

From: [REDACTED]
To: [TPC Enquiry](#)
Subject: Draft Guidelines for Macquarie Point POSS
Date: Monday, 1 January 2024 11:34:02 AM
Attachments: [Dr K Shield Submission to TPC Jan 2024.pdf](#)

To whom it may concern
Please find attached my submission on the Draft Guidelines for a Macquarie Point Multipurpose Stadium - Project of State Significance.
Thank you for your kind consideration in this matter.
Yours sincerely
Kate Shield
[REDACTED]

Submission on the draft guidelines for a Macquarie Point Multipurpose Stadium - Project of State Significance.

Dr Kate Shield

To the Tasmanian Planning Commission

In making this submission, I refer to the "*Draft Guidelines - Macquarie Point Multipurpose Stadium Project of State Significance - December 2023.*" All quotations from this document are in italics.

I have read the Draft Guidelines and appreciate that they are substantial and comprehensive (editorial typos notwithstanding). That said, there are some items that need strengthening if the Commission is to fulfill its charter.

I use the headings and item numbers used throughout the Draft Guidelines in identifying these items.

PART 1: INTRODUCTION

2.0 Background

Item 2. As part of the integrated assessment, the Commission is to specifically consider the extent to which the proposed project is consistent with and supports the urban renewal of the Macquarie Point site (as defined in the Macquarie Point Development Corporation Act 2012) as provided for in the Mac Point Precinct Plan prepared by the Macquarie Point Development Corporation established under section 5 of that Act.

The recently revised (Oct 2023) Mac Point Precinct Plan existed only as a draft at the time of Ministerial Direction and should not be given undue consideration. The draft Precinct Plan was hastily cobbled together after the precipitous announcement by the Premier of his deal with the then AFL CEO, Gil McLachlan for a stadium at its centre.

The survey that comprised the 'public consultation' component of the Precinct Plan's release was farcical. It presented a stadium as a *fait accompli* and offered no opportunity for respondents to declare their opposition to a stadium on the site; it only sought feedback on the proposed structures around the edges. It also included a misleading 'artist's impression' of the proposed stadium's height and bulk, that was obviously drawn to diminish the structure's true scale and impact on the site. The Mac Point Precinct Plan's credibility is therefore tainted.

Instead, the proponent should be required to specifically report on the extent to which the proposed project is consistent with other current relevant planning documents for the site, including:

- The Sullivans Cove Planning Scheme 1997
- The Macquarie Point Site Development Plan
- Macquarie Point Reset Masterplan 2017-2030

The Commission should assess the project against compliance with prescriptions in these planning documents.

While the order *supplants the approval processes otherwise required by legislation concerning the use and development relevant to the proposed project under the Resource Management and Planning System of Tasmania, specifically the Land Use Planning and Approvals Act (1993); the Environmental Management and Pollution Control Act (1994) and the Historic Cultural Heritage Act (1995)*, it is vital that the Commission gives full weight in its considerations to the approval criteria under these Acts. This order should not be seen as an opportunity for a '*tabula rasa*', as these Acts have served the community in protecting the Tasmanian environment, its resources and cultural heritage since their inception. This is not a greenfield site. The same degree of rigour that these Acts impose should be applied by the Commission in its integrated assessment.

If the proposal for a stadium does not comply with the prescriptions of all relevant planning documents, and meet requirements under the relevant existing Planning Acts, it cannot be acceptable to the Commission.

PART II: GUIDELINES

1.0 The Proposal

While there are several references to 'context' in Items 1.1 to 1.4, the notion of scale, or more specifically of an 'out-of-scale' structure overshadowing an historic precinct, goes unaddressed until Section 4.0. I believe a truly 'integrated assessment' should see these requirements merged and given equal value. In fact, the notion of scale should precede the siting of a building in a specific location. Addressing the brief of trying to squeeze an out-of-scale structure into an undersized site leaves the proponent wasting more time and money on a Cinderella exercise – no matter how hard the ugly sister tries, the shoe won't fit. If Section 4.0 *Landscape and Urban Form* is to be addressed AFTER the design is completed, the whole planning process is turned on its head.

In a similar vein, items addressed later in the guidelines like environmental hazards, also seem to be putting the cart before the horse. Surely the assessment of the site for these impacts needs doing before the criteria are set for any grand design.

That said, a report prepared under *Site description, features and context* should include future flood modelling, taking into account sea level rise, as well as details on remaining site contamination issues including proposed treatments, if any.

In addressing *the engineering properties of the reclaimed land*, details and plans of any proposed cut and fill should include proposed building footings.

2.0 Policy, strategy and legislative context.

As stated above, setting the Commission's focus on specific consideration of *the extent to which the proposed project is consistent with and supports the urban renewal of the Macquarie Point site (as defined in the Macquarie Point Development Corporation Act 2012) as provided for in the Mac Point Precinct Plan prepared by the Macquarie Point Development Corporation established under section 5 of that Act*, is problematic as it favours a document which lacks credibility. It imparts the impression that the Commission is being set up to give the proponent what it wants, without any option to canvas alternative uses for the land. This is a shaky foundation upon which to base credible findings. Opportunities lost must come into consideration.

3.0 Economic development and social, cultural and community wellbeing

3.1 CBAassessing the **net** benefit of investing in the proposed project;

3.2 EIAassess the **net** effect of the proposed project on the Tasmanian economy;

3.3 FIR ...the impact of project costs on **the State's** projected financial position.

All economic analyses need to be strengthened to consider the **differential impacts** on various parts of the state. It is insufficient to present financial impacts in whole-of-state terms only. The **substitution effect** of concentrating public spending, and its concomitant ongoing debt, in the south which will stand to benefit more from any 'profits' generated by the site, compared with the north, which will share the cost and debt burdens while receiving few of the benefits, needs to be clearly articulated in any financial summary. Even within the city itself, the differential distribution of benefits will be felt by businesses in the CBD vs those in outer areas. These differences need to be identified and clearly stated.

Any consultants engaged by the proponent to conduct these economic analyses should not have existing government contracts or potential conflicts of interest with the proponent.

An **independently** verified report detailing the full, updated cost estimate of the project should be provided. Questionable consultancies like PwC need to be excluded. All consultants' reports should be open to public examination, without redaction for 'commercial in confidence' reasons, if the proponent is to adhere to transparency requirements as stated in Item 3.2. *The modelling is to be provided in a transparent manner with all key assumptions separately detailed and supported and should enable professional peer review.*

The proposed source of the funding should be detailed, and the amounts itemised using several statistical comparisons including gross, per capita, and % of SGDP, in total and year on year, to avoid cherry picking data.

The CBA should also detail:

- The full financial cost of the project, including money spent to the current stage, and the expected interest on any debt generated, to the budget;
- The opportunity cost of not using the site in accordance with the previously agreed and finalised development management plan;
- The cost associated with paying out commercial contracts entered into in line with the previously agreed and finalised management plan.

3.4 *Social and Cultural Analysis Reports...are to include an analysis of these effects based on a combination of quantitative and qualitative data and information.*

When reports from various organisations include survey results as evidence for their findings, it is critical that the survey be constructed by knowledgeable researchers and expert statisticians, not Survey Monkeys. The survey itself needs to be honest in its attempt to illicit informed responses.

As an educator, I understand fully how respondents can be manipulated, and surveys can be engineered to return a desired result. Surveys need to be fact-checked and analysed for bias in their construction before their results can be given any weight or credibility. The total number of respondents to any survey needs to be assessed for statistical significance, using academically recognised statistical tools.

The Commission's guidelines should specify the survey criteria to which reports should adhere in order to be accepted as valid.

The *social and cultural analysis report* should:

- Provide workable solutions for the recruitment and accommodation of the construction workforce required to deliver the project that ameliorate the impacts on housing availability throughout the construction period;
- Take account of the perspective of the Tasmanian Aboriginal community with regard to the effective abandonment of a Truth and Reconciliation Park;
- Address the impact of the development on the built cultural heritage values of the Sullivans Cove precinct.

PLANNING ASSESSMENT

4.0 Landscape and Urban form

A detailed independent visual impact assessment must be provided, modelled from a variety of viewpoints including, but not limited to:

- The Tasman Bridge;
- The Derwent River;
- The Cenotaph;
- Various locations within Sullivans Cove;
- kunanyi/Mt Wellington
- Battery Point
- The Glebe

Reports examining the urban form of Sullivans Cove should analyse the effect of any impacts on the existing cultural heritage values of the Cove.

Where reports *use specific views in to and out of the site*, they should be taken from human eye level, not drone shots or worm's eye views designed to diminish scale and visual impact.

5.0 Cultural Heritage

5.2 Aboriginal heritage

5.2.2 The reports are to assess the extent to which the development affects Aboriginal heritage protected under the Aboriginal Heritage Act 1975;

The Aboriginal Heritage Act (1975) is acknowledged as deficient and is currently under review.

Projects of this scale and significance should not be assessed until that process has been completed.

6.0 Movement

Mass transport and public transport analysis should only consider those aspects of public transport that are existing, or formally form part of this proposal, as there are no guarantees other mass transport options that have been mooted will eventuate. Or that transport options will evolve quickly leaving stranded assets to be paid off well after their utility value has passed.

Traffic and transport analysis must detail congestion issues on adjacent roads, including the approach to Davey Street and Davey Street itself.

8.0 ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY AND HAZARDS

8.4 Noise and vibration

Noise impact assessment must consider the activities of adjacent businesses and residences and the impact of all aspects of the process on neighbours, during both construction and operation phases.

Thank you for your kind consideration of this submission.

Sincerely

Kate Shield (BA, Dip Ed, ID Cert 3, Cert 4, M Ed Admin, EDD)

