



Suggestion 60

Christine Feinle-Bisset

2 pages

From: Christine Feinle-Bisset [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, 8 November 2017 11:59 AM
To: FedRedistribution - SA
Subject: Potential elimination of the Federal Electorate of Mayo in the upcoming redistribution of seats undertaken by the Australian Electoral Commission

To the Redistribution Committee for South Australia,

I am a constituent of the Federal Division of Mayo and am concerned that the Division of Mayo might be abolished in this redistribution process. I note that the committee responsible for managing the redistribution must consider a number of criteria, including (i) communities of interest within the proposed electorate, including economic, social and regional interests, (ii) means of communication and travel within the proposed federal electorate, and (iii) the physical features of an area of the proposed federal electorate.

With these criteria in mind, I believe that the Division of Mayo should not be abolished, and would like to draw your attention to the following points:

(1) Communities of Interest As a constituent of Mayo, I know that the collaboration between Federal and Local Government is incredibly important. Mayo includes the entirety of the Adelaide Hills Council, Mount Barker District Council, Alexandrina Council, Victor Harbor Council, The District Council of Yankalilla and the Kangaroo Island Council. To abolish Mayo and split these councils between two or three electorates would mean that my local community would no longer be represented consistently.

The community of Mayo has shared interests and passions. Mayo has the highest percentage of volunteers in Australia, which speaks to our shared community spirit.

In an economic sense, Mayo contains the vast majority of South Australia's horticulture industry and seven distinct wine regions. I believe it is critical that these important businesses in our community are represented by someone who understands the issues they are facing, rather than being represented by someone based in the metropolitan area.

At the recent election, there was an overwhelming vote for our current independent Federal Member, demonstrating a clear desire across the region for an independent voice in Federal Parliament, and it would be disappointing if this voice was silenced due to the electorate being abolished.

(2) Physical features of Mayo There are distinct physical features that define Mayo from the metropolitan electorates and the rural electorate of Barker, including the Hills Face Zone, the Onkaparinga River and the Lower Lakes.

The Hills Face Zone is a large planning zone in South Australia that restricts development in the Adelaide Foothills and Mount Lofty Ranges. As a result of this zone, there is an effective barrier between metropolitan Adelaide and the communities of the Adelaide Hills. It does not make sense for these two distinct areas to be represented by a metropolitan based electorate.

The Lower Lakes separate riverside communities, including Goolwa, Milang and Currency Creek, from the Division of Barker. This creates a true physical barrier between Mayo and Barker.

(3) Population Growth in Key Areas I understand that the AEC needs to ensure that all of the remaining ten electorates have a similar population. Mayo currently has 3 fast growing communities in Mount Barker, Victor Harbor and Strathalbyn. Mount Barker in particular currently has a population of 34,000, but this is

projected to increase to 55,000 by 2036. It would not be fair for an area of this size to be included within a metropolitan seat boundary, as the needs and experiences of the voters would be considerably different.

I hope you will consider my submission, and agree that it is critically important for this region to retain the Division of Mayo as one of the ten electoral divisions in South Australia.

Yours sincerely, Christine Feinle-Bisset [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]