

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Sue Henn [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Sunday, 7 January 2024 11:42 PM  
**To:** TPC Enquiry  
**Subject:** Macquarie Point Multipurpose Stadium

**Categories:** [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

John Ramsay, Executive Commissioner Tasmanian Planning Commission

7th January, 2024

I am writing to express my concerns about the process involved with the public comment on the Draft Guidelines for Macquarie Point Multipurpose Stadium and I also wish to make some submissions with regards to the process and the guidelines.

Firstly, the timeline for public comment has deliberately and cynically been set at the busiest holiday period of the year when many families are away on holiday and/or involved in other activities. For a project of this importance and with such significant financial consequences to Tasmania, this timeline is inadequate and quite frankly, unethical. I strongly suggest that the Commission recommends that the timeline be extended by one month.

Secondly, the Draft Guidelines and proposal is set as a fait accompli, the implication being that a Macquarie Point stadium is the only option. This is inaccurate and misleading in the extreme. The Commission should have the ability to look at alternative venues in terms of cost benefits to all regions of Tasmania and not just to the southern region. There is a strong case for an AFL stadium to be based in Launceston which is a fairer and cheaper option for all Tasmanians. There would be business and tourism benefits to the whole of Tasmania instead of the current Hobart centric approach. It is a major oversight that this Government has refused to consider alternative venues. In effect, the democratic process has not been followed and the people of Tasmania have not had the opportunity or platform that has allowed for proper and purposeful comment. I suggest that the Commission request, or demand, the ability to broaden its scope to include the viability of alternative venues for a Tasmanian AFL team and stadium.

Thirdly, the economic and business viability of all options should be assessed and determined by Treasury. This assessment should include annual depreciation costs and running costs which is likely to be estimated in the region of \$50 million per year. It should also include a realistic evaluation of the likelihood of any additional events being held running at an overall profit. Indeed, is the whole project to be a drain on the Tasmanian economy and if so, what effect will this have on Tasmanians especially with regards to health, housing and socio-economic outcomes.

Unfortunately, there is insufficient time to make a more detailed submission on this project. The whole decision making process has been inadequate, shockingly undemocratic and biased. Opponents of the Macquarie Point site have been vilified by a Premier who is supposed to represent all Tasmanians, and alternative suggestions have been utterly disregarded. Once again I recommend that the Draft Report Guidelines include the ability to investigate the economic, cultural and social viability of all possible venues including Bellerive and Launceston.

If the Macquarie Point Multipurpose Stadium is viewed as the preferred option, then visual, sound and light, aesthetic and environmental issues should require very strict guidelines. And maybe cruise ship companies should be asked about the potential negative visual impact of a dominating concrete structure on the Hobart waterfront.

Thank you for your attention,

Susan Henn