Contents

Li	ist of	Figures	5
Li	ist of	Tables	6
1	Intr	oduction	7
	1.1	What makes a good district?	8
	1.2	One vote, one value	9
	1.3	On the current enrolment rule	10
	1.4	Names of districts	11
2	Sug	gestions	12
	2.1	Sutherland Shire	13
	2.2	Macarthur and surrounds	18
	2.3	Fairfield to Liverpool	26
	2.4	Eastern Suburbs and Inner West (east)	28
	2.5	St George	37
	2.6	Canterbury-Bankstown, Cumberland, and Inner West (west) $\ . \ . \ .$.	40
	2.7	Blue Mountains and Hawkesbury	50
	2.8	Penrith	53
	2.9	Blacktown	58

	2.10	Northern Sydney, Hills, and Parramatta	62
	2.11	Central Coast	86
3	Alte	rnative	88
	3.1	Northern Sydney, Hills, and Parramatta	89
	3.2	Blacktown	105
	3.3	Other alternatives	109
4	Clos	ing remarks	110
Α	Enro	olment summary	111
в	Over	rview map	115

List of Figures

2.1	Suggested H	leathcote		 			 	•	•		•	 •		15
2.2	Suggested C	Cronulla		 			 	•	•	 •	•	 •	•	16
2.3	Suggested M	Iiranda		 			 	•	•	 •		 •		17
2.4	Suggested H	Iolsworthy .		 			 	•	•			 •		19
2.5	Suggested C	Campbelltown		 			 	•	•	 •		 •		21
2.6	Suggested M	lacquarie Fiel	ds	 			 	•	•			 •		22
2.7	Suggested E	Badgerys Cree	k.	 			 	•	•			 •		24
2.8	Suggested C	Camden		 			 		•	 •		 •		25
2.9	Suggested L	iverpool		 			 	•	•			 •		26
2.10	Suggested C	Cabramatta .		 			 	•	•			 •		27
2.11	Suggested F	àirfield		 			 	•	•	 •		 •		27
2.12	Suggested E	leffron		 			 			 •	•	 •		30
2.13	Suggested S	ydney		 			 			 •	•	 •		31
2.14	Suggested C	Coogee		 			 			 •	•	 •		32
2.15	Suggested M	faroubra		 			 			 •	•	 •		33
2.16	Suggested N	lewtown		 			 			 •	•	 •		34
2.17	Suggested S	ummer Hill .		 			 	•	•	 •	•	 •		35
2.18	Suggested C	Datley		 			 	•	•		•	 •		38
2.19	Suggested K	Kogarah		 			 					 •		39

2.20	Suggested East Hills	41
2.21	Suggested Auburn	42
2.22	Suggested Bankstown	43
2.23	Suggested Lakemba	45
2.24	Suggested Canterbury	46
2.25	Suggested Drummoyne	47
2.26	Suggested Strathfield	48
2.27	Suggested Greystanes	49
2.28	Suggested Blue Mountains	51
2.29	Suggested Hawkesbury	52
2.30	Suggested Mulgoa	54
2.31	Suggested Londonderry	56
2.32	Suggested Penrith	57
2.33	Suggested Mount Druitt	59
2.34	Suggested Riverstone	60
2.35	Suggested Blacktown	61
2.36	Suggested Kellyville	67
2.37	Suggested Seven Hills	68
2.38	Suggested Parramatta	69
2.39	Suggested Epping	70
2.40	Suggested Ryde	71
2.41	Suggested Lane Cove	73
2.42	Suggested North Shore	74
2.43	Suggested Willoughby	75
2.44	Suggested Pittwater	77
2.45	Suggested Wakehurst	78

2.46	Suggested Manly	79
2.47	Suggested Ku-ring-gai	80
2.48	Suggested Hornsby	82
2.49	Suggested Pennant Hills	83
2.50	Suggested Castle Hill	84
2.51	Suggested The Entrance	86
2.52	Suggested Wyong	87
3.1	Alternative Hornsby	90
3.2	Alternative Ku-ring-gai	91
3.3	Alternative Willoughby	92
3.4	Alternative Lane Cove	93
3.5	Alternative North Shore	94
3.6	Alternative Ryde	95
3.7	Alternative Epping	96
3.8	Alternative Dural	99
3.9	Alternative Dundas	100
3.10	Alternative Rouse Hill	101
3.11	Alternative Baulkham Hills	102
3.12	Alternative Parramatta	103
3.13	Alternative Riverstone	106
3.14	Alternative Mount Druitt	107
3.15	Alternative Blacktown	108
B.1	Overview map of suggested districts	116
B.2	Overview map of alternative districts	117

List of Tables

2.1	Overview of suggested districts	12
3.1	Overview of alternative districts	88
A.1	Enrolment in suggested districts (1 of 2)	112
A.2	Enrolment in suggested districts (2 of 2)	113
A.3	Enrolment in alternative districts	114

1. Introduction

The scope of this suggestion is the Greater Sydney area, comprising 58 of the 93 electoral districts of NSW. In this submission, I present a complete proposal for the boundaries of all of these districts, augmented with discussion, analysis, and justification for these boundaries, along with maps of suggested districts.

I also offer an alternative for 15 districts in Northern and North West Sydney in the hope that it will be of use to the Panel should they opt for an approach that significantly differs from my preferred suggestion. I also hope that it will highlight some of the hard decisions that the Panel will have to make in their determination.

I have spent much of my spare time over the past year investigating possible boundaries for this redistribution. Of course, much of this time was spent drawing lines in the dark, as I did not have access to enrolment data at the SA1 level, or projected enrolment. In the past couple months since the NSWEC released enrolment data, I have concretised my ideas into this suggestion.

I obviously do not expect that the Panel will adopt all, or even most of my suggestions. Moreover, I am sure that other suggestions, as well as comments on suggestions, may change my mind on some aspects of my suggestion. Rather, I present this suggestion in the hope that the ideas, arguments, and observations will be useful to the Panel, and that they will form part of the conversation in the comments and objections phases.

I have lived in Sydney for half of my life, and the suburbs I have lived in are Beecroft, Cherrybrook, Carlingford (all within Epping district), Stanhope Gardens (Riverstone), and Rouse Hill (Castle Hill). Naturally, this means I have a personal interest in the districts in the northwest of Sydney. This is probably evident in my discussion on districts in this region, which is especially in-depth, and (I dare say) more fervent. This is also the region for which I present an alternative suggestion. Maps of suggested districts can be found in this document, interspersed with my discussion. (Note that I have not included these maps for districts to which I suggest no changes be made.) I have also made the maps available as a KMZ file, which can be viewed in Google Earth, and in MapInfo format, which can be viewed using most geospatial software tools. At the end of this document, I have included a table of each suggested district with its (approximate) current and projected enrolment, along with an overview map.

1.1 What makes a good district?

The only hard constraint on the Panel's determination, as stated on the NSWEC's website, is that the *current* enrolment of each district (with "current" referring to the time at the commencement of the redistribution, i.e. 17 April 2020) does not vary from the quota (57,193) by more than 10%. I will henceforth refer to this as the *current* enrolment rule.

Constrained by the current enrolment rule, the prime goal of the redistribution is to realise, as far as is practicable, the "one vote, one value" principle by equalising the *projected* (at 17 April 2023) enrolment of districts. It is acceptable to deviate slightly from this to align district boundaries to physical boundaries, locality boundaries, or to unite communities of interest. This is a precedent that has been upheld in previous redistributions.

Throughout this suggestion, whenever I refer to enrolment, quotas, electors, numerical requirements, etc., I am, unless qualified otherwise, referring specifically to *projected* enrolment.

There are numerous factors that should be accounted for in drawing districts, but they can be broadly classified into three themes:

• connectedness: All parts of a district should ideally have numerous means of transport connecting it with the rest of the district. A district is weakened if it is made up of parts separated by non-residential areas, especially if there are few transport connections crossing these areas, or if segments of these transport connections lie outside the district in question. I will use the term "hard physical boundary" to describe such a boundary with few transport connections crossing

them. A transport connection is stronger if it is a common means of travel. Also tied into this is common services, facilities, and amenities, such as shopping centres, schools, places of worship, train stations, parks, and so on. Connectedness is also improved by the compactness of a district.

- **demography**: Where possible, districts should unite nearby areas with similar demography and lifestyles. These factors include age structure, ethnic diversity, socioeconomic status, and residential density. Demography is not the be-all and end-all of what makes good boundaries, otherwise we would have highly discontiguous districts. But they are one piece in the puzzle that can decide, for example, which of two suburbs should be transferred into a particular district.
- clarity: Where possible, district boundaries should follow significant physical boundaries or locality boundaries. This includes prominent transport lines, creeks and rivers, and LGA boundaries. Uniting suburbs is desirable, though many suburbs have very ragged boundaries that are not appropriate for electoral boundaries. Following purely cadastral boundaries is a last resort that should otherwise be avoided. Boundaries of existing districts should be favoured, but only secondarily to other considerations.

I will also mention a factor that should *not* be considered – politics. Districts should not be altered with the intention of any political outcome. This includes attempts to maximise the number of marginal seats, or attempts to align the likely distribution of seats to that of the popular vote. The Panel should conduct the redistribution with a blindness to all political matters.

1.2 One vote, one value

Throughout this suggestion, I will be referring to "regional equality", a principle that I contend is necessary to faithfully abide by "one vote, one value".

To introduce what I mean by this, I will pose a thought experiment. It is possible that the Panel could make a determination that has almost every district in Greater Sydney 2.2% *below* quota, and every district elsewhere (including all of regional NSW) 2.2% *above* quota. On the surface, this may seem quite innocuous. Every district is within 2.2% of a quota. But what actually amounts to is that regional NSW has been deprived a seat, and Greater Sydney has been granted an additional seat. This can be seen in that 2.2% times half the number of districts is 100% of a quota. I am sure most people would agree that this would be indefensible.

The Panel therefore needs to not only minimise the deviations of individual districts, but also avoid collections of contiguous districts that together have a large deviation. It is easy to create large regional disparities incidentally. For example, we might happen to have three adjacent seats that are each, say, 5% above quota. We then draw surrounding districts very close to a quota. But here we have created a 15%-of-a-quota black hole centred on these three districts, causing the entire region to be 15% above quota, and likely causing numerical problems elsewhere, possibly propagating to the other side of the state. If there needs to be a district significantly above or below quota, it should be immediately counterbalanced by adjoining districts. This may seem counterintuitive initially, but as can be seen in the example I gave, it is much more egregious to have an enrolment disparity across an entire region than it is within a single district.

In practical terms, there are two techniques that can be used to ensure regional equality. The approach I have largely taken is to divide the state into regions which are then further subdivided into individual districts. Each region should be as close to a quota as is practicable. Another technique is to draw all districts as close as possible to a quota, all other factors aside, *and then* tweak the boundaries to better align to clear boundaries and communities of interest.

1.3 On the current enrolment rule

This notion of regional equality is more important than ever in this redistribution. Usually it is not something that needs to be emphasised, as we try to draw avoid districts that are significantly above or below quota on projected enrolment.

However, the current enrolment rule actually *conflicts* with attempts to equalise projected enrolment. As far as I can tell, this was not a problem in the last redistribution, and I imagine that this may have never been a problem in the past. There are large parts of Greater Sydney that are growing extremely fast, and this is where the current enrolment rule becomes problematic.

We are required, by current enrolment rule, to ensure that the *current* enrolment of a district does not deviate from the quota by more than 10%. At the same time, we aim

to bring the *projected* enrolment of each district to as close as zero as is practicable. But what if a district's enrolment (proportional to the rest of the state) is expected to grow by more than 10% of a quota between April 2020 and April 2023? There is a part of Greater Sydney that is expected to grow by 20% of a quota in this time. Constrained by the current enrolment rule, we could draw this district to be just over 90% of a quota on current enrolment. We cannot shrink it any further. But unfortunately, what this means is that by 2023 (the year NSW is due for a state election), this district will be more than 10% *above* quota, when it is already the fastest-growing part of the state. And there is nothing we can do about this. We are obliged to satisfy the current enrolment rule, which forces us to draw districts that are projected to be well oversize by the next election.

I suppose there is one thing we could do to avoid this. We could divide up this fastgrowing region and split it between multiple districts. I urge the Panel to avoid this, as it flies in the face of drawing well-connected, compact districts that unite communities of interest. New residential areas share an especially strong community of interest.

There are two regions of Sydney that have this problem – the outer southwest of Sydney currently contained by Camden district, and in the northwest of Sydney, contained in Castle Hill and Riverstone districts.

The approach I strongly suggest to the Panel is to immediately counterbalance the discrepancies created by the current enrolment rule in adjoining districts, thus preserving regional equality. At least then, we are able to say that the union of the district and one or more of its neighbours is fairly represented.

1.4 Names of districts

There seems to a precedent of holding onto existing district names, even if a district is no longer centred on its namesake. I have adhered to this precedent in my suggestion. I have introduced new names only in cases where a district contains none (or very little) of a namesake. I have also hinted towards possible name changes that the Panel may want to consider in the case that the Panel is more inclined to renaming than I anticipate.

2. Suggestions

I have adopted 11 regions of Greater Sydney to subdivide this section, as outlined in Table 2.1.

Sec.	Districts
2.1	Cronulla, Heathcote, Miranda.
2.2	Badgerys Creek (new), Camden, Campbelltown, Holsworthy, Macquarie
	Fields, Wollondilly.
2.3	Cabramatta, Fairfield, Liverpool.
2.4	Balmain, Coogee, Heffron, Maroubra, Newtown, Summer Hill, Sydney,
	Vaucluse.
2.5	Kogarah, Oatley, Rockdale.
2.6	Auburn, Bankstown, Canterbury, Drummoyne, East Hills, Greystanes
	(replacing Granville and Prospect), Lakemba, Strathfield.
2.7	Blue Mountains, Hawkesbury.
2.8	Londonderry, Mulgoa, Penrith.
2.9	Blacktown, Mount Druitt, Riverstone.
2.10	Castle Hill (absorbing Baulkham Hills), Epping, Hornsby, Kellyville
	(new), Ku-ring-gai (absorbing Davidson), Lane Cove, Manly, North
	Shore, Parramatta, Pennant Hills (new), Pittwater, Ryde, Seven Hills,
	Wakehurst, Willoughby.
2.11	Gosford, Terrigal, The Entrance, Wyong.

Table 2.1: Overview of suggested districts

2.1 Sutherland Shire

It would be desirable to maintain the western boundaries of the Illawarra and South Coast districts, which currently follow LGA boundaries. Changing this would involve radically redrawing these districts, when numerical requirements necessitate only minor changes:

- The boundaries of Monaro are ideal (precisely the union of two LGAs), and Monaro is within 1% of a quota. The eastern boundary of Monaro is an extremely hard physical boundary, with very few road connections running across it.
- A district straddling the Illawarra and the Southern Highlands would be undesirable from the perspective of communities of interest, and would likely lead to the partitioning of the Southern Highlands between three different districts. Moreover, avoiding this allows us to leave the existing boundary between Wollondilly and Camden unchanged.

Perhaps the most pressing question in this region is whether it is viable to avoid a district that contains parts of both Wollongong LGA and Sutherland LGA. Unfortunately, it is not. Bega Valley, Eurobodalla, Kiama, Shellharbour, and Wollongong LGAs together have approximately 6.36 quotas.

The next question one might ask is where it is possible to avoid having a district contain both parts of Sutherland LGA and other metropolitan LGAs. The LGAs in the Illawarra and South Coast plus Sutherland LGA amounts to approximately 9.20 quotas, which again is too far from an integer. Even after removing Sandy Point and Barden Ridge (currently in Holsworthy district), the number of quotas is still 9.15.

I see two solutions to this problem:

- the Holsworthy option Transfer parts of Alfords Point, Illawong and parts of Menai to Holsworthy,
- the East Hills option Transfer Alfords Point, Illawong, and parts of Menai to East Hills, and transfer Barden Ridge out of Holsworthy.

Neither of these are ideal, but it is necessary to apply one of them to equalise enrolment. I am going to make the case that the East Hills option is preferable. There are significant problems with the Holsworthy option:

- The only connection to the rest of Holsworthy is via New Illawarra Road onto Heathcote Road, which hardly constitutes a significant means of travel.
- Holsworthy will need to either include Alfords Point or extend towards Bangor. In the former case, the connectedness of the district becomes even weaker. In the latter case, Alfords Point and Illawong will need to remain in Miranda.

With the East Hills option, we are at the very least uniting a common means of transport, and areas which are much closer to each other. It allows us to ensure that Alfords Point and Illawong are not completely disconnected from the rest of their district, as they currently are in Miranda.

I thereby suggest that Alfords Point, Illawong, and parts of Menai west of Alfords Point Road and Illawarra Road be transferred to East Hills, and Barden Ridge be transferred out of Holsworthy.

From this, the boundaries of Heathcote are obvious – it should include the rest of the western portion of the Sutherland Shire. To equalise enrolment in the Illawarra and south coast districts (assuming their western boundaries are left unchanged), the southern boundary of Heathcote should approximately be that between Bulli and Woonona SSCs. This leaves enough room for Heathcote to extend to the boundary between Yarrawarrah and Loftus SSCs.

This change to the southern boundary of Heathcote not only equalises enrolment in the Illawarra and South Coast districts without changing their western boundaries, it actually entirely rectifies the imbalance in enrolment between Greater Sydney and the rest of the state.

We have the opportunity to use an extremely clear and simple boundary to delineate Miranda and Cronulla – Kiora Road onto Port Hacking Road. While this does leave Cronulla around 2% below quota and Miranda 3.5% above, this is justified by the clarity of the boundary. Should the Panel disagree, they can easily even these numbers further, for example, by having Cronulla extend to Wandella Road around Miranda SSC.

The suggested boundaries of Miranda contain even less of Miranda SSC than the pre-2015 boundaries. It is now a district fully contained within Sutherland LGA that itself fully contains Sutherland SSC. The Panel may therefore want to consider renaming Miranda to "Sutherland".



Figure 2.1: Suggested Heathcote



Figure 2.2: Suggested Cronulla



Figure 2.3: Suggested Miranda

2.2 Macarthur and surrounds

As mentioned in Section 2.1, the changes to Heathcote fully rebalance the enrolment of districts in Greater Sydney and those in the rest of the state. To see that this is the case, take the union of all districts proposed in the previous section and all districts in Greater Sydney including Hawkesbury and Blue Mountains, but excluding Wollondilly and the Central Coast. We find that this contains almost exactly 53 quotas, within less than half of a percent of a quota.

It is obvious that Wollondilly should remain largely the same, and it could be left entirely unchanged. As it is slightly above quota, the Panel may want to consider transferring out Glenquarry and/or Woodlands. Transferring out all of Burradoo would bring Wollondilly very close to a quota. However, I imagine that it is preferable to leave Burradoo united with Bowral. I am going to err on the conservative side and suggest that the boundaries be left unchanged. The best decision may ultimately depend on implications on rural districts, which are outside the scope of my suggestion.

We should now consider a northern boundary for districts in the Macarthur region and surrounds. A very strong boundary that equalises enrolment to within one percent of a quota is to follow the northern boundary of Liverpool LGA in the west, south along the M7, east along the A34 (Terminus Street and Newbridge Road), and north along the Georges River, following it until Sandy Point, where we reach the boundaries of the suggested districts in the Sutherland Shire. This allows us to largely retain Holsworthy in its existing form, and, as we will see later, works quite nicely in allowing us to respect the LGA boundary between Fairfield and Cumberland.

Having lost Barden Ridge (as discussed in Section 2.1), Holsworthy must gain electors in the west. We can achieve this while at the same time improving upon existing boundaries, by:

- aligning the southern boundary around Casula to that of Liverpool LGA,
- aligning the northern boundary around Liverpool SSC to the A34.

We are left to draw four districts in the rest of the region. We can split this region into two Camden-based districts, and two Campbelltown-based districts.



Figure 2.4: Suggested Holsworthy

South of Raby Road, it would be desirable if we could continue to respect the boundary between Campbelltown and Camden LGAs, where it forms a clear boundary, with suburban areas across the boundary separated by over a kilometre of undeveloped land.

With that in mind, we can draw Campbelltown district largely using the existing boundaries, but extending it further north. In particular, we can transfer Eschol Park and Kearns into Campbelltown.

With the transfers to Camden and from Holsworthy accounted for, Macquarie Fields is still around 9% above quota. The existing boundary between Macquarie Fields and Camden follows an LGA boundary that has since been altered. This existing boundary cuts diagonally through houses in the Willowdale estate (in Denham Court SSC). The amended LGA boundary at least respects cadastral boundaries, but is not ideal. If possible, the entire Willowdale estate, along with the Emerald Hills estate (in Leppington SSC), should be united within a single electorate.

We can bring Macquarie Fields close to a quota by ceding the Willowdale, Emerald Hills, and Antegra estates. The question is where the exact boundary should lie.

Note that the small community in Varroville just south of the Willowdale estate is only connected via St Andrews Road to St Andrews or Kearns (via Spitfire Road), so Varroville should remain in Macquarie Fields. Transferring out the semirural eastern portion of Denham Court would lead either to a weakening in the connectedness of the district by having the boundary cross Campbelltown Road, or split this semirural area (by following Campbelltown Road). We therefore want to look for a boundary that leaves Varroville and the semirural portion of Denham Court in Macquarie Fields.

The water supply canal is an obvious candidate, and we can use it for the boundary separating the Emerald Hills estate, and further east where it coincides with the boundary of Denham Court. However, the water supply canal cuts through the Willowdale Estate. I propose that here, we use the boundary of the South West Growth Area – specifically the East Leppington Precinct. This is the boundary of the area in which we can expect to see new housing developments in the foreseeable future.

These changes keep the community of interest around Edmondson Park station and the soon-to-be *Ed.Square* Town Centre united, while allowing the suburbs utilising Leppington station to be united in another district.



Figure 2.5: Suggested Campbelltown



Figure 2.6: Suggested Macquarie Fields

The remaining region we need to subdivide into two districts – one of them Camden, and the other a new district. But there is a problem – the *current* enrolment of this area is less than 1.8 quotas, meaning that it is not possible to subdivide it into two districts here while adhering to the current enrolment rule. This is despite the fact that the *projected* enrolment is almost exactly two quotas due to rapid population growth.

To solve this, we can push the northern boundary of this region to the water supply pipeline, thus taking in parts of Penrith and Fairfield LGAs. One benefit of this is that we avoid splitting the suburban centres of Wallacia and Luddenham. In doing so, the combined current enrolment of these two districts is just barely above two quotas. To maintain regional equality, the numerical shock that this causes to projected enrolment should be absorbed entirely by whatever district lies north of the water supply line.

To divide this region into half, we can approximately follow, from west to east, Cobbitty Road, Dan Cleary Drive, Oran Park Drive, and Gregory Hills Drive. The Dan Cleary Drive and Oran Park Drive portion of this boundary coincides with that between Harrington Park and Oran Park SSCs. I suggest following this boundary exactly, thus placing all of Harrington Park within Camden, and all of Oran Park in the district to the north. The Cobbitty Road portion is less ideal, as it cuts through the heart of Cobbitty. We should instead follow the boundary of SA1 1150619 to the Nepean River.

Finally, the boundary around Gregory Hills Drive needs to ensure that both of these districts are above 90% of a quota in current enrolment. There is a single SA1, namely 1150633, that takes in all of Gledswood Hills and more than half of Gregory Hills. It is therefore impossible for me to discern where exactly this boundary should lie. I have made a guess – the transmission lines around South Creek and the SSC boundary – but the Panel may need to modify it slightly to ensure that the current enrolment rule is adhered to.

The district to the north unites rapidly-growing areas in Sydney's southwest that will be impacted by the development of the new Western Sydney airport and aerotropolis. A fitting name for it is "Badgerys Creek", which I note is a district name that has been used in the past. "Leppington" is also appropriate.



Figure 2.7: Suggested Badgerys Creek



Figure 2.8: Suggested Camden

Despite the fact that the suggested Badgerys Creek district is almost 10% below quota in current enrolment, it is expected to swell to be 12% above quota by 2023. This is the current enrolment rule at its ugliest, but we are obliged to adhere to it. Perhaps one might say that to better abide by this rule, we should avoid drawing districts that contain mostly fast-growing suburbs. But this is such an proposition – new residential developments bring about some of the strongest communities of interest and demographic homogeneity that exist, and they should be united.

Furthermore, I would note that, as far I can see, no matter what the Panel tries, they are going to run into this same problem – there is going to be a district that must be around 10% above quota by 2023 in order to satisfy the current enrolment rule. We will see this problem show up again in the northwest.

2.3 Fairfield to Liverpool

If we take the union of remaining areas in Fairfield and Liverpool LGAs, the projected enrolment of this region is less than one percent of a quota in excess. We can therefore fit Liverpool, Cabramatta, and Fairfield districts in this region while fully respecting the northern and eastern LGA boundaries of Fairfield (barring the hundred or so electors in Fairfield SSC within Cumberland LGA, who should remain in Fairfield district).

Having lost its southwestern panhandle to Badgerys Creek, along with a couple thousand electors to Holsworthy, Liverpool will need to expand west to take in Cecil Hills, and north to follow Elizabeth Drive. The flow-on to Cabramatta can be addressed by moving the northern boundary to follow Orphan School Creek. Fairfield should then be defined to contain the rest of this region. The boundaries of these three districts thus remain simple, clear, and minimal.

It is possible to break the east-west alignment of Fairfield and Cabramatta districts and instead unite Fairfield and Cabramatta SSCs in the same district. While I can see a demographic argument for this, I am not sure if it would be well-received, and ultimately it is not a necessary change.



Figure 2.9: Suggested Liverpool

Figure 2.10: Suggested Cabramatta

Figure 2.11: Suggested Fairfield

2.4 Eastern Suburbs and Inner West (east)

Take Inner West LGA and everything to the east. This region has around 7.98 quotas, so we can subdivide it into eight districts, with some wriggle room for the western and southern boundaries of Summer Hill.

I experimented with various ideas for this region, including some that were quite radical. In the last federal redistribution, residents of Paddington urged the committee to not split Paddington. Certainly, we can avoid splitting Paddington in this state redistribution. But some of the objections further expressed a preference for Paddington to be united with the rest of Woollahra LGA, and specifically not Sydney LGA. This was part of the inspiration for investigating more radical change in this region.

One such idea involved moving Coogee east and north to extend to Bondi Beach, transferring Paddington to Vaucluse, transferring all of Surry Hills to Sydney, transferring Haberfield to Balmain, centring Heffron on Kensington, and extending Newtown south all the way to the airport. I more or less abandoned this idea as it poses significant problems with equalising enrolment, and has multiple features that I expect would be viewed as unwelcome change. The approach I have taken instead is rather conservative.

Six of the eight existing districts in this region are below quota. Summer Hill is one of the other two, which sits half a percent above quota. The other is Heffron, which is projected to be a whopping 13.66% above quota. The general strategy for this region is quite obvious – cut Heffron down to a quota, and distribute the excess among the other districts.

The western boundary of Heffron is close to ideal, uniting St Peters, Sydenham, and Tempe, an area which is quite physically isolated. The boundary with Newtown is very delicate. Even minor changes to this boundary break the connectedness of Newtown and turn its eastern end into a panhandle. The approach I suggest is to have Heffron lose Moore Park and most of its area in Randwick LGA.

If we transfer out all of Randwick LGA, Heffron ends up around 9% below quota. For this reason, Heffron should retain a small portion. I would think that the best way to achieve this is for Heffron to retain parts of Kensington immediately east of Zetland.

If we take the existing Maroubra, Coogee, Vaucluse, and Sydney, along with the portions to be transferred out of Heffron, we are short of four quotas by around 3% of quota. Taking the remaining 3% from Balmain I do not think is an option. The western and southern boundaries of Balmain are simply too strong. Transferring Haberfield to Balmain is not an option as Haberfield contains 8% of a quota.

The only other option is to transfer a small part of Newtown to Sydney. All of Surry Hills north of Devonshire Street is a little too much. I will also reiterate the point that the boundaries of the eastern portion of Newtown are fragile, so it would be ideal to leave them as they are. For this reason, I propose that we keep the boundary between Sydney and Newtown as is, despite the 3% disparity. If the Panel would prefer to equalise further, it has the option of transferring a small part of Surry Hills south of Foveaux Street to Sydney.

I suggest that the only change to Sydney be the transfer of Moore Park from Heffron. This leaves around 3.02 quotas for the three seats in the Eastern Suburbs. This could be equalised by transferring parts of Woollahra SSC east of Jersey Road to Vaucluse. This would immediately bring Vaucluse to within 1% of a quota. However, having opted to not transfer any more of Surry Hills into Sydney, this would leave Sydney further under quota than it is on its existing boundaries. There is also a community of interest between this part of Woollahra and Paddington, and it helps to justify the inclusion of parts of Edgecliff. For these reasons, my suggestion leaves the boundary between Sydney and Vaucluse unchanged.

I experimented with many different ways that Vaucluse could expand into Coogee to make up its shortage of electors. First, I would note that Vaucluse really should not expand into Bondi Junction without covering all of it, which is not possible unless Vaucluse loses electors elsewhere. The boundaries I obtained by having Vaucluse expand into Coogee further east were unsatisfying and ugly. There are too many electors in the remainder of Bondi and Tamarama north of the Tamarama Gully, which would constitute the most obvious boundary. For this reason, I have left the boundary between Vaucluse and Coogee unchanged, and thus Vaucluse remains entirely unchanged.

Figure 2.12: Suggested Heffron

Figure 2.13: Suggested Sydney

Figure 2.14: Suggested Coogee

Figure 2.15: Suggested Maroubra

It is obvious that the remaining area transferred out of Heffron should be transferred to Coogee. This solves Coogee's enrolment deficiency, but actually leaves Coogee with a little too many electors. We can equalise the enrolments of Coogee and Maroubra further by moving the boundary between them north. There are several ways that this can be achieved. The solution I propose is to transfer the newer residential areas around Randwick Barracks into Maroubra, and use Macleay Street as part of the southeastern boundary.

On these boundaries, Coogee loses part of South Coogee and Coogee SSC is moved into the corner. I think it is nonetheless still appropriate to retain the name "Coogee" on these boundaries, although "Randwick" appears to be a strong candidate for a name change that the Panel may want to consider.

As implied by my discussion concerning the western boundary of Sydney, there is no reason to make any changes to Balmain under this configuration.

Newtown needs to expand slightly. I would imagine that the best way to achieve this is to transfer the remainder of Petersham and Lewisham into Newtown. Recall that we did not transfer any of Surry Hills from Newtown into Sydney, effectively borrowing 3% of a quota from Newtown. This accounts for the slight surplus in electors on these boundaries.

Figure 2.16: Suggested Newtown

Figure 2.17: Suggested Summer Hill

A starting point for Summer Hill is the remainder of the region we delineated at the start of this section, using the boundaries of Inner West LGA as the western and southern boundary. However, this leaves Summer Hill slightly under quota. This is expected as we found that this entire region is slightly below quota. We could follow the existing boundaries in the southeast, however, I worry that the eastern portion of Summer Hill has become a little disconnected, attached by a skinny neck across New Canterbury Road.

I therefore suggest that Hurlstone Park be transferred to Summer Hill, and that this be the only portion of Summer Hill outside of Inner West LGA. Hurlstone Park is another suburb on the Bankstown line (soon to be converted to a Metro line). This puts Summer Hill slightly above quota, which we will account for in districts to the west. The Panel may also opt to use use Edwin Street and Robinson Street instead of the Inner West LGA boundary.

An alternative would be for Newtown to expand further into Marrickville, allowing for a more compact (and better connected) Summer Hill. However, this would mean jumping the industrial area of Marrickville, and foregoing the opportunity to unite suburbs (Petersham and Lewisham). An even more radical approach would be to split Summer Hill, with a district uniting Marrickville and Canterbury SSCs. This would require a shake-up of the Inner West and Canterbury-Bankstown regions.
2.5 St George

The St George area has some of the cleanest boundaries in the state, so the changes I will be suggesting are minimal.

The existing boundaries of Rockdale are close to ideal, and its enrolment is almost exactly one quota with negligible deviation. For yet another redistribution, these exemplary boundaries can remain unchanged.

Oatley and Kogarah are significantly below quota and need to be changed.

Oatley's northern boundary currently follows the East Hills Line. If we have to push north, it would be ideal if we could use the M5 – the next prominent boundary running east to west. Unfortunately, this leads to Oatley becoming well over quota. The Panel has several options here, with various combinations of the East Hills Line, the M5, Hannans Road, Bonds Road, Belmore Road, the Riverwood SSC boundary, and the Georges River LGA boundary possible. I think that the clearest boundary preserving communities of interest is to have Oatley extend to the M5 with the exception of the medium-density residential area west of Belmore Road. The demography of this area is very different to the rest of Riverwood.

To address Kogarah's shortfall, Kogarah can extend north to unite Kingsgrove and parts of Beverly Hills east of King Georges Road.



Figure 2.18: Suggested Oatley



Figure 2.19: Suggested Kogarah

2.6 Canterbury-Bankstown, Cumberland, and Inner West (west)

In this chapter, I will also be considering the districts in Canterbury-Bankstown LGA, the Inner West west of Inner West LGA, and Cumberland LGA. The reason why I have this region in a single section because of the ease of defining an outer boundary for it. We have already identified a southern boundary in Sections 2.1 and 2.5, and partly identified a western boundary in Section 2.3. I think it is a given that there will be no districts crossing the Parramatta River or Sydney Harbour east of the Ryde Bridge. All that is left is to determine a northwestern boundary.

I suggest the following boundary – starting at the intersection of Prospect Canal and the Main South Line in the south, follow the Main South Line north through Granville station, then follow the Duck River northeast to the Parramatta River. The Main South Line portion is arguably the strongest and most easily recognisable boundary in the area, with few roads running across it, and having previously formed part of the boundary of Parramatta LGA.

As discussed in Section 2.1, Alfords Point, Illawong, and part of Menai are to be transferred into East Hills. Consequently, East Hills' northern boundary must retract south. The Georges Hall portion of East Hills, which is somewhat disconnected from the rest of the district (due to the Bankstown Aerodrome), can be removed. We can then use Marion Street, Edgar Street, Eldridge Road, Chapel Road, and Canterbury Road for a clear northern boundary.

My initial approach for Auburn was to largely align to the boundaries of Cumberland LGA. The flow-on effects of this included the splitting of Lakemba SSC in half and Lakemba district having a panhandle extending through Potts Hill to Berala. I was able to obtain much clearer boundaries throughout this region by using the A6 as an eastern boundary, and using the Main South Line as a southern boundary.

With this configuration for Auburn, along with changes made to East Hills, the boundaries of Bankstown see immense improvement. The panhandle dangling into Bankstown SSC has been straightened out and follows much clearer boundaries.



Figure 2.20: Suggested East Hills



Figure 2.21: Suggested Auburn



Figure 2.22: Suggested Bankstown

Lakemba has lost a few thousand electors to Oatley, and gained around a thousand from Bankstown, thus needing a few thousand to make up its shortfall. This can be achieved by uniting Roselands within Lakemba. Lakemba would have been a prime candidate for abolition were it not for East Hills extending into the Sutherland Shire. Instead, we are able to improve upon the existing boundaries.

Having lost much of its southwestern portion to Kogarah and Lakemba, Canterbury needs to expand north into Strathfield and Burwood. The cleanest to achieve this is to unite (almost all of) Strathfield South and Croydon Park within Canterbury.

Drummoyne could be defined to be coterminous with Canada Bay LGA, though the LGA boundaries feature an odd triangular protrusion south of Parramatta Road. I have excluded this small area from Drummoyne in my suggestion.

Strathfield must contain the remainder of Burwood and Strathfield LGAs, plus Lidcombe and the suburbs around Sydney Olympic Park. Splitting Strathfield and Burwood LGAs is unfortunate, but as previously discussed, avoiding this comes at the cost of creating a mess of districts around Bankstown.

Uniting Newington and Wentworth Point within Strathfield I would contend is not a bad thing. These suburbs are of their own kind, and if anything, have the most in common with the western suburbs of Canada Bay LGA, in particular Rhodes and Liberty Grove. However, Rhodes and Liberty Grove are best united within Drummoyne. Newington and Wentworth Point share common means of transport with Strathfield, and the same can be said of Lidcombe. Regardless, I think the Panel will find that there are few alternatives to uniting these suburbs within Strathfield. If Strathfield does not push west, it must push south, squeezing Canterbury into a thin sliver.

Finally in this section, I will discuss the district to the west of the suggested Auburn. With the northern boundary of Fairfield district aligned to that of Fairfield LGA, it would be ideal to fully contain this district within Cumberland LGA. As far as I can find, the clearest boundaries for this district by far are to follow the M4 west until the A28 (Jersey Road, Emert Street), then follow the A28 north to the Cumberland LGA boundary.

The resulting district contains parts of the existing Fairfield, Granville, and Prospect districts, but does not contain any of these namesake suburbs. Thus we will need a new name for it. The most natural name is "Greystanes", as the district is roughly centred on Greystanes SSC, and it is a fairly large suburb. I note that this district is fully contained within and almost coterminous with the former Holroyd LGA (missing areas north of the M4). The Panel may therefore want to consider the name "Holroyd" for this district. The Panel may also want to consider the name "Pemulwuy", which is the name of a suburb contained in the district, itself named after an indigenous Australian man prominent in the history of the area.



Figure 2.23: Suggested Lakemba



Figure 2.24: Suggested Canterbury



Figure 2.25: Suggested Drummoyne



Figure 2.26: Suggested Strathfield



Figure 2.27: Suggested Greystanes

2.7 Blue Mountains and Hawkesbury

This redistribution offers us the opportunity to define Blue Mountains district to be coterminous with Blue Mountains LGA, and be within 0.2% of a quota.

Hawkesbury is somewhat more of a challenge. It is based mainly Hawkesbury LGA, but needs to take in electors from elsewhere to satisfy numerical requirements. Currently, it takes in semirural suburbs of Hornsby and the Hills. How we choose to draw the boundaries of Hawkesbury will have significant ramifications on the rest of the northern half of Greater Sydney.

I experimented with configurations involving Hawkesbury expanding into the north of Penrith LGA or the area around Box Hill. Both involve partially retracting Hawkesbury from Hornsby and The Hills. I cannot find any pressing reason as to why either of these options should be pursued.

One possibility I investigated is for Hawkesbury to lose all semirural Hornsby and Hills suburbs, with the exception of Maraylya. In exchange, Hawkesbury would gain Box Hill, Nelson, and parts of Londonderry and Castlereagh. We could then draw a district comprised of the entire Hills/Hornsby semirural area and the Hornsby to Berowra corridor. Uniting each of these regions is a good thing, but other aspects of this idea are more dubious. I explored it further, and found that it becomes extremely difficult to draw the boundaries of districts to the north of Parramatta.

I have thus concluded that Hawkesbury should remain the union of Hawkesbury LGA and some semirural suburbs of The Hills and Hornsby. It is possible to leave Hawkesbury district completely unchanged. However, Hawkesbury is 3.49% below quota, so a modification is preferable. To equalise enrolment while ensuring that Hawkesbury and its neighbours remain well-connected, we could transfer Kenthurst out of Hawkesbury, and transfer Galston, Berrilee, Arcadia, and Fiddletown into it.

Which of these we choose depends on whether Hornsby holds onto the Galston area. As we will see in Section 2.10. Hornsby cannot afford to keep Galston in my preferred suggestion, and so it is the latter. We can use O'Haras Creek, which forms a hard physical boundary separating Glenorie and Middle Dural from Kenthurst.



Figure 2.28: Suggested Blue Mountains



Figure 2.29: Suggested Hawkesbury

2.8 Penrith

The current boundaries of Mulgoa, at first glance, appear quite odd. Most of the population is at its edges, with the boundaries scraping off outer suburbs that are several kilometres away from each other. But if we take a look at the demographics of these suburbs – particularly socioeconomics – we can concede that these boundaries are not as bad as they initially seem. From a socioeconomic perspective, each of these suburbs has more in common with the other suburbs in the district than it does with its neighbouring suburbs, despite the distance. Regardless, Mulgoa will need to lose Abbotsbury and its Liverpool portion to facilitate the creation of a new district in the outer southwest.

As discussed in Section 2.2, the new Badgerys Creek district needs to borrow just over 5,000 excess electors (on projected enrolment) in Penrith and Fairfield LGAs from Mulgoa to satisfy the current enrolment rule. To maintain regional equality, we need to draw Mulgoa as if the southern boundary were that of Penrith and Fairfield LGAs. I included in my introduction (Section 1.2) a discussion on why I am suggesting this, but I will briefly recapitulate. Badgerys Creek must be more than 10% above quota by 2023 to satisfy the current enrolment rule. If we do not immediately absorb this disparity in neighbouring districts and instead allow it to propagate, the result will be that outer Western Sydney will be well below quota on projected enrolment, which is a much more egregious violation of the "one vote, one value" principle.

Having lost Abbotsbury and parts of Liverpool Council, Mulgoa must expand north. The simplest solution is for Mulgoa to gain (the remainder of) Caddens, Orchard Hills, Claremont Meadows, and the St Marys area up to the Great Western Highway (including Colyton).

I regret the transfer of Colyton and the south of St Marys into Mulgoa, as they are an odd fit for this district, and it would be ideal for all of St Marys to remain united in Londonderry. For what it is worth, I will note that the area north of the Great Western Highway is of higher density than the area to the south, though admittedly the area west of Mamre Road is an exception to this. Additionally, these boundaries are very similar to the pre-2015 boundaries. Later in this section, I will provide an alternative solution for the Penrith area whereby Londonderry retains all of this area.



Figure 2.30: Suggested Mulgoa

I suppose Mulgoa is still an appropriate name for this district, but perhaps the Panel might want to consider "Orchard Hills".

Londonderry district is situated in an extremely diverse part of Sydney, and it is impossible to avoid mixing different distinct communities of interest into a single district to at least some extent. There is a suburb in Londonderry with a median household income of \$900. There is another one with a median household income of \$2,000. It may surprise the reader to know that these two suburbs actually neighbour each other.

The communities of interest in Londonderry are:

- the semirural areas in the north of Penrith LGA, which have a very unique demography. It is characterised by large proportions of blue-collar workers, medium-tohigh household incomes, Catholics, and Maltese ancestry.
- the suburbs of Jordan Springs, Ropes Crossing, and Marsden Park. While these areas are somewhat disconnected, their demographics are very similar (and distinct from nearby areas) as they are all comprised of new residential developments.
- the area around St Marys,
- the suburbs east of Penrith,
- the suburbs northwest of Mount Druitt, excluding Ropes Crossing. These suburbs share a common history they were developed as public housing estates in the

1960s and 1970s, and this is reflected in the commonalities between these suburbs to this day. These suburbs are currently split between Londonderry and Mount Druitt districts.

Taking the union of the existing Penrith and Londonderry districts, excluding parts in the suggested Blue Mountains and Mulgoa, we are around 9,000 electors short of a quota. It would be ideal if we could unite the remaining suburbs of the 60s-70s public housing developments in Londonderry. It turns out we can do this, as these suburbs have around 8,800 electors.

The final question for Penrith LGA is where the boundary between Penrith and Londonderry should lie. Having retracted out of the Blue Mountains, Penrith needs to expand east. I sugest that Penrith expand to include all of Cambridge Park and Werrington Downs.

I will briefly outline an alternative to these boundaries that involves more radical changes, but may be worth considering. Unfortunately, I did not have time to produce maps for this alternative.

- The theme of Mulgoa being a "unite high SES suburbs on the suburban fringe" district is upheld. Instead of expanding towards St Marys, Mulgoa gains Leonay in the west, and Minchinbury in the east. This produces two distinct tabs protruding northwards from the M4. Connectedness remains a point of a dubiousness for Mulgoa in this configuration, though it is not as bad as the existing boundaries.
- Penrith further gains Werrington County from Londonderry, uniting the trio of suburbs on the north side of Dunheved Road, which are all extremely similar demographically.
- Londonderry sees minimal change (possibly none) to its eastern boundary.



Figure 2.31: Suggested Londonderry



Figure 2.32: Suggested Penrith

2.9 Blacktown

Having lost its suburbs northwest of Mount Druitt SSC, Mount Druitt district needs to expand east. We can easily bring Mount Druitt back to quota by transferring in Doonside and Bungarribee. It is hard to avoid Mount Druitt straddling South Creek, but following SSC boundaries makes the best of it.

Riverstone is another district where we run into a similar problem as Badgerys Creek, where satisfying the current enrolment rule conflicts with attempts to equalise projected enrolment. I suggest that the only change to made to Riverstone is that it loses Glenwood. On current enrolment, this leaves Riverstone 7.4% below quota, but on projected enrolment, this becomes 4.6% above quota. It appears we have more room to cut down Riverstone further. But what else can we remove without violating the current enrolment rule? Remove Acacia Gardens, and we are at 11.6% below quota on current enrolment. Remove the portion of Quakers Hill southwest of the Richmond Line, and it is 10.7%. Unfortunately, we cannot compromise on the current enrolment rule. To cut Riverstone down further, the only options are to split Acacia Gardens, or awkwardly cut through Quakers Hill, perhaps using Eastern Road, for example. I suggest that we simply remove Glenwood, and have the excess counterbalanced by Blacktown district.

Blacktown district needs to span from the M2 in the north to Prospect Reservoir in the south. There is not enough room in the south for an east-west alignment. The question is whether Blacktown should extend east in the north into Lalor Park, or in the south into Seven Hills SSC. As we will see, if we want to avoid worsening the boundaries of Seven Hills district, Blacktown needs to expand into Seven Hills SSC. We can use Sunnyholt Road and the Main Western Line as boundaries.

Here it becomes apparent that Prospect has disappeared. Prospect is a bits-and-pieces district with very fuzzy boundaries. In its place, we have districts that respect the boundaries of the three LGAs that Prospect currently straddles.



Figure 2.33: Suggested Mount Druitt



Figure 2.34: Suggested Riverstone



Figure 2.35: Suggested Blacktown

2.10 Northern Sydney, Hills, and Parramatta

Northern and North West Sydney have a very unique geography that poses numerous challenges to drawing electoral boundaries. There are many hard physical boundaries, most notably Garigal National Park and the Lane Cove River, subdividing Northern and North West Sydney into its distinctive subregions. Arterial roads are sparse, with collector roads branching off into quiet, isolated neighbourhoods. Take the Northern Beaches for example – a region of almost 300,000 people with only three road connections to it!

All of this makes drawing electoral boundaries in Northern and North West Sydney especially challenging. This redistribution is no exception, and the Panel is going to have to make some tough decisions to satisfy numerical requirements, especially with the significant enrolment imbalances across the region.

I will be including a preferred suggestion for this region, along with an alternative (Section 3). The alternative addresses a few of the less than ideal features of my preferred suggestion.

I would like to begin by making a few comments about the existing boundaries in this region. As disclosed in my introduction, I have lived in Northern and North West Sydney for half of my life, and the (existing) districts I have resided in are Castle Hill, Epping, and Riverstone.

Many of the boundaries in this region do not reflect the understanding I have developed of these areas over the years. They cut and mix communities of interest rather than uniting them. I completely understand that this is often necessary to satisfy numerical requirements. But in most of these cases, there are several clear and viable alternatives that all seem to have been completely overlooked. There are three districts in particular that I will single out for this – Baulkham Hills, Castle Hill, and Epping.

Baulkham Hills unites (most of) Baulkham Hills and Bella Vista SSCs with parts of Castle Hill SSC – so far, so good. But in the east, the district crosses Darling Mills Creek and Excelsior Creek, leaving North Rocks and West Pennant Hills dangling off the side, hardly connected to the rest of the district. The North Rocks portion is only connected via Barclay Road and the M2 in the southeast corner of Baulkham Hills SSC. West Pennant Hills is only just barely connected through North Rocks via Oakes

Road. I would emphasise that the only roads leading out of the Hills portion of West Pennant Hills lead out to the northeast, east, and southeast – the west is completely sealed off by Excelsior Creek and Darling Mills Creek.

The physical separation of West Pennant Hills is not the only reason why these boundaries are frustrating. The bulk of the Hills portion of West Pennant Hills shares a common history with Cherrybrook, Glenhaven, and northeastern parts of Castle Hill, having all been developed throughout the 1980s. The similar demographies of these areas reflect this shared history. Most of Baulkham Hills and the south of Castle Hill are the older parts of the Hills.

North Rocks would be better off united with Carlingford and suburbs to the east and southeast, especially given the strong physical separation with suburbs to the west imposed by Darling Mills Creek.

It gets worse still at the northwestern end of the district. Baulkham Hills extends into yet another distinct community of interest – the new suburban developments around the west of Kellyville.

There are many alternatives that could be taken to the existing boundaries. Suburbs such as Winston Hills, Kings Langley, and Glenwood could be united within Baulkham Hills. We could have a district uniting the bulk of Baulkham Hills and Castle Hill SSCs, which together constitute the older suburban part of the Hills. If there is to be a district centred on Baulkham Hills and Bella Vista SSCs, the two directions I would *not* start expanding into are east and northwest, which is precisely the alignment that the existing district takes.

Castle Hill is another district that needlessly cuts and mixes distinct communities of interests, namely:

- the rapidly-growing northwest of the Hills around Kellyville, Rouse Hill, and Box Hill. These areas are dominated by younger families. The newest of these areas are also more ethnically diverse than the rest of the Hills.
- the semirural suburbs of The Hills that are not going to see development any time soon. These areas feature a different lifestyle to most of the Hills by virtue of their rurality, are especially affluent, and have a population significantly older than the rest of the Hills.

Epping is the third district that is especially egregious. This is the district that I have lived in the longest, and I have lived in the north (Cherrybrook), the middle (Beecroft) and south (Carlingford). And having lived in all three places, uniting them makes no sense to me. Again, this might be acceptable if there were no alternatives to satisfy numerical requirements, but there are clear alternatives here that I will present. Uniting Cherrybrook with Beecroft I admit is acceptable, as is uniting Beecroft with Epping. But uniting Cherrybrook with Epping is very strange indeed.

When my family moved from Beecroft to Cherrybrook, I insisted I continue to attend Carlingford High School. For these several years, I felt like home and school were worlds apart. People would say to me, "Oh, you're from Cherrybrook?". I did not know anyone from Cherrybrook (barring my GP, our neighbours, and the like). In fact it was not until I started studying at Macquarie University that I met people from Cherrybrook. The perceptions of Cherrybrook Technology High School at Carlingford were negative, largely due to an incident that occurred years ago. My younger naïve self did not want to move there, partly for this reason. I now know from friends who attended Cherrybrook Technology that these perceptions were far from the truth.

I do acknowledge that my own personal anecdotes are of limited value in making this suggestion. So I will again point to history and demography. Epping, Cheltenham, Beecroft, and Pennant Hills arose as suburbs around the Main North railway line in the late 1800s and early 1900s, with residential areas interspersed by farmland. Carlingford took off as a suburban area in the post-WWII era. Epping has become more similar to Carlingford over time having undergone waves of expansion and transformation over time, in contrast to Beecroft and Cheltenham. Cherrybrook was only developed in the 1980s, along with most of West Pennant Hills, Glenhaven, and the north of Castle Hill.

All of this has led to numerous demographic indicators revealing significant differences between Epping and Cherrybrook SSCs. Cherrybrook is predominantly comprised of older families, while Epping SSC has a significant proportion young people living alone or in group households. Epping has a much larger migrant population. Epping contains many medium and high-density residential areas – it almost has what you could call a skyline, and this trend in development is set to continue into the future. Cherrybrook on the other hand, is almost entirely detached houses. Epping is relatively vibrant – at least by North West Sydney standards – whereas Cherrybrook is very quiet. The list goes on. If all this does not suffice to convince that Epping district needs to be reworked, perhaps numerical considerations will. Suppose we took a minimal approach to Epping – we could, for example, flatten out Ryde's protrusion into Parramatta LGA, with no other changes to Epping. We are in huge trouble here. Ryde, Hornsby, and the North Shore and Northern Beaches districts together have 9.57 quotas. There is no way to make the numbers work without ghastly panhandles extending west from either Ryde or Hornsby.

I will summarise what I have laid out here in terms of a subdivision of the North West of Sydney into its distinct subregions:

- the rapidly-growing corridor from Norwest to Box Hill,
- the suburbs of the Hills developed around the 1960s, namely most of Baulkham Hills and Castle Hill, characterised by older families,
- the suburbs of Parramatta council northeast of Parramatta, characterised by a significant migrant population and higher residential density,
- the old, leafy suburbs along the rail line between Epping and Hornsby,
- the suburbs around Old Northern Road developed in the 1980s, namely Cherrybrook, Glenhaven, and parts of West Pennant Hills and Castle Hill,
- the semirural suburbs in the north of The Hills and Hornsby LGAs.

I will start by discussing the boundaries of Castle Hill. I urge the Panel to avoid any proposal that involves only making minor changes to the south of the district around Castle Hill SSC. This district on its current boundaries crosses Cattai Creek to mix together the two most diametrically opposite areas of The Hills LGA, and then throws in parts of Castle Hill SSC. In one of these areas, the semirural bulk of Dural is split right through its heart (this may be an LGA boundary, but it nonetheless splits a community of interest), and in the other, more or less the same is done to Kellyville! The connectedness of the existing Castle Hill district is rather weak, and largely a result of it crossing Cattai Creek. How many roads are there that cross Cattai Creek?

The boundaries in this area should realign to unite each of these areas, not cut and mix them. For Castle Hill, this means confinement to the west side of Cattai Creek and reorientation along the Norwest to Box Hill corridor. As Castle Hill SSC will no longer form a part of this district, a name change is warranted. I suggest the name "Kellyville", as Kellyville SSC will be fully contained in this district, as will Beaumont Hills and North Kellyville, both of which were formerly parts of Kellyville SSC. Were it not for the current enrolment rule, we could define Kellyville to be precisely the union of Box Hill, Nelson, Rouse Hill, Beaumont Hills, North Kellyville, Kellyville, Bella Vista and Norwest SSCs, and the resulting district would be between 1% and 2% below quota, appropriate for a district experiencing rapid growth. However, the current enrolment rule precludes this, as this would place Kellyville 15% below quota on current enrolment. Kellyville thus forms the third case whereby we are unable to effectively equalise projected enrolment due to the current enrolment rule, and spoils an opportunity to use ideal boundaries. Because of the current enrolment rule, the southern boundary must move south into Baulkham Hills SSC. We might try using Chapel Lane onto Mackillop Drive as a southern boundary, but we are still 13% below quota on current enrolment. Next, we could try incorporating the neighbourhoods coming off Mackillop Drive eastwards. Frustratingly, this leaves Kellyville 10.5% below quota on current enrolment. It is not clear where to go from here without overextending. I think the best solution is simply to overextend a little in the interests of creating clear boundaries, and use Merindah Road as the southern boundary.

I think it is clear at this point that Glenwood, Kings Langley, and Lalor Park all need to be located in Seven Hills. Seven Hills then needs to jump the Seven Hills Business Park to cover suburbs in the northwest of Parramatta LGA, as it currently does. These boundaries are, as are the existing boundaries, unfortunate. Seven Hills is at the intersection of multiple corridors running through Greater Sydney, so it is not easy to control its alignment. However, I will contend that these boundaries are a significant improvement upon the existing ones. The district is much more compact, with much clearer boundaries. The southwestern bulge across the rail line is gone, and the Kings Langley panhandle is, well, no longer a panhandle. The M2/M7, Old Windsor Road, and the Main Western line are common means of transport in this district.

We can also align the northeastern boundary to The Hills LGA boundary. By doing this, we confine Seven Hills to two LGAs rather than three, ensure that Baulkham Hills SSC (excluding parts in Parramatta LGA) is split only between two districts rather than three, and help to smooth out the boundary of the district to the north perturbed by the encroachment of Kellyville into Baulkham Hills SSC.

Seven Hills district must also move out of Westmead, which is a good thing as this part of Westmead is not poorly connected to the rest of the district. Furthermore, we are able to unite all of Westmead within a single district.



Figure 2.36: Suggested Kellyville



Figure 2.37: Suggested Seven Hills

We are able to drastically improve and simplify the boundaries of Parramatta. More than 80% of the existing Parramatta district is north of the Parramatta River, despite it containing Parramatta SSC along with Harris Park and Rosehill. We can reorient Parramatta district to an east-west alignment uniting suburbs along the Main Western Line and Victoria Road, using James Ruse Drive and Kissing Point Road as the northern boundary. The boundaries I suggest better respect the socioeconomic communities of interest and common means of transport in the area, and centres on Parramatta SSC.

These boundaries also allow a district uniting the suburbs in the northeast of Parramatta LGA, one of the communities of interest included in my discussion of this rgion. We can finally respect Darling Mills Creek and have North Rocks united with suburbs to the east and south. In the north, we can use the M2, a clear boundary delineating distinct communities of interest. The only exceptions to this are that we should unite all of North Rocks, and place North Epping in this district (as it is only connected via Epping SSC). The southeastern boundary follows that of Parramatta LGA. These boundaries are ideal – for a district in this region, there is nothing I would want to change. And on these boundaries, the district is within 1% of a quota.



Figure 2.38: Suggested Parramatta

This district contains all of Epping and North Epping SSCs, so arguably it is reasonable to retain the name "Epping" in the interests of avoiding name changes. Just over half of electors in the existing Epping are in this district, so there is some continuity. On the other hand, existing names aside, the most natural name for this district is "Carlingford", which I note is a name that has been used in the past.

These boundaries address numerous shortcomings I discussed regarding the boundaries of Epping and of Baulkham Hills. North Rocks is no longer largely disconnected from its district. Pennant Hills Road – used as a boundary by the existing Epping – does not delineate particularly distinct communities of interest. On the other hand, the M2 very much does. The east-west orientation of Parramatta and Epping is a substantial improvement in reflecting both demographic commonalities and variation across Parramatta LGA.



Figure 2.39: Suggested Epping

How districts in Northern Sydney will turn out can largely be parametrised by the rotational offset of districts around the Lane Cove River. If Ku-ring-gai recedes from Hornsby LGA, a southern push cascades down the North Shore, eventually causing Lane Cove to push west into Ryde, which then must expand into Parramatta LGA. Conversely, if Ku-ring-gai pushes north, then the North Shore districts are pulled north, and parts of Ryde LGA must be transferred to Epping or Parramatta.

The suggested boundaries for Parramatta and Epping imply that this rotational offset will be such that it respects the boundary between Parramatta and Ryde LGAs. My alternative suggestion will look at what happens if we set this offset elsewhere.



Figure 2.40: Suggested Ryde

The remaining area in Northern and North West Sydney that we are yet to divide into districts contains 11.004 quotas.

Having lost its uptick into Parramatta LGA, and already slight under-quota, Ryde now needs to expand into Lane Cove. There are various ways that the Panel could approach this. What I am going to suggest is a more conservative approach, with changes to the northeastern boundary with Lane Cove. This involves the removal of Lane Cove's rectangular bulge, and moving the boundary north of Twin Road to Cressy Road. This unites the medium to high-density areas of Macquarie Park and North Ryde northeast of Epping Road in a single district.

The flow-on to Lane Cove can be rectified entirely by transferring the rest of higherdensity portion of Artarmon west of the North Shore line into Lane Cove.

I considered a few other alternatives:

- Use Cressy Road as a boundary between Ryde and Lane Cove all the way from Pittwater Road to Victoria Road, eliminating the awkward crisscrossing of the existing boundaries through Ryde SSC. As a counterargument, there is no good way to ensure that the medium and high-density areas in Macquarie Park and North Ryde are united within one district.
- Transfer the bulk of North Ryde east of Lane Cove Road from Ryde to Lane Cove, and most of Putney from Lane Cove to Ryde. This runs into the same problem as the previous alternative.
- Transfer the western panhandle of Willoughby LGA west of the Pacific Highway to Lane Cove, with Lane Cove in return losing its portions of Artarmon and St Leonards. The Panel should consider this if they choose either of the above alternatives for Ryde above as this will improve the connectedness of Lane Cove. However, to equalise enrolment, it is necessary either for areas north of Fullers Road to remain part of Willoughby or be transferred to the district to the north, or for part of Greenwich to be transferred to North Shore.

There are two relatively modest approaches we could take to bring North Shore closer to quota:

- Expand in the northwest, transferring more of Crows Nest to North Shore.
- Drop the boundary in the west south to River Road and Shirley Road, and transfer in all of Cremorne.
I note that Cremorne north of Military Road has not been included in North Shore for most (if not all) of the last few decades. Cremorne is a very similar suburb to Cammeray, so it makes sense to have both of them mostly united in Willoughby. The second option also leaves North Shore around a thousand voters above quota. For these reasons, I suggest the more conservative approach. Regardless, this decision has no propagating impact on other districts.

I should now discuss the Northern Beaches, as there is still a need for a district that crosses the Northern Beaches LGA boundary. The three Northern Beaches districts (Manly, Wakehurst, and Pittwater) are together 12.7% below quota, meaning that these districts need to contain more of the Northern Beaches currently located in Davidson. However, if we were to entirely unite the Northern Beaches within these three districts, they would together be 12.9% *above* quota. The number of electors in the Northern Beaches not part of these districts therefore needs to approximately halve.



Figure 2.41: Suggested Lane Cove



Figure 2.42: Suggested North Shore

This is quite problematic. With the existing Davidson, the Northern Beaches portion is at least connected via both Mona Vale Road and the Roseville Bridge. This is no longer possible – we can only choose one. To ensure that this district is connected via the most common means of travel, the Roseville Bridge is certainly the better option.

The clearest boundaries can be obtained by having the area south of Warringah Road and west of the Wakehurst Parkway be the only part of the Northern Beaches not within the three Northern Beaches districts. And with this, I would argue that it is actually better to have this area be part of Willoughby district, instead of a district in Ku-ringgai LGA. The commute to the CBD from Killarney Heights passes through Willoughby from its northern to southern boundary, whereas there is only a small section along Warringah Road through Ku-ring-gai LGA.



Figure 2.43: Suggested Willoughby

Aside from this and the alterations to its boundaries with Lane Cove and North Shore, the only other changes I propose for Willoughby is that the northern boundary drops south to unite all of Roseville in the district to the north, and that Castle Cove be returned to Willoughby.

This is an unfortunate configuration, but we can neither maintain the existing boundaries nor contain Northern Beaches LGA completely in three districts without causing significant enrolment inequality.

The alternative of placing part of the Northern Beaches in a district to the north is, in my view, no better, if not worse. The problem is that Willoughby will then need to expand into the south Ku-ring-gai LGA making the Roseville Bridge connection even more tenuous. The Panel could also consider keeping the Killarney Heights area part of Wakehurst, and instead shrinking the Davidson portion of the Northern Beaches. However, the boundaries are very unclear. Blackbutts Road I suppose is the best candidate.

I think that the clearest boundaries for the Northern Beaches districts can be obtained by having Pittwater extend south down Pittwater Road, Manly exchanging North Curl Curl for Allambie Heights with Wakehurst, and Wakehurst filling in the former Davidson areas.

The district to the north of Willoughby we can draw with mostly ideal boundaries, using Bobbin Head Road and the western boundaries of West Pymble, Pymble, St Ives, and St Ives Chase SSCs. This district unites Roseville, Roseville Chase, Lindfield, East Lindfield, Killara, East Killara, Gordon, St Ives, St Ives Chase, (almost all of) Pymble, West Pymble, and a small part of Turramurra to the east of Bobbin Head Road. South Turramurra and West Pymble are separated by a hard physical boundary, as are St Ives and North Turramurra, and Bobbin Head Road is a prominent road running north-south through the area.

Davidson is off the table as a name for this distrct, with Davidson SSC now in Wakehurst. In the interests of using existing names, I am going to suggest "Ku-ring-gai", but note that only a third of electors in this new district are in the existing Ku-ringgai. The Panel may want to instead consider this a new incarnation of the "Gordon" district.



Figure 2.44: Suggested Pittwater



Figure 2.45: Suggested Wakehurst



Figure 2.46: Suggested Manly



Figure 2.47: Suggested Ku-ring-gai

The district to the north of Gordon must combine the remaining 25,000 electors in Ku-ring-gai LGA with electors to the north of Hornsby. I understand that this may be less than than ideal. My alternative suggestion will explore the flow-on effects of specifically avoiding this configuration. There is a socioeconomic community of interest between Ku-ring-gai LGA and suburbs north of Hornsby, though admittedly it is not as strong as that within the Ku-ring-gai LGA. There is also common means of transport across this district, specifically the North Shore Line and the Pacific Highway. I also note that these boundaries are similar to the 1991 boundaries of Ku-ring-gai. (I too was surprised to see that this district was named "Ku-ring-gai" at the time.)

Again, in the interests of using existing names, I am going to suggest that "Hornsby" be retained for this district. Over half of the existing Hornsby is in this district. The Panel may want to consider the name "Wahroonga" as an alternative. The name "Berowra" would be ideal, but is used as the name of a federal electorate (despite it violating guidelines concerning the naming of federal divisions). "Asquith" and "Mount Colah" are some other ideas. If the Panel wants a throwback to the 1991 electoral map, I suppose "Ku-ring-gai" also works, though in this case the district to the south needs to be renamed.

To the west of Hornsby, we have a district uniting suburbs along the railway between Epping and Hornsby, along with West Pennant Hills and Cherrybrook. To me, as a former resident of Cherrybrook, this is a massive improvement upon being located within Epping district. Uniting West Pennant Hills and Cherrybrook makes a lot of a sense, as these are the Hornsby/Hills suburban areas developed in 1980s, and consequently the two suburbs share a lot in common demographically. The new Cherrybrook Metro Station along Castle Hill Road further connects these two suburbs. This is a massive improvement over West Pennant Hills' location in Baulkham Hills district, the rest of which it was almost entirely disconnected to, and Cherrybrook's odd location in Epping district.

As this district contains all of Pennant Hills and West Pennant Hills, and is roughly centred on Pennant Hills, I suggest that this district be named "Pennant Hills".



Figure 2.48: Suggested Hornsby



Figure 2.49: Suggested Pennant Hills

The last remaining district unites the older suburbs of The Hills LGA, namely most of Baulkham Hills and Castle Hill, along with the affluent semirural Hills/Hornsby suburbs to the north. The encroachment of Kellyville into Baulkham Hills (due to the current enrolment rule) makes the boundaries appear a little awkward, but otherwise these boundaries are a huge improvement, uniting Dural SSC within a single district rather than cruelly partitioning it into three. It also unites Dural with the similar suburbs of Annangrove and Kenthurst, whose collector roads lead to the heart of Dural.

It should be clear at this point why I opted to transfer Kenthurst out of Hawkesbury. These boundaries would look very bizarre indeed if it had a panhandle out to Annangrove while also stretching to Fiddletown, and the community of interest united would be weaker.



Figure 2.50: Suggested Castle Hill

"Castle Hill" is the most natural name for this district, though there is a lack of continuity between the existing Castle Hill and this one. The suggested Kellyville district is really the successor the existing Castle Hill (with Kellyville taking around 40,000 electors from the existing Castle Hill). However, I would also point out that "Castle Hill" was a tenuous name for the existing district, and had little overlap with the pre-2015 Castle Hill.

2.11 Central Coast

With population growth in the Central Coast closely following the state trend, very few changes are needed here. I cannot find a way to improve upon the existing configuration. Gosford and Terrigal can remain unchanged. A couple thousand voters can be transferred from Wyong to The Entrance by following Ourimbah Creek and the boundary between Chittaway Bay and Berkeley Vale SSCs.



Figure 2.51: Suggested The Entrance



Figure 2.52: Suggested Wyong