

TASMANIAN PLANNING COMMISSION



Macquarie Point Multipurpose Stadium Project of State Significance

Summary of comments on draft guidelines

16 February 2024

Introduction

This is a report concerning the response(s) of the Tasmanian Planning Commission (the Commission) to the comments received following of the Draft Guidelines - Macquarie Point Multipurpose Stadium Project of State Significance (draft guidelines) having been published.

The draft guidelines were published on the Commission's website on 4 December 2023. The Commission invited comments on them, to be made by 8 January 2024. 547 comments were received and considered by the Commission.

Final guidelines are to be publicly exhibited by 16 February 2024. They will be published on the Commission's website.

Comments were received from individuals, community groups, organisations and government agencies. The comments range from statements of opposition or support for the concept of a stadium, to detailed comments on one or more of the draft guidelines and suggestions for changes or additions to the draft guidelines. Some of the comments wholly or partly adopt a proforma response or endorse the content of another comment.

Purpose of the guidelines¹

The purpose of the guidelines is to provide a framework to be followed '...in the preparation of reports to be presented to the Commission for the purposes of the integrated assessment'² it is to undertake. The guidelines set out the matters the Commission will consider when undertaking its integrated assessment of the project.

Overview of comments received

The Commission considered the comments received in its review of the guidelines and has made a number of changes to them to reflect issues raised by the comments. Some of the changes clarify, strengthen or broaden existing requirements, while others introduce new elements. What follows is an overview of the nature of comments received and the approach adopted in response:

- Multiple comments make either general statements or specific suggestions on what the draft guidelines should cover. Where the matters raised were considered to be adequately addressed by the draft guidelines, no changes have been made. Where the matters raised were considered to augment or add clarity within the scope of the guidelines, changes have been made.
- Many of the comments raise issues that are outside the scope of the integrated assessment to be conducted, including general statements as to whether the project should proceed. Many of these comments provide views on how the project may affect, either positively or negatively, issues such as urban form, landscape, heritage and cultural values, amenity, traffic, transport, economics, tourism and employment. These did not require changes to the draft guidelines, noting that the majority of issues raised are covered as matters for consideration under the draft guidelines.
- Many of the comments expressed dissatisfaction with the timing and length of the period in which comments could be made on the draft guidelines, or other aspects of the project of State significance process. These comments are acknowledged.

¹ See s20(2B) of the *State Policies and Projects Act 1993*

² uplifted from that sub-section.

- Some comments raise issues that relate to the guidelines, but that appear to misapprehend the purpose of the guidelines. For example:
 - some comments suggest that the guidelines should provide standards for the assessment of the proposal. As the guidelines are not development or performance criteria, these suggestions were considered to be misplaced.
 - some of the comments make suggestions relating to specific matters that should be achieved through the design of the proposal. These were also considered to be beyond the purpose of the draft guidelines.
- Other comments refer to elements of or potential future uses of land in the area under the draft Mac Point Precinct Plan, such as an Aboriginal cultural precinct, which is not directly within the scope of the Commission's assessment. The Commission is limited to assessing a proposal for a Macquarie Point Multipurpose Stadium.
- Some comments make suggestions about how the project should be required to operate, or compliance measures for it. These did not require any changes to the draft guidelines.

Summary of changes to the draft guidelines

The following is a summary of key issues raised for each Section, or topic area, of the guidelines, and the main changes that arose from the Commission's consideration of the comments. Not all comments or suggestions are summarised here, although all comments and suggestions were considered.

Part I - Introduction

Overview of issues raised in comments

Some comments suggested that the guidelines should be written as clear criteria or objectives that provide certainty on how the project will be assessed and what the relative importance of different matters are.

Many comments suggested that the guidelines should restrict some consulting firms from being involved in the preparation of assessment reports.

Some comments outlined that, in addition to the assessment reports, it was important that the Proponent has an opportunity to provide its views on the merits of the project or how it relates to objectives.

Changes made in response to comments

The draft guidelines were modified to clarify that:

- reports submitted to the Commission are to be prepared by suitably qualified people; and
- the views of the Proponent on the merits of the project may be provided separately to the reports it will submit.

Part II, Section 1.0 - Proposal

Overview of issues raised in comments

Some comments related to the veracity of advice received from organisations that are part of the State Government.

Some comments outlined that that:

- the draft guidelines appear to be asking for detailed plans, drawings of building approval matters and a detailed description of different types of events and specific activities; and
- the plans should show indicative dimensions to enable flexibility in future design development.

Many comments indicated that it was important that human-made as well as natural hazards and a range of cultural values were clearly shown on plans.

Some comments indicated that it was unclear what was meant or intended by requiring information on management actions to address on-site and off-site effects.

Changes made in response to comments

The draft guidelines were modified to clarify:

- that the development plans are to be provided at a stage in the process where structural engineering and significant building compliance matters have been adequately resolved, but that detailed plans on these matters are not required;
- the description required for use and activities proposed; and
- that plans are to show key dimensions.

A new section has been added requiring that any information and advice requested or provided by relevant agencies is to be cited in any reports.

The scope of matters to be addressed and shown on plans under section 1.4 of the guidelines was extended to include hazards, places of cultural significance and noise sensitive activities.

The guidelines were modified to clarify the intended scope of 'off-site' versus 'on-site' effects and what is meant by proposed 'management actions'.

Part II, Section 2.0 - Policy, strategy and legislative context

Overview of issues raised in comments

There were a range of opposing views expressed on the planning documents referred to in this section. Some comments stated that the draft and final precinct plans for the area should not be considered as relevant while some comments believed that precinct plans by the Macquarie Point Corporation should be the only documents considered.

A number of comments referred to a need to:

- say what the actual planning criteria for the area are, as opposed to outlining the range of strategies and plans that the reports should include;
- refer explicitly to the requirements of other Acts that may relate to the project; and
- explicitly list relevant codes and regulations that may be relevant for the project.

Some comments outlined that, in addition to development strategies, other policies of government such as those related to climate change may be relevant matters to consider.

Some comments indicated that it is not certain what status management plans and strategies should have - i.e. whether they need to be publicly available and approved by the relevant organisation.

Changes made in response to comments

The draft guidelines were modified to clarify that parts B and C of the Sullivans Cove Planning Scheme 1997 should be considered.

The draft guidelines were modified to clarify the status of plans and strategies that may be relevant.

The draft guidelines were amended to include a reference to policies and strategies related to climate change and greenhouse gas emissions.

Part II, Section 3.0 - Economic development and social, cultural and community wellbeing

Overview of issues raised in comments

Many comments proposed that the guidelines for the Cost Benefit Assessment (CBA) include:

- a clear methodology for monetising non-priced values; and
- more detail on how specific matters such as the value of land, the opportunity cost of other uses, or investment costs should be treated.

Some comments suggested that the guidelines could refer to guides for undertaking a CBA from other Australian jurisdictions.

There was a wide range of opposing views on the suitability of the guidelines requiring:

- an assessment of alternative use and development of the site or an alternative stadium proposal;
- an assessment of an alternative investment of public funds; and
- an assessment of the economic effect of the project matters such as the overall level of grants/funding from the Commonwealth to the State, the level of Government debt and potential effect on matters such as the State's credit rating.

Some comments raised concerns about the veracity of assumptions around matters such as investment costs, operating revenue or the treatment of non-priced values leading to unreliable economic assessments.

Some comments outlined that there is a need to ensure that Tasmanian Aboriginal communities were part of any assessment of social or cultural effects.

Changes made in response to comments

The draft guidelines were modified to clarify that the CBA is to be undertaken as an absolute analysis of the project rather than a comparative assessment of any alternative use of the site, noting that the Economic Impact Assessment is to include an assessment of an alternative investment of public funds and the Financial Impact Report compares a projection of the State's finances resulting from stadium's costs and financing with a no policy change (i.e. no stadium) scenario.

A reference to guides from Infrastructure Australia for undertaking economic appraisal of projects and assessing greenhouse gas emission as part of a CBA, were included in the draft guidelines.

The draft guidelines were amended to state that treatment or valuation of different non-priced cultural and social values need to be undertaken on the same basis.

The draft guidelines were modified to clarify that where an assessment of social or cultural values or association with place are undertaken, this is to include consultation with Tasmanian Aboriginal communities.

Part II, Section 4.0 - Landscape and urban form

Overview of issues raised in comments

Suggestions generally related to improvements on and clarification of definitions, such as 'landscape' and 'broader area'.

The comments raised issues relating to visual impact and the need to provide a detailed independent visual impact assessment.

The comments made statements about how the area considered should be wider and include specific areas such as the Queens Domain and the Eastern Shore of the River Derwent.

The comments made suggestions that the human scale of Sullivans Cove should be expressly considered and that specific locations should be identified for photomontages.

The comments made suggestions that the draft guidelines should also refer to the degree to which the proposed project may 'detract' from the character of Sullivans Cove.

Changes made in response to comments

The draft guidelines were modified to clarify that landscape refers to both the built and natural elements, and to broaden the scope by removing references to specific places where an effect should be considered.

The draft guidelines were modified to refer to 'visualisations' rather than 'photomontages' and reference professionally developed and adopted guidelines as a basis for the methodology to produce these visualisations.

The Commission made a number of other amendments to the draft guidelines in response to comments, including:

- inserting references to the effects of the proposal on a human scale environment of Sullivans Cove; and
- requiring consideration of the entire proposed project rather than limiting consideration to 'the stadium building', where appropriate.

Part II, Section 5.0 - Cultural heritage

Overview of issues raised in comments

The comments raised issues relating to both European and Aboriginal cultural heritage.

Suggestions generally related to improvements and clarification on drafting and expanding the consideration of issues covered in the reports.

Consultation with Tasmanian Aboriginal communities, ensuring the guidelines gave enough focus on Aboriginal heritage issues, and the legislative context of Aboriginal heritage in the state were common themes raised.

The comments also made suggestions for documents to reference in the preparation of reports.

Various comments made statements about the potential impact the proposed project may have on cultural heritage values.

Changes made in response to comments

Section '5.1 Historic and cultural context' in the draft guidelines has been replaced with a new section, '5.1 Aboriginal cultural values and landscape'. This specifically relates to Aboriginal cultural values that are linked to the landscape character of the place.

The Commission made a number of other amendments to the draft guidelines in response to comments, including:

- inclusion of provisional heritage listings as well as permanent heritage listings;
- changes to photomontage requirements and reference to guidelines that detail requirements for appropriate methodology;
- requirements to investigate options for avoiding or mitigating impacts on Aboriginal heritage as well as actions to recognise Aboriginal cultural values; and
- inclusion of references to guidelines and practice notes relating to both European and Aboriginal heritage.

Part II, Section 6.0 - Movement

Overview of issues raised in comments

Many comments considered that the draft guidelines should contain principles that outline what specific transport outcomes are to be achieved. This included stating what scenarios are to be modelled and ensuring all activities at the site are considered.

The comments raised concerns about the broader impacts to pedestrian, cycling and vehicle traffic across the region, including the northern freight route. Further concerns were raised about the need for assessments to consider the existing transport systems and infrastructure only unless further systems are proposed as part of the project.

The need for secure bicycle parking facilities with end-of-trip facilities and infrastructure that caters for all abilities was raised in multiple comments.

Changes made in response to comments

The draft guidelines were modified to include a requirement that the modelling and assessment of transport demand and management options considers the range of uses and activities proposed.

The draft guidelines were also modified to require that the modelling and assessment of transport demand and management options is informed by relevant transport plans and strategies, at a local and regional level.

The guidelines were amended to require that specific consideration is given to develop strategies that promote mass/public transport services as the intended mode of transport to the stadium and locality.

The draft guidelines were amended to include a requirement for plans to show the linkages between existing and proposed pedestrian and cycling infrastructure.

The Commission made a number of other modifications to the draft guidelines in response to comments, including:

- requiring that specific consideration is to be given to continued access to the Port of Hobart via Evans Street and any new proposed freight access route;
- including a requirement that specific consideration is given to the capacity of the existing mass/public transport system;

- including a requirement that the reports are to assess the level of security and number of bays for bicycle parking infrastructure; and
- including a requirement that any new pedestrian and cycling infrastructure is informed by the Greater Hobart Cycle Plan.

Part II, Section 7.0 - Activity and land use

Overview of issues raised in comments

Some comments suggested that the scope of the draft guidelines should be expanded to include an assessment of other potential uses in the area that are reflected in the draft Macquarie Point Precinct Plan.

Many comments related to being more specific about likely conflicts between residential uses or business activities in the area and events that may occur at the stadium.

Some comments suggested that specific business activities in the area be listed in the draft guidelines.

Some comments outlined that there were not sufficient noise policies in place related to conflicts between events at the stadium and commercial, cultural or community-based activities.

Changes made in response to comments

A number of changes were made to this section, including:

- requiring a consideration of the potential for land use conflicts between commercial or residential uses and the area and the operation of the project related to specific matters such as parking demand, noise and crowd behaviour;
- requiring a specific consideration of how land use conflicts may be avoided or mitigated; and
- adding a definition of noise sensitive activities to the glossary that includes commercial, community based adversely affected by noise.

Part II, Section 8.0 - Environmental quality and hazards

Overview of issues raised in comments

The comments raised issues that covered each of the topic areas in this section.

The comments suggested that the effects of issues such as light, water quality management and noise and vibration have on fauna should be considered.

Some comments suggested a comprehensive environmental impact assessment or flora and fauna survey should be provided.

The comments suggested that consideration of environmental quality issues should be benchmarked against the existing conditions as well as against potential alternative future uses on the site.

Some comments focussed particularly on the issues associated with noise and vibration, and suggested the effects of noise and vibration on a broader range of adjacent uses should be considered.

The comments suggested that a new noise policy should be introduced, including acceptable standards, and that this policy should be referenced in the draft guidelines.

Some comments suggested further potential hazards on the site should be considered, and the assessment of contaminated land should be strengthened.

Some comments suggested the section on climate change could be strengthened and broadened.

Changes made in response to comments

The draft guidelines were amended to ensure a wider range of surrounding uses that are potentially sensitive to noise and vibration are considered. A list of potentially 'noise-sensitive uses' was added to the glossary.

The Commission made a number of other amendments to the draft guidelines in response to comments, including:

- requiring the effects of environmental quality issues to be considered for fauna and, in some cases, flora;
- requiring description of the existing environmental conditions on and in the vicinity of the site;
- including further environmental hazards to be addressed; and
- broadening and strengthening the requirements relating to climate change.

Part II, Section 9.0 - Other planning matters

Overview of issues raised in comments

Issues raised in relation to signage included a lack of detail in the draft guidelines of alternative methods for wayfinding. Comments suggested that the signage guidelines should include requirements related to urban design principles and include specific requirements for colours, materials and lighting.

Comments received suggested that the construction management guidelines should consider dust, noise, vibration, acid sulphate soils and contaminated land and how these matters will be managed.

Matters raised for utility services considered that telecommunications and the augmentation of services should be included as a requirement in the guidelines.

Comments relating to emergency management and incident response stated that consideration should be given to emergencies outside the stadium, and the operation of access and exits during emergencies.

Changes made in response to comments

The guidelines were amended to require the reports to include a Wayfinding and Signage Strategy.

The guidelines were amended to require that issues relating to environmental quality, including stormwater management, dust and noise, be specifically assessed for the construction phase of the proposed project.

The guidelines were modified to ensure that telecommunications is included as a 'utility service', along with electricity, gas, water, stormwater and sewerage.

The Commission made a number of other amendments to the draft guidelines in response to comments, including:

- requiring reports on indicative signage designs, rather than the final designs;
- including specific consideration on Aboriginal cultural heritage significance;
- including a requirement that the results of soil contamination and acid sulphate soil analysis are provided in the reports; and
- including landowner support as a consideration for utility service augmentation.