

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, 6 January 2024 11:12 PM
To: TPC Enquiry
Subject: Comment on Draft Guidelines - Macquarie Point Multipurpose Stadium

Categories: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Tasmanian Planning Commission
GPO Box 1691
HOBART TAS 7001

Macquarie Point Multipurpose Stadium Draft Guidelines

Dear Commissioner

I am writing to you to provide comment regarding the Draft Guidelines that are currently exhibited for public comment. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this important part of the planning process.

The comment I wish to provide is for the Commission. Therefore, **I ask that my name and personal details not be published publicly and not be released under Right to Information without my express approval.**

I was born and raised in Tasmania and have called Hobart my home for more than 30 years. I have used this as personal context when providing these comments. I do not have a real, potential or perceived conflict of interest regarding the Order or any proposed clause within the Draft Guidelines.

I support the general approach to the assessment process and the elements that the Commission has identified as its guiding principles. I support an independent assessment of this important project and prefer it greatly over the common practice where Local Governments often act as owner, proponent and planning authority. I acknowledge that these Guidelines will not bind the Commission's approach. I also acknowledge that there will be hearings and other opportunities for public and stakeholder input and interaction with Members of Parliament.

Feedback

- The Cost Benefit Analysis must include a base line scenario that outlines the economic, social and cultural benefits of the site over the past 10 years adjusted to current dollars. This baseline must be considered as the base case, because, despite endless discussion, proposals and money spent, the site has remained largely vacant and undeveloped. Although people may claim otherwise, a vacant undeveloped site is the most like state of the site for the next decade should this Stadium not be constructed.
- The Cost Benefit and Social Analysis must take into account that as per the contact with the AFL that without a roofed stadium at that site the licence for a Tasmanian AFL and AFLW team is voided and that innovation, opportunity and investment of a perpetual team in the AFL will be lost, including game development, training facilities, games in Launceston, tourism, marketing, merchandise and employment that results from a local team. This should be modelled on the precedents of new State's entering the AFL such as West Coast Eagles or Adelaide Crows.
- The Landscape and visual values must be progressed in a balanced way, avoiding a scenario where the "worst" angles and impacts are given undue focus and weight. For example, I reject the idea that the replica Mawson's Hut, a reasonably recent addition to the waterfront, is a key reference site.

- The Landscape and visual values must consider innovation, art installation and creative built infrastructure as a way to avoid, manage or mitigate the visual impact from key sites such as the Cenotaph. The fact that the RSL has been supportive of an alternative vision that shares the same basic bulk as this Project demonstrates to me that there are solutions and compromises that may be achieved.
- The impact on place, and interpretation of “adjacent area” must be kept reasonable and where impacts can be demonstrated as material.
- I disagree that the reference to the Hobart aquatic centre in 2.2.1(3) is of relevance and ask it be removed.
- In general terms I am of the strong opinion that the role of the City of Hobart Council must be kept to matters of fact and as an owner of adjacent facilities. It is my opinion that the Council’s views about development at Macquarie Point are not representative of broader opinion and therefore its policies, plans and strategies are also not representative.
- In terms of any hearings, it is my experience that involvement in hearings, appeals and “objections” are generally unrepresentative of the general community, particularly influenced by planning lobby groups that have full time organisers or campaigners who can be available during business hours. This in my view is undemocratic and should somehow be considered when the structure of those processes are formulated.

As a final point, I note with interest - but no surprise - that an online campaign is being run that effectively boils this public exhibition and comment process into some sort of “vote” against the AFL, stadium and/or Liberal Government. I agree that people need to be provided an opportunity to engage in the process. However, I request that the Commission provide a strong statement about what this process is - and what it isn’t – to help stakeholders, the community and the media understand the process better.

Kind regards

