

Please provide additional information and supporting documentation as attachments.

This response is submitted on behalf of the Management Committee of Riverstone Neighbourhood Centre.

We understand the need to consider electoral boundaries as our population grows. The key considerations for a change to electoral boundaries include:

- * balance the number of voters
- * communities of interest, with a focus on the socio-economic profiles and regional interest
- * capacity to communicate and travel within the electorate
- * physical features and area
- * boundaries of the existing electorate

The Seat of Riverstone encompasses an area with significant urban development as part of the Sydney North West Growth Area. Consequently, we see rapid population growth, which includes low density housing on smaller parcels of land, medium density and high density residential development.

We firmly oppose the submission proposals of The Liberals (NSWR 200701/34) and Mulcair (NSWR 200702/36) to move a large proportion of the seat of Riverstone into the seat of Hawkesbury, for the following reasons:

- a. The submission only address one key criteria for the proposed boundary change, and that is purely the number of voters
- b. The existing seat of Riverstone has no communities of interest, with very different communities and spread. The existing seat of Riverstone is very much suburban, and will continue to continue along this path, in fact, becoming more densely populated with high density residential neighbourhoods. These share no common identity/ interests with a very different cohort in the seat of Hawkesbury, which still remains a relatively rural based seat.
- c. The seat of Hawkesbury is large in area, and would create potential negative impacts for communication and travel for the significant numbers of residents in the existing seat of Riverstone (which will only continue to grow).

We see no benefit in moving a large seat, such as Riverstone, into the seat of Hawkesbury. The submissions by The Liberals and Mulcair have failed to demonstrate the benefit of their submission.