly a number of residents are unhappy about it.

Most of the objections, as is typically the way with these things, do not suggest any alternative. If the territory concerned was all to stay in *Boothby* then substantial transfers elsewhere would be required, with possible flow-on effects. The only detailed proposal for how to do this is from the Liberal Party (#318), which disrupts the proposed divisions of *Adelaide* and *Hindmarsh* and lacks plausibility on a number of fronts, particularly in the way it leaves both *Hindmarsh* and *Mayo* at the extreme limit of the tolerance for projected enrolment.

If the Commission is willing to undertake large-scale revision, I would point to the suggestion contained in my objection, of which the primary point is to fix the alignment of *Barker*, *Grey* and *Spence*, but which incidentally requires moving electors through *Mayo*, *Boothby*, *Adelaide*, *Sturt* and *Makin*. This would have the effect of making *Mayo* a more identifiably metropolitan division, giving it most of the City of Mitcham; that would address the concern about Craigburn Farm, although not in the way that the objectors request.

On the assumption that the Commission will prefer to avoid wholesale changes, I suggest that the main concerns of the objectors could be met by a much more limited scheme, as follows:

- Retain Flagstaff Hill SA2 in *Boothby* (7,809 projected electors)
- Transfer the remainder of Blackwood SA2 and the whole of Belair SA2 from *Boothby* to *Mayo* (8,516 projected electors)
- Retain the existing southern boundary of *Kingston*, returning 11,149 projected electors in Aldinga SA2 to it from *Mayo*

Those changes would bring *Kingston*, which on the proposed boundaries is very underweight, to almost exactly the projected average enrolment; *Boothby* would remain overweight, but somewhat less so (101.8%), while *Mayo* would remain well within the tolerance at 98.6%.

In terms of community of interest, I think they are probably an improvement on the Committee's proposals. Keeping the Belair-Blackwood area together makes sense, and it is a good fit with the Adelaide Hills. Aldinga and Sellicks Beach fit well with the other coastal areas of *Kingston* and have little in common with the rest of *Mayo*. And while the boundary between Flagstaff Hill and Aberfoyle Park, along Manning and Black Roads, is not an ideal divisional boundary, the objectors' points about Flagstaff Hill's links to the north, up Flagstaff Road, are quite legitimate.

Respectfully submitted,

Charles Richardson
25 May 2018