

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** ben clark [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Monday, 8 January 2024 5:12 PM  
**To:** TPC Enquiry  
**Subject:** Submission re Macquarie Point Multipurpose Stadium Draft Guidelines

**Categories:** [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Dear Tasmanian Planning Commission,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft guidelines.

I consider the Macquarie Point site to be once of the most significant urban redevelopment opportunities in Tasmania. I contributed to earlier public consultation processes, and was in support of the vision in the most recent iteration, which incorporated a Truth and Reconciliation Park as its centrepiece. Whilst a keen supporter of the AFL, and I am pleased the state has been granted its licence, it has left me feeling disappointed that the AFL have been able to override those processes in order to secure the licence deal.

That said, I have been a spectator at recently built stadiums in Adelaide and Perth and can see the economic benefit they have brought to the cities. I consider Hobart's situation to be a lot harder, given our stadium will host 8 AFL games per season (excluding finals), which is roughly 1/3rd the Adelaide and Perth games. However, given the stadium project has a sense of inevitability - and the State is contractually bound to deliver it - I offer the following comments in relation to the draft guidelines.

My comments are mostly in relation to Guideline 4: Landscape and Urban Form, and Guideline 6: Movement but also cover other mentions of active transport and cycling throughout the document. My references to cycling also include e-scooters and other mobility devices such as skateboards, hoverboards, roller blades and disability devices such as wheelchairs and motorised chairs. This is because these devices roughly fit into the 15–25km/h speed average of most bicycle riders.

#### **Guideline 4 - Landscape and Urban Form**

4.2.3 - consider adding a dot point: "to what extent the stadium build, including forecourt detailing can be 'timber-rich'".

One of the chief concerns about the stadium is that it will present a concrete bowl appearance (as is case with most stadiums in Australia and internationally. Looking at the work by UTas in Launceston, and the Forest Green Rovers in UK, building timber-rich is possible, and brings a different aesthetic. UTas have resident experts in this discipline, that could provide advice on how to make this feasible.

#### **Guideline 6 - Movement**

##### *Safe cycling paths*

The key word in the guidelines is "safe". The guidelines require the government to assess what is needed to provide people wanting to ride with "safe, visible, amenable, direct and convenient routes when moving to and from the stadium and surrounding area". For some people, a painted line on a busy road next to parked cars is a safe cycling route but for others nothing less than an off-road path would be.

If active transport routes are going to be successful in moving large numbers of people in and out of the precinct, then the infrastructure needs to be of a standard where everyone considers it safe.

The guidelines could specifically reference All Ages and Abilities (AAA) infrastructure. This standard of infrastructure is outlined in the Greater Hobart Cycling Plan and could be the basis for the commission's assessment of whether cycling paths and lanes will give as many people as possible the choice of riding. The Greater Hobart Cycling Plan has already been agreed to by the Tasmanian Government and greater Hobart councils.

- The Greater Hobart Cycling Plan could be added to the list of strategies to be considered in Guideline 2.2.1, and "All Ages and Abilities" added before all mentions of cycling or active transport routes, and its definition added to the Glossary.

It is not clear from the Macquarie Point Draft Precinct Plan but we were told the intention is to "grade separate" any roads and pathways through the site to avoid conflict between vehicles and people walking and riding. This should be clear in the information the government provides.

In Guideline 6.4, it refers to the matters which special consideration should be given to. This list could be altered to read: clause be specifically noted for review within 2 years of the Bill passing into law, in case refinements are needed.

The need for plans and management to minimise the likelihood of prevent near misses or crashes between vehicles and pedestrians/cyclists such as grade separation, and to minimise pedestrian/cyclist conflicts via separation.

#### *Viability of planned paths*

While there are many plans and strategies to improve cycling in Hobart there is little funding available to make it happen and most of the land needed to create AAA routes is owned by local rather than state government.

Paths and cycleways in the precinct will only be as effective as those they connect to. I want to see the precinct assessed based on existing and imminent active transport infrastructure, rather than paths that may never be built or are many years away from being built.

- The guidelines could require the government to provide likely construction timelines of AAA routes leading into the precinct from Glenorchy, Clarence and Hobart areas and the government's funding commitment to ensure they get built in time for the precinct opening.

Guideline 6.4 highlights the potential for pedestrian and cyclist conflict and asks that reports assess the risk of this and detail plans and management to minimise it.

This is important as some of the existing infrastructure in Sullivans Cove, such as the shared paths along the Hobart waterfront, are poorly delineated and would struggle to cope with large numbers of people walking, riding and scooting. Another example of poor planning for all users is the closure of Franklin Wharf when cruise ships are docked – it accommodates people walking but prevents people riding, scooting or otherwise wheeling using the route.

- The guidelines could refer to the 2017 Austroads Guide to Road Design Part 6A: Paths for Walking and Cycling as it is clear about when pedestrians and cyclists/scooters should have separated paths to avoid conflict and ensure safety.

It may be that the government chooses to achieve this separation by shutting down roads on event days for temporary separation rather than building permanent infrastructure, but the numbers in the Austroads matrix are useful for this planning.

The matrix also shows desirable widths for people walking and cycling. Cycling paths in particular need more space to allow other riders to pass safely and to accommodate cargo bikes and three-wheelers that take up more space than a standard bicycle. As I currently access Bellerive Oval (and would do so for the Mac Pt stadium) on game days with my cargo bike, this is particularly relevant for me and my family. Adequate widths will also allow wheelchairs and other mobility devices to safely use the paths.

*Bike parking*

The guidelines do not mention bike parking but secure parking in the precinct will be essential if people are going to ride. This is because open bike parking will be a sitting duck for thieves who'll know the owners are working or attending an event inside the stadium.

Secure bike parking adds another level of security onto personal locks. It can be activated by swipe cards or mobile phone apps that require users to register with ID. The added layer of security can be added to bike cages, bike lockers or electronic bike docks. If people feel their bike is safe from theft, especially the more expensive e-bikes, then they are more likely to ride for transport.

The Macquarie Point Draft Precinct Plan sets aside a small area for bike and scooter parking but doesn't specify the standard of parking. I feel we should aim high in this regard, with potential for 6% of spectators to access via bike, therefore a bike-parking capacity of 1,350 spaces.

- Guideline 6.4.2 could add another dot point: "the level of security of proposed bicycle parking infrastructure and number of bicycles to be accommodated."

I look forward to your acknowledgement that my submission has been received, and the next step in the consultation process. Please feel free to contact me if you need to clarify anything.

Yours faithfully,

Ben Clark

-

[Redacted signature]

[Redacted contact information]