

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [TPC Enquiry](#)  
**Subject:** Stadium guidelines' submission  
**Date:** Monday, 1 January 2024 11:58:28 AM

---

Dear Commissioners  
Here is my submission.  
Yours sincerely

Frank Noakes

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

. Given all major government projects in Australia (and in most other countries) run grossly over budget, what plans are in place to ensure this doesn't happen here as the public will foot the bill, which could amount to hundreds of millions of dollars.

. Macquarie Point Precinct Plan, as referenced in the draft guidelines, is still in development, and did not exist at the time of the Ministerial Direction or at the time of publication of the draft guidelines.

- The proponent should specifically report against the extent to which the proposed project is consistent with all elements of all current relevant planning documents for the site, including:

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

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

- The Aboriginal Heritage Act (1975) is acknowledged as deficient and is under review. Projects of this scale and significance should not be assessed until that process has been completed.
- Consultants engaged by the proponent should not have existing government contracts, and questionable consultants like Price Waterhouse Coopers should be excluded.
- An independently verified report detailing the full, updated cost estimate of the project should be provided.
- The proposed source of the funding should be detailed.
- A report prepared under 'Site description, features and context', should include:
  - o future flood modelling, taking into account sea level rise
  - o details on remaining site contamination issues including proposed treatments, if any.
- A detailed independent visual impact assessment must be provided, with impacts from a variety of viewpoints modelled, including:
  - o The Tasman Bridge
  - o The Derwent River
  - o The Cenotaph
  - o Various locations within Sullivans Cove
  - o kunanyi/Mt Wellington.
- Details and plans of any proposed cut and fill should include proposed building footings.
- A cost-benefit analysis should detail:
  - o The full financial cost of the project
  - o The opportunity cost of not using the site in line with the previously agreed and finalised development management plan
  - o The cost associated with paying out commercial contracts

entered into in line with the previously agreed and finalised management plan.

- A social and cultural analysis report should:
  - o Consider the recruitment and accommodation of the construction workforce needed to build the project and the impacts on housing availability across the construction period
  - o The perspective of the Tasmanian Aboriginal community and the effective abandonment of a Truth and Reconciliation Park
  - o The impact of the development on the built cultural heritage values of the Sullivans Cove precinct.
- Reports examining the urban form of Sullivans Cove should also analyse the effect of any impacts from the proposed project on the existing cultural heritage values of the Cove.
- Mass transport and public transport analysis should only consider existing aspects of public transport, or formally form part of this proposal, as there are no guarantees other mooted mass transport proposals will eventuate.
- Traffic and transport analysis must detail congestion issues on adjacent roads, including the approach to Davey Street and Davey Street itself.
- Noise impact assessment must consider the activities of adjacent businesses and residences and the likely impact of all aspects of the project.