

Macquarie Point Multipurpose Stadium

Public Hearing Technical Note

Technical Note Number	5
Subject	Plans update and clarification
Date	3 July 2025

1. Background

- 1.1 On 25 June 2025, during the course of the Proponent opening its case, there was questioning by the Commission about any differences between the project considered by the Commission as part of preparing the Draft Integrated Assessment Report (**DIAR**) and the project as proposed at the time of releasing under the *Macquarie Point Planning Permit Bill 2025 (Bill)* for public consultation. The material compiled at the time of the release of the Bill for public consultation, has been supplied to the Commission to inform its assessment.
- 1.2 On 30 June 2025, during the course of the information presented by Alastair Richardson from Cox Architecture, on behalf of the Proponent, several matters were taken on notice to confirm.
- 1.3 This Technical Note 5 identifies:
 - (a) at section 2, the changes between the project the subject of the Project of State Significance submission before the Panel (**PoSS Version**) and the project as proposed at the time of releasing the Bill for public consultation (**Bill Version**);
 - (b) at section 3, further information on the external finishes of the project, and the mechanisms in place to provide certainty around how these will be implemented as intended through the construction procurement process; and
 - (c) at section 4, clarifications on matters taken on notice, including in relation to the Goods Shed.
- 1.4 The attachments to this Technical Note are contained in the following link: [Attachments to Technical Note 5](#).

2. The Plans

- 2.1 Since the PoSS submission, the design work for the project has continued and is currently in the detailed design stage. The detailed design process has resulted in refinement of the designs, as the documentation advances to prepare for the issue for construction stage. The Bill Version incorporated advancement from the PoSS Versions, as set out below.
- 2.2 The key design revision between the Bill Version and the PoSS Version is the reduction of the carpark to remove one level as described at (a) below. The other differences between the versions reflect additional detail that has been identified as part of the normal progression of design. These are listed at (b) – (j) below.

Design revision:

- (a) the car park shown in the PoSS Version is three levels. The Bill Version proposes a car park with two levels. **Attachment 1** contains plans and sections of the Bill Version car park. This change was made to ensure the car park is above groundwater level, which has reduced the complexity of the basement structure and environmental regulation required. A separate Technical Note will be provided to the Panel on the car park;

Additional information:

- (b) egress drawings have been included in the Bill Version depicting an example of how people will exit the stadium. The egress drawings were provided to the Commission as an attachment to Representation 3. Additional drawings showing egress for each of the levels within the stadium were provided in the Bill Version (**Attachment 2**). As the detailed design progressed, detailed static and dynamic pedestrian modelling is being progressed, which will support the development of detailed pedestrian and transport event and operational plans. A separate Technical Note will be provided to the Panel on emergency management and safety.
- (c) landscape plans were included as part of the Bill Version (**Attachment 3**). The landscape plans were developed through design refinement process. A separate Technical Note will be provided to the Commission attaching updated landscape plans, including further information on the ramp on the eastern side of the external concourse which will support emergency vehicle and pedestrian access around the level change on the site;

Updated documents:

- (d) the Emergency Management and Incident Response Plan was updated as part of the Bill Version (**Attachment 4**) to reflect the landscape design noted above at (c);
- (e) the Cut and Fill Plan was updated as part of the Bill Version (**Attachment 5**) to reflect the reduction in car park levels and updates to the approach to subgrade strengthening;
- (f) the Construction Environmental Management Plan was updated in the Bill Version (**Attachment 6**) to reflect:
 - (i) the reduction in car park levels noted above at (a);
 - (ii) updates to the approach in subgrade strengthening; and
 - (iii) updates to cut and fill and reuse of some material, where appropriate, on site;
- (g) the latest versions of renders of the four entrance gates were provided as part of the Bill Version;
- (h) minor updates to the Planning Report (**Attachment 7**) were made, such as to reflect the reduction in car park levels as noted at (a) above and to note that the Royal Engineers Building title transfer to the Macquarie Point Development Corporation has been completed;
- (i) minor changes were made in the Bill Version to the Stadium Design Description (**Attachment 8**), such as diagrams and images were updated to the latest drawings and renders, and information was removed that was already covered in other submitted material; and
- (j) the consolidated drawings in the Bill Version were updated to reflect minor design updates. It is noted that the façade details were clarified as part of the further information provided to the Commission on 31 January 2025 in response to the request for further information and remain as shown in those drawings.

2.3 The Bill Version documents are available here: <https://www.tas.gov.au/dpac/macquarie-point-multipurpose-stadium-consultation#Additional-documents>.

3. Materials and finishes

3.1 The elevation drawings noted in 2.1(j) above, are attached with an updated materials schedule which provides further details on the colour and finishes of the façade details, which have been

confirmed through the detailed design process as it has progressed since the submission of the PoSS Version (**Attachment 9**).

3.2 In respect of the roof:

- (a) the roof cover is to comprise of Ethylene Tetrafluoroethylene (**ETFE**) pillows. Depending on the type, design and application, ETFE is capable of having minimal reflection risk;
- (b) as the ETFE material is transparent, the portion of the sunlight reflected is very low. Typically, reflection values are between 2% and maximum 10% depending on the angle. The range of transparency in the options of ETFE being considered to diffuse shadow risks relevant to the wicket area through testing with cricket, will only result in a relatively small variation to this. This is much lower than on glazing where reflectivity can be up to 60%; and
- (c) the shape of the ETFE is also important. Flat glazing generates reflections of larger dimensions than sunbeams interacting with a double curved surface, as is the case with the proposed ETFE cushions. In this case, the very low reflection property of the ETFE and the double curved surfaces of the cushions make the risks of glare from reflected sunlight very unlikely.

3.3 The intended external finishes schedule will be achieved through:

- (a) the delivery model selected for the project;
- (b) novation of the lead design team; and
- (c) documenting the Principal's Project Requirements as part of the procurement and contracting process.

3.4 These are explained in further detail below:

- (a) **Delivery model:** The Stadium is intended to be procured through a Design Development and Construction (**DD&C**) method. A DD&C is a derivative of the more conventional Design and Construction (**D&C**) method. In a D&C method, the client progresses the design and/or functional brief to a point and then hands over responsibility to a construction contractor to complete, allowing for design and construction innovation to be included.

The distinguishing feature of a DD&C is the extent to which the design is progressed prior to appointing the construction contractor, which is typically more advanced than a conventional D&C. In this instance, the design will be progressed to approximately 70% Design Development.

As a result of the chosen methodology, the Corporation retains responsibility for the design for longer than is often the case. This will allow the Corporation to provide an increased level of specificity (including in respect of materials and finishes) into the tender and subsequent contractual documentation and, as a result, have a greater degree of control over the final product.

The hand-over of a more developed design allows the tenderers to more accurately understand and price the project, reducing the likelihood of downstream value management as a result of cost pressures post contract award.

- (b) **Novation of the design team:** When the tender process was undertaken to procure the lead design team, a deed of novation was included outlining the intended DD&C delivery model. This followed through to the contractual arrangements.

Similarly, novation documentation is being drafted as part of preparations to undertake a procurement process to identify and appoint a suitable construction contractor to deliver the project.

- (c) **Principals Project Requirements:** As part of this delivery model, the Corporation has appointed Scyne to develop the technical and functional briefs to document the Proponent's requirements in terms of the design and to identify the areas of the design and functional brief that are set, and the extent of the areas and elements of the design that are open to innovation. Scyne has extensive experience developing stadium briefs and tender documentation and will incorporate learnings for a number of other recently completed stadia.

4. Response to questions to Alastair Richardson from the Panel

4.1 The following matters were taken on notice by Alastair Richardson, Director, Cox Architecture as part of his presentation on 30 June 2025. This included questions from the Panel in relation to the broader Macquarie Point site and the development of the Mac Point Precinct Plan, querying the possibility for new view lines through the neighbouring port area, and clarifications on the capacity, use and status of the Goods Shed, and the supporting conservation management plan that has been submitted.

- (a) There were some questions from the Panel about the gross floor area (GFA) of the Antarctic Facilities Zone and the Complementary Integrated Mixed Use Zone on the eastern side of the broader development. Approval to develop these zones is not part of the project being considered through the project subject to the PoSS process however, as set out in the approved Mac Point Precinct Plan:

- (i) the Antarctic Facilities Zone ground floor area is 7,000m²; and
- (ii) the Complementary Integrated Mixed Use Zone ground floor area is 10,000m².

The plans illustrate two building envelopes respectively within each of those zones which represent the work underway to prepare more detailed master planning documents to support the implementation of the Precinct Plan. The indicative ground plate for the building parcels in the Antarctic Facilities Zone are approximately 1600m² each. The indicative ground plate for the building envelopes shown in the Complementary Integrated Mixed Use Zone are 1,467m², to the north and 2,572m² to the south.

The master planning process is being undertaken through a separate consultancy which is being led by another team in Cox Architecture under a separate procurement, contract and brief. It is supported by local firms including ireneinc which offers local planning knowledge and expertise. The master planning work being undertaken through that separate team, contract and scope is consistent with the brief for the work.

- (b) In terms of the interactions with the Working Port and view lines, the Mac Point Precinct Plan was developed working closely with TasPorts. TasPorts was a member of the Project Steering Committee which oversaw the development of the plan, and the resulted in the inclusion of informed references to TasPorts intended future development spaces. In particular:

- (i) the Mac Point Precinct Plan highlights both the commercial and cruise zone for current and future development and commercial use at Macquarie Wharf, and the secure port area; and
- (ii) developments neighbouring the latter require careful design informed by the needs of the secure port. The commercial development areas on the eastern side of the Macquarie Point site offer protection for the secure port as a physical and sight barrier, as opposed to the TasPorts sites to the north and south where the interaction between the Macquarie Point site and TasPorts' commercial and public access areas are consciously more porous.

- (c) In respect of the Good Shed intended uses, capacity, layout and status of the conservation management plan:
- (i) the Planning Report included as part of the PoSS submission (**Planning Report**), which was updated and re-submitted on 17 February 2025 at Annexure C, as part of the response to the Request for Further Information from the Commission, provides the Goods Shed currently provides an event space in its current use (page 24, Section: Existing Use / Events).
 - (ii) the Planning Report also provides the proposed use as part of the future use is to include:
 - (A) being fitted out to enable events and functions (page 27, Section: Community meeting, events and entertainment); and
 - (B) serving as a breakout space during primary events, and may also be used as a bar, open to the public outside primary events (page 27, Section: Food services, general retail and hotel industry);
 - (iii) these uses reflect the intended uses and are able to be accommodated as a result of the layout and capacity planning for the venue;
 - (iv) the Goods Shed maximum capacity is 1,500 patrons, with space able to be dynamic to suit a variety of layouts and uses, as illustrated in the following three modes with supporting drawings:
 - (A) game day mode – 900 capacity comprising a combination of dining and standing offerings (**Attachment 10**);
 - (B) every day / general access bar mode – 736 capacity in the current working layout (**Attachment 11**); and
 - (C) cocktail mode – 1,500 capacity in cocktail mode with predominately standing space only (**Attachment 12**).
 - (v) As noted by the Commission on 30 June 2025, an initial Conservation Management Plan for the Goods Shed formed part of the PoSS submission. As noted in that plan, an updated plan will be prepared after a suitable contractor has been appointed to work with the Proponent, and in consultation with Heritage Tasmania, to detail suitable methodologies for the relocation of the Goods Shed. This is consistent with the recommendations of heritage expert, Mr Jim Gard'ner in his witness statement.
- (d) Details of the ramp on the eastern side of the site that form part of the external concourse will be addressed in a separate Technical Note focussing on Landscape Plans as noted above at 2.1 (c).