

**THE MATTER OF THE MACQUARIE POINT MULTIPURPOSE STADIUM
INTEGRATED ASSESSMENT UNDER THE *STATE POLICIES AND
PROJECTS ACT 1993***

GENERAL SUBMISSIONS ON BEHALF OF THE PROPONENT

Table of Contents

I	Introduction.....	3
A.	Opening remarks on the Proponent's position	3
B.	Overview of general submission	4
C.	Structure	5
II	The Project and its Integrated Assessment.....	6
A.	Project Description	6
B.	Integrated Assessment of a Project of State Significance.....	7
C.	Separate legislative process	9
D.	Role of Commission	10
III	KEY LEGISLATION AND POLICIES	11
A.	<i>State Policies and Projects Act 1999</i>	11
B.	<i>Tasmanian Planning Commission Act 1997</i>	12
C.	<i>Macquarie Point Development Corporation Act 2012</i>	12
D.	<i>Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993</i>	13
E.	State Policies.....	13
	State Coastal Policy (SCP)	13
	State Policy on Water Quality Management 1997 (SPWQM).....	13
F.	Other Policies	14
IV	Issues Relevant to Integrated Assessment	15
A.	Urban Design, Form and Planning	15
B.	Social and Community Effects.....	26
C.	Economic Effects	30
D.	Historic Heritage	35
E.	Aboriginal Cultural Heritage.....	44
F.	Transport and Movement	50
G.	Noise and Vibration	58
H.	Lighting	63
I.	Other Environmental Effects.....	67
I1.	Geotechnical.....	67
I2.	Contamination, remediation and groundwater	68
I3.	Stormwater management	74
I4.	Flooding and coastal inundation.....	79
I5.	Wind effects	81
I6.	Natural Values and Climate Change	84
J.	Construction	87
V	Integrated Assessment	91
A.	The Project should proceed.....	91
B.	Conditions.....	91
	APPENDIX A - ABBREVIATIONS.....	93

I INTRODUCTION

1. This general submission is made on behalf of the Crown in Right of Tasmania (**Proponent**), the proponent in respect of the Macquarie Point Multipurpose Stadium Project (**Project**).
2. The Project was declared by the Governor to be a project of State significance by an order made under section 18(2) of the *State Policies and Project Act 1993* (Tas) (**SPP Act**) on 16 October 2023 (**Order**). The Ministerial Direction to the Tasmanian Planning Commission in relation to the Macquarie Point Stadium and Entertainment project dated 16 October 2023 (**Ministerial Direction**), made under section 20 of the SPP Act, directs the Tasmanian Planning Commission (**Commission**) to undertake an integrated assessment of the Project.

A. Opening remarks on the Proponent's position

3. Opening comments will be presented on day 1 of the hearing.
4. The underlying themes focus on the opportunity that the project presents and how the process to provide for opportunity of state significance is facilitated by legislation.
5. The underlying rationale is that the system provides for development and land use that is not contemplated by the existing planning regime, and which may even be in conflict with it. This rationale automatically implies that the assessment accommodates change, and that the public process is concerned with how that change might be perceived, managed or tolerated.
6. The potential economic social and community benefits of the Project are substantial and, in general terms, should not be contentious in providing advice to government. This is separate from an assessment of development cost which is a separate matter for the developer, in this case the government.
7. Environmentally, the project occupies land which serves no modern purpose befitting its location adjacent to the CBD of Hobart, and which on any view has been earmarked for substantial change for decades.
8. Socially, by its landmark presence and colocation with city attractions, and by its potential to provide a destination for a variety of entertainment, sporting and corporate events for generations, the Project is poised to foster civic pride, enhance community identity, and provide a venue for inclusive cultural, sporting, and educational engagement.
9. Economically, for the purposes of the town planning assessment, it is properly expected that the project would generate significant employment during construction and operation, stimulated tourism, and a catalyst for investment in surrounding precincts.

10. Architecturally, the Project is bold and visionary. It is more than a utilitarian venue. It is designed to have a point of difference in a national setting, with a striking design and setting, and with a domed form suggestive of excitement and protection of the activities carried out within, and a spectacular backdrop to the city's nightlife and lights.
11. The design is informed by the site's history, character, cultural heritage. This approach ensures that the development is both distinctive and contextually appropriate, while aspiring to a confident visual statement.
12. For the assessment of the project, the TPC's intellectual task is to apply the best principles to considering whether the significant opportunity can be realised, based on its expertise and special knowledge, and not based on a typical town planning assessment based on established planning controls and policies.
13. The vision for a high-quality stadium is central to the Project. It is designed to foster civic pride, encourage public use and visitation, and promote a lasting sense of ownership for future generations. This vision reflects a commitment to creating a space that is not only functional but also meaningful to the community. That this critical site would be effectively dedicated to public use for the long term is a strong argument in favour of the proposed land use.
14. The flow on benefits can only be estimated or speculated in 2025 relative to possibilities that emerge over many years hence. They include direct and indirect outcomes, some of which are quantifiable, while others can be reasonably anticipated through qualitative assessment and experienced judgement. The Project is designed to accommodate a diverse range of user groups and events. These include AFL and AFLW games—particularly for Tasmanian teams—cricket and other sporting events, cultural, musical, and corporate events, as well as activities in health, education, and hospitality. This versatility ensures that the stadium will serve as a dynamic and inclusive community asset.
15. The Project can be effectively managed to mitigate potential impacts. Construction-related effects such as noise, dust, and traffic can be addressed through a robust Construction Management Plan. Operational impacts can be managed through coordinated event planning and collaboration with relevant agencies. As identified throughout this general submission, appropriate conditions are to be applied to ensure ongoing impact is appropriately managed.

B. Overview of general submission

16. The form and content of this general submission are intended to assist the Commission to provide its advice in respect of the Project according to the requirements of the SPP Act and relevant matters.

17. This general submission makes reference to the material submitted by the Proponent in respect of the Project (**POSS Submission**), and in response to requests for information (**RFI Material**). It is prepared to supplement, and not replace, the POSS Submission, RFI Material and the Representations made on behalf of the Proponent. The Proponent will rely on it, together with the POSS Submission and RFI Material and evidence and further material to be produced in the context of a hearing and otherwise.
18. This submission includes the central questions and upon which the Proponent relies for the purposes of its case and to which it will return in closing. These questions will be the subject of further observations in opening submissions and throughout the hearing.
19. The Proponent will call and rely on, the evidence of:
 - (a) Mr Neil Shephard on planning;
 - (b) Mr Chris Goss on visual amenity;
 - (c) Mr Graeme Steverson on transport and movement;
 - (d) Mr Neil Mackenzie on noise and vibration;
 - (e) Mr Jim Gard'ner on heritage.

C. Structure

20. The structure of this outline of submissions is as follows:
 - (a) Part II defines what is, and what is not, the Project, outlines the proper approach to the integrated assessment of the Project for the purposes of Part 3 of the SPP Act, addresses the draft *Macquarie Point Planning Permit Bill 2025* process (**Legislative Process**) and the role of the Commission in this PoSS process;
 - (b) Part III outlines key legislation and policies relevant to the integrated assessment;
 - (c) Part IV identifies issues relevant to the integrated assessment of the Project, defining central questions relevant to each, considering how the issues have been addressed in material to date, and setting out the Proponent's summary position in respect of those issues including, as appropriate, by way of response to issues raised in the Commission's Draft Integrated Assessment Report (**Draft IAR**) dated 31 March 2025 and representations; and
 - (d) Part V addresses the integrated assessment of the Project, considering all of the relevant issues.

II THE PROJECT AND ITS INTEGRATED ASSESSMENT

A. Project Description

What is the Project?

21. The Project comprises:
- (a) the Multipurpose Stadium and surrounding concourse, and arrival plaza areas (**Stadium**);
 - (b) the proposed relocated area for the Goods Shed, to be integrated to the north of the Stadium, while remaining as a standalone structure and facility;
 - (c) practice cricket wickets; and
 - (d) a below ground carpark located below the Antarctic Facilities Zone.
22. The Project is described in Section O.2 of the *Macquarie Point Multipurpose Stadium: Project of State Significance* Summary Report dated 17 September 2024 (**Summary Report**). The design, construction and operation of the components of the Project are detailed in Appendices to the POSS Submission and Annexures to the RFI Material.
23. Approval under the SPP Act is sought for the Project as described in this section.

The Project Site

24. The boundary of the land on which the use and development is proposed as part of the Project (**Project Site**) is shown in *Figure O-4: Site details and title details* on page 14 of the Summary Report.

Development which is not part of the Project

25. The Project has been developed and is designed to form an integrated part of the Macquarie Point precinct, as the precinct is redeveloped consistent with the vision of the *Mac Point Precinct Plan* (Macquarie Point Development Corporation, August 2024) (**Mac Point Precinct Plan**). It does not include all development or land uses within the precinct, or which would ultimately integrate with the Project.
26. In particular, the Project does not include:
- (a) the northern access road identified in the Mac Point Precinct Plan which will provide access to the Port of Hobart and otherwise to the Macquarie Point precinct (**Northern Access Road**); or

- (a) development of the Macquarie Point precinct more broadly.¹
27. These developments are pre-existing commitments subject to separate legislative regimes and approval requirements. They are not subject to any process of assessment or approval under the SPP Act.
28. The Summary Report includes proposed conditions outlining how approval of the Project is intended to interrelate to the approval and delivery of other projects.²

B. Integrated Assessment of a Project of State Significance

Approach to the assessment

29. All planning in Tasmania is undertaken in consideration of the objectives of the Resource Management and Planning System of Tasmania set out in Schedule 1 of the SPP Act and Schedule 1 of the *Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993* (Tas) (**LUPA Act**).
30. The objectives serve as guiding principles for all planning decisions for Tasmania, whether those decisions concern the making of policy, planning schemes, the determination of specific applications under planning controls, or Projects of State Significance.
31. All cases require consistency with the objectives, but not all cases are constrained in the same way by current planning schemes. It is intended that policy is constantly reviewed to ensure it is current to the times and setting a forward agenda to guide decision making. The declaration of a project of State significance provides that advice can be considered with a degree of freedom, conscious that policies and controls in place may not or will not have contemplated a project that has the potential to deliver major benefits that also align with the objectives.
32. Apart from the review and formation of policy, the process for Projects of State Significance is intended to ensure that planning is not fixed or intractable where it can be demonstrated that the community would benefit from a forward looking, and potentially different, practical mindset.
33. It is in this way that the Parliament can seek to make decisions based on leadership and vision, ideally based on advice that has weighted environmental, economic, social and community considerations.
34. The fact that a declared project of State significance does not meet with established planning principles for an area is the last thing that should concern the Parliament. To start from a standpoint of expectation that it should, is to fail to undertake the intellectual exercise that is called for.

¹ See further Summary Report, section O.4.1.

² See conditions 7 and 8 on page 256 of the Summary Report.

35. Relevantly, the objectives apply to the resource management and planning system. They include the promotion of sustainable development, the fair, orderly and sustainable use of land, and the facilitation of economic development.
36. In the case of Macquarie Point, the Project is proposed to be established on a brownfield site, near the central city of Hobart. So far as there are environmental considerations, they concern built form character, design and traffic considerations.
37. Likewise, the location of the Project as part of the fabric of central Hobart provides immediate synergies with existing and future infrastructure serving the city, and for the broadest community catchment including the local population and visitors to Hobart. This has immediate implications for social and community benefits and for business decisions by others for generations to come.
38. Given its underutilisation, if not redundancy, the Macquarie Point precinct is a highly strategic public land resource. It is earmarked under site specific legislation for land use and development transformation. A worthy outcome for this precinct would see it developed and enjoyed so far as possible as a public asset and as a destination to be widely experienced for generations to come, in the interests of fairness, sustainable use of land, and the facilitation of economic benefit to the State.
39. It follows that the assessment to be undertaken by the Commission will be highly influenced by how open minded it is as to the opportunity that the Project Site presents, and the weighting it gives to the benefits that can flow notwithstanding the change it will bring to the built environment – recognising that when integrated even that change can be viewed in a positive light.
40. Put another way, the Committee must first ask of itself, is the Macquarie Point precinct an area with an already fixed vision by extension of a vision that suits the established areas of Hobart, or is it a blank canvas where a new character and built form is possible if it brings about substantial benefits to the community.
41. The Proponent contends that this is not an assessment that should be made with rearward looking vision, or with such conservatism as to stifle the opportunity to optimise the strategic resource particularly while it exists as a single available holding.

The assessment process

42. The project of State significance process is enlivened because of the significance of the Project.
43. As the Summary Report recognises, the Project is significant as a proposal for an iconic, public building in Hobart, with high-quality design, materiality and appearance respectful

of local visual, landscape, cultural and historical values, while its highly visible form makes a significant contribution to the character and identity of Hobart.³

44. It is significant for its capacity to bring positive social and community change to Hobart, by introducing to the city all of the capacities of a world-class stadium – including, but not limited to, hosting Tasmania’s own AFL team.
45. The significance of the Project, and its economic, social and cultural benefits, contribute to the basis on which the integrated assessment of relevant issues is to be carried out.
46. Having regard to the legislative context for the integrated assessment of projects under Part 3 of the SPP Act, it is necessary to:
 - (a) identify environmental, social, economic and community issues of relevance to the Project, consistent with the scope of the assessment, and having regard to both benefits and disbenefits;
 - (b) consider potential effects which may arise, how those effects may be avoided or appropriately managed, and what effects may remain following the implementation of avoidance and management measures; and
 - (c) have regard to all of those matters in reaching an overall conclusion as to the acceptability of the Project.
47. These steps are undertaken in Parts III and IV.

C. Separate legislative process

48. On 13 April 2025, the Government announced that it would introduce enabling legislation to progress development approval for the Macquarie Point Multipurpose Stadium separate to the Project of State Significance (**PoSS**) process.
49. The Government prepared the *Macquarie Point Planning Permit Bill 2025 (the Bill)* and associated draft permit for the purposes of authorising and regulating the Project (**Legislative Process**). A period of public consultation on the Bill, draft permit and supporting documents occurred between 27 May and 16 June 2025. A copy of this material is available [here](#).
50. Whilst the Legislative Process sits separate to the PoSS process, the Proponent will refer to and rely upon the draft conditions accompanying the Bill. These draft conditions reflect the position of the Proponent in respect of the necessary and appropriate conditions upon which the Project would be developed and operated.

³ Summary Report pp 10, 26, 47, 50, 56, 68, 218

D. Role of Commission

51. In the PoSS process the role of the Commission is advisory, and is wholly guided by the SPP Act. It does not sit as a decision maker or serve any conventional role under the TPC Act. After the receipt of advice, a final recommendation is to be made by the relevant Minister and the ultimate decision is to be made by Parliament.
52. The process here is separate from and in parallel with other committee processes also considering the project and Legislative Process. In either or both circumstances the ultimate decision is for the Parliament. This submission seeks to assist to achieve consistency of information for matters relevant to land use and development planning by informing the Commission if further or other relevant information is produced or required under the separate process.
53. The advisory task enables expert review of the planning merits of the Project also with the benefit of community feedback. It is submitted that the advisory task need not necessarily agree or disagree with one or other position gleaned from community feedback. The key role for the integrated assessment is to help strike a balance between sometimes competing considerations not by finding a middle point, but by clear identification and weighting of positive and negative impacts within the context of the broad objectives set out in Schedule 1.
54. A prime example concerns visual impact. The stadium will be clearly visible from in and around established built areas of identified and valued character which areas are protected by a range of established planning scheme controls and policies. Because of the availability of longer views to the stadium it can be expected that the stadium will change the existing setting of these areas from some vantage points. This change is considered acceptable and positive by some, and negative by others. The role of the Commission is to acknowledge all opinions and to seek to weigh the environmental, social and economic benefits on an objective basis, asking questions that might facilitate the Project, while also recognising the preservation of the valued character of other precincts.
55. The integrated assessment enables weighting of social outcomes in an assessment that also considers environmental outcomes. Continuing the example of visual impact, the advisory task will recognise that a change premised on social benefit assumes that those social benefits will flow for the life of the project, and hence, are relevant on an ongoing basis to the tolerance of visual impact. It is relevant that the community will respond differently to visual impact of a building that is a destination for cultural and sporting experiences for their family, than say an industrial or office building. In this case this is materially enhanced by the potential hosting of AFL games by a Tasmanian team.

56. The overall task includes making judgements as to weighting of relevant social and economic benefits mindful that while some are amenable to a level of modelling, others wholly rely upon an intuitive and qualitative appreciation.

III KEY LEGISLATION AND POLICIES

A. *State Policies and Projects Act 1999*

57. For the purposes of the advisory task, see Part 3 of the SPP Act in particular:
- (a) s19 (1) which removes the application of provisions of any Act or planning scheme requiring approval or regulating use or development;
 - (b) s21 which requires the undertaking of the Integrated Assessment defined at s 16(2);
 - (c) s20(3) which concerns directions that may be given to the Commission;
 - (d) s20 (5) which sets out mandatory considerations;
 - (e) s24 which concerns the consideration of representations by the Commission;
 - (f) s25 which empowers the Commission to modify the Draft IAR and for the modified draft to supersede the Draft;
 - (g) Schedule 1 objectives.

Mandatory considerations

58. Pursuant to s20(1) of the SPP Act, the Commission must undertake an integrated assessment of this Project of State Significance. Pursuant to s16(2) an integrated assessment is defined as *“in relation to a project of State significance, means a consideration of environmental, social, economic and community issues relevant to that project and such other issues as may be prescribed;”*.
59. There are mandatory matters that must be considered by the Commission pursuant to s20(5), specifically the Commission:
- (a) must seek to further the objectives set out in Schedule 1; and
 - (b) must be undertaken in accordance with State Policies; and
 - (c) must take into consideration the matters set out in the representations referred to in section 23.

B. Tasmanian Planning Commission Act 1997

- 60. Pursuant to s6(1) of the TPC Act, the Commission has the functions imposed and powers conferred on it by any other Act. Those functions and powers are those under Part 3 of the SPP Act. It has no inherent powers.
- 61. The Commission must consider representations to the draft Integrated Assessment Report. For those purposes it may hold a hearing in relation to each representation (s24(2) of the SPP Act).
- 62. The mechanics of hearings conducted by the Commission are found in Part 3 of the TPC Act:
 - (a) s10 stipulates the nature of a hearing;
 - (b) s11 stipulates the procedure at hearings;
 - (c) s11A provides for representation at the hearing; and
 - (d) s12 provides that submissions and documents are to be made public.

C. Macquarie Point Development Corporation Act 2012

- 63. The MPDC Act is important to the assessment because it provides statutory expectations for the development of the precinct which includes the project site. The MPDC Act establishes the Macquarie Point Development Corporation, the principal objectives of which include:
 - (b) *to plan, facilitate and manage the redevelopment of the site so as to ensure that the site –*
 - (i) *is redeveloped as a vibrant and active area, with a mix of uses, that connects with and complements adjacent areas within Hobart; and*
 - (ii) *encourages inner-city living; and*
 - (iia) *encourages pedestrian and bicycle traffic; and*
 - (iib) *allows for public transport; and*
 - (iic) *provides for public open space; and*
 - (iii) *is redeveloped so as to deliver sustainable social and economic benefits to Hobart; and*
 - (iv) *is redeveloped in accordance with sound planning, urban design and environmental principles; and*
 - (ba) *to plan, facilitate and manage temporary and longer-term use of the site; and*

D. Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993

64. The LUPA Act is not called up in assessments of Projects of State Significance.

E. State Policies

State Coastal Policy (SCP)

65. The SCP is a relevant State policy. The SCP adopts the objectives of the Resource Management and Planning System with a particular focus on sustainable development. The SCP contains principles and outcomes. The principles guide the outcomes sought and are extracted below:

- (a) Natural and cultural values of the coast shall be protected.
- (b) The coast shall be used and developed in a sustainable manner.
- (c) Integrated management and protection of the coastal zone is a shared responsibility.

66. The outcomes sought are grouped according to the above principles. The outcomes include:

- (a) Outcome 1.1.1 states that the coastal zone will be managed to ensure the sustainability of ecosystems and natural processes;
- (b) Outcome 1.2 provides that Aboriginal sites and relics are to be protected and conserved, where appropriate;
- (c) Outcome 1.3 provides that cultural heritage is to be protected and conserved, where appropriate;
- (d) Outcome 1.4 provides that coastal hazards are to be appropriately responded to and managed; and Outcome 2.4.2 provides that urban development in the coastal zone is to be based on existing towns and townships.

State Policy on Water Quality Management 1997 (SPWQM)

67. The SPWQM applies to all surface waters including coastal waters and ground water. The purpose of the SPWQM is:

To achieve the sustainable management of Tasmania's surface water and groundwater resources by protecting or enhancing their qualities while allowing for sustainable development in accordance with the objectives of Tasmania's Resource Management and Planning System. (Schedule 1 of the State Policies and Projects Act 1993)

68. The purpose is achieved through objectives, principles and outcomes. The objectives and principles of the SPWQM implemented through statute, in particular the *Urban Drainage Act 2013*.

F. Other Policies

69. While the SPP Act removes application of requirements, there are a number of policy documents that may be considered relevant as appropriate. These are not mandatory considerations under the Act and any reliance on them must be mindful of s 19(1) less the weight given to the policy undermines the purpose of the removal from the task of provisions that would otherwise regulate the proposed use and development.
70. Nonetheless the Proponent has treated a range of policy documents as relevant background. These are the subject of comment in this submission and will be addressed at hearing and include:
- (a) *Sullivans Cove Planning Scheme 1997*; and
 - (b) *Sullivans Cove Planning Review 1991*.
71. It is also noted that other agencies, including Hobart City Council have a range of policy platforms concerning aspirations for the economic growth of Hobart, and the State, and for other projects planned or under consideration which will have a relationship with the project. These can be borne in mind in making an assessment about the project and include:
- (a) Central Hobart Plan - The Central Hobart Plan is a 20-year plan prepared and adopted by the Hobart City Council in early 2024.
 - (b) Capital City Strategic Plan 2023.
 - (c) Inner Hobart Transport Network Operations Plan.

IV ISSUES RELEVANT TO INTEGRATED ASSESSMENT

72. This Part identifies and addresses issues relevant to and informing the integrated assessment of the Project under Part 3 of the SPP Act.
73. Each section of this Part is structured to inform the Commission's advice, by:
- (a) identifying:
 - (i) the central questions relevant to each matter;
 - (ii) how those questions are addressed in application material;
 - (iii) the relevant issues raised in the Draft IAR; and
 - (iv) what representations said in respect of relevant issues;
 - (b) providing the Proponent's position:
 - (i) through comments and summary responses to central questions; and
 - (ii) conditions appropriately included on an approval for the Project; and
 - (c) identifying evidence called in respect of each matter.

A. Urban Design, Form and Planning

What are the central questions?

74. A stadium has not been contemplated for the site or area in any prior planning exercises. Intellectual leadership is required to assess the challenge on all the available information and evidence as it applies in 2025 and for future generations. This means that for a project of State significance the central questions are not premised on *compliance* with past planning, but on a weighted assessment of all relevant factors to environmental, social and economic benefit. This is not done with ignorance of past planning but it is sure to review and improve on that planning as necessary to the task and having regard to the potential benefits of the Project.
75. The Proponent contends that the central questions can usefully be framed as follows:
- (a) What level of land use and built form change should be reasonably expected for the Macquarie Point area having regard to:
 - (i) past planning exercises with guidance as to urban form as expressed in the *Sullivans Cove Planning Review 1991 (1991 Review)*;
 - (ii) the *Macquarie Point Development Corporation Act 2012 (Tas) (MPDC Act)*; and

- (iii) the strategic opportunity?
- (b) How does the proposed built form impact on the area having regard to:
 - (i) established heritage areas;
 - (ii) established built form;
 - (iii) natural topography; and
 - (iv) urban detail and expression?
- (c) How successful is the proposed architecture and surrounding civic and urban design having regard to:
 - (i) the degree to which the Stadium can be expected to be a landmark, and
 - (ii) pedestrian movement and amenity around the Stadium with and without an event occurring; and
 - (iii) integration with other precincts?

How are the questions addressed in application material?

- 76. The POSS Submission addresses urban design, form and planning in the Summary Report at Chapters 1-3, and in:
 - (a) *Appendix A - Architectural Drawings;*
 - (b) *Appendix B - Stadium Design Description;*
 - (c) *Appendix I - Urban Design Framework; and*
 - (d) *Appendix J - Visual Impact Assessment Report.*
- 77. Relevant issues were addressed in responses to RFI items 1-5, 7, 15-18, 44-46, 52-56 and 65, and in RFI Material including:
 - (a) *Annexure B - Consolidated plans 31 January 2025;*
 - (b) *Annexure F - ireneinc Planning & Urban Design Planning Report January 2025 (SUPERSEDED by Annexure C dated 17 February 2025);*
 - (c) *Annexure K – Visualisations 31 January 2025;*
 - (d) *Annexure L – Clarification regarding visualisations 31 January 2025;*
 - (e) *Annexure AA - Urban Design Framework 31 January 2025;*

- (f) *Annexure C - Cox Architecture Information on Gross Floor Areas 12 February 2025;*
- (g) *Annexure B - Consolidated plans 1 17 February 2025;*
- (h) *Annexure C - Ireneinc Planning and Urban Design Planning Report 17 February 2025 (Planning and Urban Design Report);*
- (i) *Annexure D – SLR Viewpoint Locations Information 17 February 2025; and*
- (j) *Annexure B - Updated architectural plans (MPMS-CXC-DR-01-A20-0050 P3 Gantry Level and MPMS-CXC-DR-01-A20-0060 P3 Roof Plan) 4 March 2025.*

What did the Draft IAR say?

78. The Draft IAR is emphatic in its *'finding'* that the scale and bulk of the proposal is *'non-compliant'* with *'established planning principles'*. The following paragraph captures the substance of the core issue (underlining added):

'Overall, the Panel finds that it is unlikely that any stadium development within Sullivans Cove could comply with the established planning principles for the area, regardless of design details. The Panel considers that the size of the Stadium is disproportionate to Hobart's small scale and would be contrary to Hobart's visual values which consist of natural topography, established built form, and urban detail and expression'.⁴

79. The Draft IAR draws heavily for *'established planning principles'* on the 1991 Review,⁵ which the Draft IAR describes as *'well established and specific'* and *'relevant as guidance to continue the development of the area'*.⁶ It assesses the Project (in the broadened scope adopted by the Commission) on the basis of the Sullivans Cove Planning Scheme (SCPS).
80. The Draft IAR is critical of the scale and bulk of the Stadium having regard to the layering of built form in the context of the natural topography whereby built form rises with the land level between the water and the mountain.

What did representations say?

81. Public opinion expressed in the representations received on the Draft IAR is varied. Some representations are in line with the approach in the Draft IAR whilst others support the design and appearance of the stadium. The urban design, form and planning related concerns raised in representations are in summary:

⁴ Draft IAR, p 45.

⁵ Sullivans Cove Planning Authority (Department of Environment and Planning), 1991.

⁶ Draft IAR, p 45.

- (a) compliance with established planning principles of Sullivans Cove and Sullivans Cove Planning Scheme 1997 should be required;
- (b) the height, size, mass, scale and form of the Stadium is disproportionate to Hobart's existing built form scale and character, and the broader city context.
- (c) insufficient activation and street level amenity;
- (d) inappropriate location for a stadium, including suggestions for alternative sites;
- (e) the Project Site's constraints including size make it inappropriate for the Project;
- (f) the Project would prevents other public uses of the site;
- (g) impact on view lines, *including views to the Derwent River, Mount Nelson, portions of Sullivans Cove and Battery Point and views from the Cenotaph*;
- (h) criticism of the visual impact assessment in the POSS Submission;
- (i) concern about size and integration of signage;
- (j) concern regarding potential reflectivity of the roof dome.

82. Other representations expressed support for:

- (a) the form and design of the stadium;
- (b) the materiality of the built form;
- (c) the quality and integration of proposed signage; and
- (d) the location of the Project, noting that the gateway location signifies the stadium as an attractive.

Outline of Proponent's position

Observations regarding urban design and urban form

83. The reliance on the 1991 Review in the Draft IAR is a "turnkey" moment. Because it literally relied on what it called established principles for this site, it is perhaps understandable that the Commission found its way to a finding of non-compliance.

84. It is unnecessary for the Proponent to criticise the 1991 Review, which is accepted to be a valuable strategic exercise conducted at that time, and as a document that informed subsequent planning controls. It is also true that many broader principles identifying values remain relevant particularly for established heritage areas.

85. Accordingly, the Proponent's criticism is not of the 1991 Review, but of the proposition that the 1991 Review should be given substantial weight in the assessment of this Project, on this Project Site, in 2025.
86. Some necessary qualifications are set out here:
- (a) First, the task for the 1991 Review was to take a necessarily broad view of built form strategies for areas then under different planning schemes and multiple decision makers. Importantly the review did not seek to form planning controls or requirements. It also noted flexibility was required as needs would change over time.
 - (b) Second, it is a fair reading that the 1991 Review was primarily focussed on the areas with an established built environment and how new development might knit in with established heights, scale and street wall relationships (none of which applied then or today at the subject site). In fact, the better view is that the Project Site was recognised as a different precinct, and not as a sensitive area, and given less attention than other established precincts.
 - (c) Third, 35 years ago, the status of the Project Site (and adjacent Port) was as a transit area with a working Port focussed on cargo with some mention of cruising. The Port strategy which re-focussed the Port to emphasise cruise shipping, Antarctic expeditions and only some cargo, did not occur until many years later.
 - (d) Fourth, the 1991 Review was prepared 20 years prior to the introduction of the MPDC Act, which, supported by a federal funding program, envisages transformative change for the Project Site and wider precinct. This legislated impetus was not, and could not have been, appreciated in the 1991 Review. It is critical to accept that the legislation sets a reasonable expectation for land use and built form transformation and character change in this precinct of Sullivans Cove.
 - (e) Fifth, it is evident from the 1991 Review that the Project Site was peripheral, if not exempt from most, if not all, of the "specific" guidance provided. On a complete reading of the 1991 Review, it can be seen that:
 - (i) the Project Site was identified as not forming part of the original Macquarie Plan area;
 - (ii) it was not included as within the Main or Secondary areas of Sullivans Cove;
 - (iii) identified as '*other area*', it was also not subject to built form considerations applying to established areas including siting, design, wall or quarry

principles. It is also not identified as a step area for the connection through buildings rising through the CBD;

- (iv) the Project Site is identified in the Review as '*LOST SPACE*', and as having a civic supporting function (presumably car parking);
 - (v) the aspirations for the Project Site in 1991 were essentially for car parking and transport, perhaps realistic in the 1991 economy but falling well short of the aspirations later legislated under the MPDC Act;
 - (vi) the Project Site was not the subject of specific consideration for built form outcomes, other than a blanket 15m height measured to the eave and linked to its transport function, and
 - (vii) there is no basis to conclude the Project Site fell within the description of '*sensitive area*' where used throughout the document.
- (f) Sixth, the 1991 Review was not, and could not have been, premised on the question of what would be possible for the Project Site in the context of a declared project of State significance bringing a new built form and typology than conceivable in 1991, or with the other public design and accessibility benefits of a stadium on the Project Site.

87. This is not to say that the general visual values identified in the 1991 Review are not relevant, but they are not a basis to prevent consideration of a different, or more visible, outcome on the Project Site. Rather,

- (a) viewed in the context of community aspirations in 2025; and
- (b) acknowledging principles espoused in the 1991 Review and principles able to be ascertained on an inspection of the area; and
- (c) factoring in the reasonable expectations for development potential of the precinct as a consequence of the MPDC Act,

it can reasonably be demonstrated that:

- (d) the Project Site represents a strategic opportunity – substantial change is to be expected;
- (e) the public nature, and level of visitation for a stadium use wholly alters the potential for integration of the area with other activities (beyond the considerations that would have applied to a transport hub);
- (f) the potential for a landmark, or highly visible built form is a reasonable consequence given the strategic potential of the Project Site;

- (g) the Project Site remains separate from the Main and Secondary areas of Sullivans Cove, and is not part of the most sensitive areas for protection. It is a precinct of its own, set back from the water's edge, not part of any uniform built form setting and not part of the obvious stepping up through the city buildings;
- (h) the separation of the Project Site from other areas enables it to be developed differently from established areas;
- (i) the distance and separation of the Project Site dictates that the precinct will remain detached and separate such as to be respectful of the preservation and setting of other areas;
- (j) while the overall scale and visibility is obvious and well presented in the material, and need not be the subject of expert opinion, its location and role as a backdrop to other areas is consistent with vitality, drama and interest, all fitting for a building housing a stadium use;
- (k) it is an exaggeration to say that, at the Project Site, at the floor of the amphitheatre, the Stadium would materially change the scale relationship of the built environment with the mountain setting, or that the Project Site is central to the relationship of stepped built form between the docks, the heritage "wall" and the city buildings through the CBD. All of these values will remain observable and protected; and
- (l) the relevance of the proposed use for a stadium presents a fundamental shift from prior planning for the Project Site. It brings with it a sense of public visitation and public ownership and a sense of place that is wholly different that would be expected from other land uses let alone a transport hub, with the precinct acting as a destination, not a support area.

88. The architectural response exhibits a high level of consideration and a supportable aim to introduce a stadium that is visually pleasing, and worthy of its prominence in broader views to the city. While it is true that any stadium will be highly visible, the more important question is whether the architecture responds to that challenge. In this context the materiality and shaping of the roof is of importance as the wall heights are in fact of the order of height commensurate with the nearest heritage buildings.

89. The urban design report includes longitudinal sections through the stadium at its highest point in the context of its surrounds. In each case the sections concern the height relative through the site and on angles away from and the central city. It is useful to consider these sections in light of the key values expressed in the 1991 Review. If sections were passed through the prime aspects and views it would show that the stadium has a peripheral, not central presence.

Observations regarding land use planning

90. As a land use planning proposition, the Project represents change in similar terms, and which is similarly supported by site-specific legislation and processes. It realises the significant opportunity of the underutilised land, introducing both the Stadium and associated components, and aligned and other integrated land uses.
91. Its assessment, in land use planning terms:
- (a) must not proceed on the basis of historical identifications of land use outcomes for the Project Site or broader precinct – whether the ‘LOST SPACE’ of the 1991 Review, or various outcomes contemplated but not realised in years since;
 - (b) must proceed on a ‘first principles’, strategically minded basis, having regard to the locational characteristics of the Project Site including:
 - (i) its proximity to the economic activity of the CBD, which enables uplift through event-related spending in the CBD, and maximises the accessibility of the Stadium to members of the local and broader communities;
 - (ii) the connection via the Project Site of the CBD to the green heart of the city on the Queen’s Domain, the Hobart Cenotaph and to the intercity cycleway and Tasman Bridge;
 - (iii) the accessibility it offers to current and future sustainable travel options;
 - (iv) its access to services infrastructure such as sewerage, water and electricity which, in the context of a project of this nature, is significant of itself and as a means to avoid additional works and associated impacts.
92. The Project does not represent a land use change representative of activity only during events, or at the expense of other development and use across the Mac Point precinct.
- (a) As the Planning and Urban Design Report notes, it includes spaces and facilities for a range of integrated, aligned, and other uses, which are not dependent on or associated with events.
 - (b) The Precinct Plan was developed prior to the design of the Project, and informed its design. The positioning of the Stadium, including the north-south orientation, and the design of its environs supports development of the broader precinct consistent with the activation and identity created by the Stadium as an anchor for that precinct.

Response to central questions

What level of land use and built form change should be reasonably expected for the Macquarie Point area having regard to:

- a. past planning exercises with guidance as to urban form, including as expressed in the 1991 Review;*
- b. the MPDC Act, and*
- c. the strategic opportunity?*

93. The level of land use and built form change on the Project Site is primarily directed by the strategic opportunity of the Project Site, the legislated effect of the MPDC Act and the declaration of the Project as a project of State significance. The aspirations for the Project Site in the 1991 Review, and in the SCPS, are wholly superseded by these matters.
94. While the Draft IAR refers to and relies on the 1991 Review, and the SCPS, it does not acknowledge more recent relevant processes including the *Macquarie Point Site Development Plan* (2017).
95. The Project is consistent with the Mac Point Precinct Plan, which (amongst other things) provides urban renewal principles to be applied assuming the presence of a stadium – not to be used as a basis to suggest the presence of a stadium would, for its difference or scale, be inconsistent.⁷
96. As set out above, the area should be considered to have planning support for substantial development, bringing with it a change to built form, scale, land use and intensity. The Project Site is capable of hosting this change without undermining key aspirations for the Main and Secondary areas of Sullivans Cove identified in the 1991 Review, or as otherwise outlined in the Sullivans Cove Planning Scheme.

As a designated redevelopment site, change to this area was always anticipated. Any new development would inevitably shift its character, particularly given its past as a working port. The key advantage of this proposal is its emphasis on public access—unlike most developments, which tend to prioritise private use. How does the proposed built form impact on the area having regard to:

- a. Established heritage areas;*
- b. Established built form;*
- c. Natural topography; and*
- d. Established urban detail and expression?*

⁷ C.f. Draft IAR, p 120 et seq, section 10.3.

97. The proposed built form is of a scale necessary to accommodate a stadium the use of which, in the circumstances, should be accepted as meeting a planning need with community benefits derived from its location in Sullivans Cove.
98. It is neither within, nor abutting or adjacent to significant buildings or areas associated with the early settlement of Hobart. It is sufficiently separate so as to contain an edge to but not interfere with the setting of historic established areas or the relationship of these areas to the CBD and beyond.
99. The established principles for built form do not apply on the Project Site nor to adjacent buildings.
100. The Project is not of a scale that disrupts the relationship between *'the stage and the gods'*. It will be a sizeable and sculpted object on the floor of the amphitheatre but still dwarfed by the natural topography.
101. The consideration of established urban expression and detailing raised in the Draft IAR is at best indirect for an area marked for change, being an area which, as shown by the 1991 Review, contains none of the established values for built form or design.

How successful is the proposed architecture and surrounding civic and urban design in terms of:

- a. The degree to which the stadium can be expected to be a landmark;*
- b. Pedestrian movement and amenity around the stadium with and without an event occurring; and*
- c. Integration with other precincts?*

102. Given the scale of a stadium its landmark quality ought be treated as an expectation and therefore an opportunity. As stated by reference to the longitudinal sections above it is also relevant that the stadium will occupy an area that is not central to or part of the established areas, and would occupy an area that makes no contribution to the character of Hobart presently, and makes little contribution to its function.
103. If a stadium is to be accommodated it is a complex that is designed in both form and function to be grand. It is a place that is intended to attract large crowds and have a presence that is commensurate with the excitement and entertainment it houses.
104. This means a stadium will necessarily be a notable presence in longer views and as a statement of what is on offer in the City. It also means it should be pleasing and to walk to, and to navigate safely around.

105. The proposed design is responsive to each of these opportunities. The roof form, patterning, and materiality provides a presence which is promising as a statement linked to the entertainment on offer, and architecturally strong as an expression of the City's values and aspirations.
106. The wall height around the Stadium refers directly to established wall heights as experienced from the human scale.
107. The design and expression is generally articulated and formed to create interesting spaces and demarcation for travel points.
108. In addition to the observations above, material provided with the POSS Submission and RFI Material includes assessment of landscape and visual impact in accordance with the *Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment*⁸ (**LVIA Guidelines**), which concludes that while the Stadium will have a visual presence befitting its significance, its architectural and surrounding civic and urban design is successful and successfully establishes a landmark for Hobart.
109. These observations and assessments are relevant to both the design of buildings including the Stadium, and to its detail including signage (which is addressed in section 3.4 of the Draft IAR as relevant to visual impact).
110. These themes will be further addressed in the context of the hearing, including through evidence including to address the additional viewpoints identified in the Draft IAR as appropriate.
111. Pedestrian movement and integration with other precincts are addressed in section F below.

Conditions

112. The suite of conditions proposed by the Proponent accompanying the Bill are relevant to the above questions. For the purposes of this submission no specific conditions are identified, beyond noting that there is scope for matters of design or detail to be incorporated within any final plans under an approval .

Evidence

113. The Proponent recognises that for a project of this scale there will be legitimate differences of opinion between lay people and experts alike. Given the drivers for the project and the integrated assessment the scale and siting of the project is not a topic that

⁸ The Landscape Institute and Institute for Environmental Management and Assessment (UK) (3rd ed., 2013).

is greatly assisted by expert opinion. The Proponent will not seek to rely on expert opinion in this way.

114. It will call evidence and/or produce material as necessary to describe and inform the consideration of visual impact of the Project, and as necessary to respond to any specific matters raised in Representations. For this purpose, the Proponent will rely on the expert evidence of Mr Chris Goss on visual amenity and Neil Shephard on planning.

B. Social and Community Effects

What are the central questions?

115. Social and community issues are mandatory considerations in an integrated assessment under section 16(2) of the SPP Act.
116. In some circumstances there may be a stronger distinction between social and community considerations, although in this and other planning jurisdictions, it can be expected that there may be a strong overlap between the two.
117. The Proponent continues to treat social and community considerations together in informing an objective assessment of effects on the Tasmanian community.
118. Community considerations also extend to a consideration of what particular community groups contend on their own behalf as to how the Project may affect them. These can be dealt with as part of the response to Representations and matters raised during the hearing.
119. It is contended that the central questions can usefully be framed as follows:
- (a) What are the potential positive and negative social effects of the Project?
 - (b) How can these effects be weighed against each other and as part of an integrated assessment?
 - (c) Are there any additional or specific community considerations arising out of the Representations?

How are the questions addressed in application material?

120. The POSS Submission addresses relevant issues in the Summary Report at Chapter 5 (Economic, Social and Cultural Analysis), and in:
- (a) *Appendix E – Cost Benefit Analysis;*
 - (b) *Appendix F – Economic Impact Assessment;*
 - (c) *Appendix G – Financial Impact Report;*

(d) *Appendix H – Social and Cultural Analysis Report.*

121. Relevant issues were addressed in responses to RFI items 8, 10-13 and 57-64, and in the RFI Material including:

(a) *Annexure H – Supplementary Report prepared by KMPG (31 January 2025);*

(b) *Annexure I – Economic Analysis Report cost estimates prepared by Wolferstan Varney & Partners Pty Ltd (31 January 2025); and*

(c) *Annexure Z – Key components cost spreadsheet (31 January 2025).*

What did the Draft IAR say?

122. The Draft IAR deals with some matters under the heading of social and community issues at pages 39-44 under the specific headings of Sense of Community, Health and Wellbeing and Sport Diplomacy. The Draft IAR explains that other social effects are dealt with elsewhere in the Draft IAR.

123. The Draft IAR acknowledges some positive social effects under each of these headings and limits the benefit based on the sustained investment that would be required to support the Stadium including in other infrastructure and tourism investment.

124. The Draft IAR is cynical of social benefits flowing from investment in sporting infrastructure by reference to published studies in respect of investment in elite sport.

125. The Draft IAR discusses a distinction between benefits that flow from the stadium itself and benefits that would flow from any stadium or benefits that it says flow from a Tasmanian AFL team and membership rather than the stadium itself. A useful summary of its approach is set out at page 42 where it says:

There is some evidence of a contribution to subjective well being for sport fans, but this is largely connected to club membership and team fandom, rather than attributable to a stadium per se. As such, these impacts on social well being are just as likely to occur in other settings (eg watching a game at the pub with friends) and via on line fan communities as they are in-person in the stadium itself.

What did representations say?

126. A difficulty arises in this case where Representations may rely on the assessment of social effects as assessed by the Commission, which includes and is derived from matters the Proponent says are beyond the scope of the Project and relevant legislation. The Proponent responds in the context of the central questions identified above and without repetition of its criticism of the Commission's approach.

127. The social and community related matters raised in representations are in summary:
- (a) concern that the social and cultural benefits, including health benefits are overstated;
 - (b) impacts on Glebe community;
 - (c) concerns about anti-social behaviour, littering and vandalism;
 - (d) insufficient community consultation;
 - (e) benefits of a Tasmanian AFL team should be dealt with separately to the Stadium;
 - (f) support for:
 - (i) state-wide social benefits;
 - (ii) increase community identity and pride;
 - (iii) increase youth engagement and development; and
 - (iv) increase cultural enrichment and inclusivity.

Outline of Proponent's position

128. In many respects the social assessment in the Draft IAR is a truncated or discursive exercise and is narrower than the approach that is contended in the application material and as a full assessment of social considerations to inform an integrated assessment.
129. The Proponent contends that the approach in the Draft IAR and in many representations has particular shortcomings in approach. For example:
- (a) The social benefits are inherently weighed in the context of the economic case and concerned with funding including ongoing funding one would expect to support the infrastructure of the city and the investment in sport and entertainment programs. It is contended that this approach places inherent constraints on the assessment without an objective appraisal and assessment of potential benefits.
 - (b) The approach of the Draft IAR fails to have regard to the evidence and information before the Commission, which is to the effect that one of the primary anchors of the facility as a user group is the AFL as the licensor for a Tasmanian team, and without which the Commission can be satisfied the stadium will not be built. This makes the assumption that benefits would flow in any case entirely artificial.
 - (c) While the Stadium and an AFL team for Tasmania are linked and cannot be separated when assessing the Project, the Draft IAR explicitly excludes social and

community benefits associated with the AFL team, such as local participation benefits, from its consideration of health and wellbeing benefits of the Project.

- (d) The comparison of experience between visitation and on line or pub experiences for families, and culture is sadly uninspiring, missing the point about social cohesion that flows from day to day, year to year, generation to generation. One wonders how this section of the draft IAR would sit as a description for the MCG, or the Sydney Opera House.
130. An understanding of social benefit is critical to the assessment. A key part of it is to recognise the vast range of direct, and indirect potential benefits over a long period of time and for generations of Hobart residents and visitors.
131. Social benefits include:
- (a) increased civic pride and community cohesion;
 - (b) improved physical and mental health;
 - (c) improved subjective wellbeing;
 - (d) improved athlete experience;
 - (e) improved amenity for Stadium visitors; and
 - (f) improved liveability.
132. It is miserly to stifle those benefits by reference to the need for future funding. It is wrong to give the need for funding the capacity to negate social benefits.
133. The assessment of social benefit requires an enlightened and open assessment of what the Stadium can deliver, not because it is an isolated structure, but because of what it can accommodate month to month and year by year, and how that will influence the liveability of Hobart and the State. This a qualitative assessment. It is tied up with the very vision and rationale for the project. It cannot be measured in monetary terms and it ought not be diminished in monetary terms.
134. The basis for the Draft IAR conclusion that positive social (including health and wellbeing) benefits are overstated absent specific documented evidence of investment by the AFL, or by reference to studies in respect of other sports and infrastructure contexts, is unclear and contrary to material included in the POSS Submission and RFI Material. These matters will be explored in the hearing.

Conditions

135. While no specific conditions are proposed in respect of social and community effects, a range of conditions will be relevant particularly in operational terms.

C. Economic Effects

What are the central questions?

136. The central questions within scope of the SPP Act assessment are:
- (a) What are the positive and negative economic effects of the Project for the purposes of an assessment for land use and development approval?

How are the questions addressed in application material?

137. The POSS Submission addresses relevant issues in the Summary Report at Chapter 5 (Economic, Social and Cultural Analysis), and in:
- (a) *Appendix E – Cost Benefit Analysis;*
 - (b) *Appendix F – Economic Impact Assessment;*
 - (c) *Appendix G – Financial Impact Report;*
 - (d) *Appendix H – Social and Cultural Analysis Report.*
138. Relevant issues were addressed in responses to RFI items 8, 10-13 and 57-64, and in the RFI Material including:
- (a) *Annexure H – Supplementary Report prepared by KMPG (31 January 2025);*
 - (b) *Annexure I – Economic Analysis Report cost estimates prepared by Wolferstan Varney & Partners Pty Ltd (31 January 2025); and*
 - (c) *Annexure Z – Key components cost spreadsheet (31 January 2025).*

What did the Draft IAR say?

139. The Commission's attention is drawn to **Representation 1**, **Representation 2** and **Representation 3**, wherein the Proponent is critical of the approach taken to the assessment of economic (and social) effects and the overreach of the assessments to speculate about and factor in other projects.
140. The Draft IAR addresses economic effects at pp 17-36.
141. The Commission found that the costs of the project (pursuant to its own definition) are approximately double its estimated benefits. In doing so, it assessed a benefit-cost ratio (**BCR**) of 0.53 in *'the Panel's central case'* compared with the Proponent's 0.69 and a third assessment of 0.44 taken from its review of the *Independent review of the Macquarie Point Stadium* prepared by Nicholas Gruen dated 1 January 2025.

142. The Commission, having done its own estimate, further asserts that downside risks are likely to lower further its '*central case*'.
143. The Commission assesses borrowing costs on behalf of the State and includes consideration of the costs of other projects it considers necessary.
144. The Commission made specific findings on aspects of the report to the following effect:
- (a) The Commission considered it appropriate to assess the costs and benefits of the Project with a Tasmanian-based AFL team.⁹
 - (b) The Commission considered the present value of costs exceed the present value of benefits by \$669.2 million.
 - (c) The Commission found that the economic welfare of Tasmanians would fall if the Project goes ahead if all 'significant costs and benefits – including intangibles – are reasonably quantified'.
 - (d) In terms of the cost-benefit analysis results, the Commission found that the key differences between the results of the Commission and KPMG's assessment are:
 - (i) inclusion of all capital expenditures. The Commission included core construction costs, the Panel has included essential client project management and consultant costs and the cost of works required to ensure the stadium is fit for purpose and is able to operate effectively for the purpose intended and include the cost of the underground car park
 - (ii) variations in the estimated benefits from increased tourism expenditure in Tasmania and reduced spending by Tasmanians travelling interstate for AFL games and events. The Commission revised assumptions downward such that:
 - only 15% of AFL game attendees are assumed to be new interstate visitors (compared with 25% by the Proponent);
 - average stay of 2.5 days (compared with 3.1 by the Proponent);
 - lower estimates for Tasmanians avoiding interstate travel; and
 - net benefit from tourism spend is set at 20 cents per dollar (compared with 35 cents by the Proponent).
 - (e) The Commission adopted a 7 per cent real discount rate as do the Proponent's report.

⁹ Draft IAR, 1.1(a), p 17.

- (f) The Commission found the KPMG economic model to be methodologically sound but considered that the model does not demonstrate a net economic benefit compared to an alternative public investment.
- (g) The Commission found that the stadium's marginal economic benefits during operation are expected low relative to the public investment required.
- (h) The Commission used its own financial model which adjusted the KPMG model to:
 - (i) include all capital expenditure in table 1.1.3 of the Draft IAR
 - (ii) reducing revenue by the amount which the revenue is already accrued by other revenues which currently host events that the KPMG model assumes would be hosted at the stadium.
- (i) Based on its financial model, the Commission's findings were that:
 - (i) the State would need to borrow the difference between total capital costs and external contributions (\$255 million from the Commonwealth and AFL).
 - (ii) the stadium is projected to operate at a cash deficit.
 - (iii) construction costs would increase Tasmania's net debt by approximately \$992 million; and
 - (iv) annual debt servicing would average \$75 million, and the cash deficit would rise by about \$87 million annually over the first 10 years; and
 - (v) after 10 years, the additional debt is estimated at \$1.86 billion.

What did representations say?

- 145. A difficulty arises in this case where Representations may rely on the assessment of economic effects as assessed by the Commission, and which the Proponent says are beyond the scope of the Project and relevant legislation.
- 146. The Proponent will attempt to respond in the context of the central question identified above and without repetition of its criticism of the Commission's approach.
- 147. The economic related matters raised in representations are in summary:
 - (a) oppose the Project based on its cost;
 - (b) concern regarding State's ability to fund the Project;
 - (c) concern regarding long-term profitability;

- (d) opportunity costs arising from loss of alternative development outcomes from the site;
- (e) critique of the cost benefit analysis:
 - (i) the base case assumptions in the KPMG reports that the site is not developed is implausible;
 - (ii) omissions of key costs;
 - (iii) inclusion of speculative benefits.
- (f) identification of and support for substantial economic benefits, including the growth in tourism and job creation;
- (g) reconciliation of the local economic benefits the Project will create;

Outline of Proponent's position

- 148. The Proponent maintains the proposition that it is unnecessary for the Commission to assess a BCR for the Project or that a BCR is central to the ultimate integrated assessment process. If, for the purposes of its assessment, the Commission considers it necessary to remark on a BCR, it can adopt a range in line with the range set out in the Draft IAR without impact to the Proponent's case.
- 149. The Proponent maintains that the Commission's assessment of matters of concern to Treasury, State financing and investment, and the cost of other projects, are beyond the task of the Commission.
- 150. The difficulty that arises is that it is difficult to identify issues raised in the Draft IAR without regard to the flawed approach that was taken. It is not only beyond the scope of the task of the Commission, but it contaminates the weighting and judgement afforded to the benefits of the Project, hence the common inclusion of relative terminology such as *'limited'*.
- 151. The Proponent contends that the Commission should start its assessment of economic effects afresh and have regard to the further analysis to be provided by the Proponent to identify the matters according to the Commission's task.
- 152. A substantial failing common to the assessment of both social and economic benefits in the Draft IAR is the separation of benefits based on the use of the Stadium and, in particular for AFL games, and a Tasmanian AFL team.
- 153. This is a substantial failure based on the law, the task of the Commission, and the common approach to merits assessment in land use and planning cases.

- (a) It is a failure of law because it is contrary to the declaration of the Project as a project of State significance with specific reference to the relationship of the Stadium with AFL football and Tasmanian AFL and AFLW Teams.
 - (b) It is a failure of the task because the Commission is required to assess the Project in accordance with the objectives of the SPP Act and the LUPA Act, all of which require a synthesis of land use benefits arising from development.
 - (c) It is a failure of common approach to merits assessment because, for some reason, it separates the user from the building. In this case, the Project to be assessed is to be premised on at least one known user. The Commission's approach is akin to assessing the economic (and social) benefits of a hospital without patients or a shopping centre without anchor tenants.
154. The Draft IAR is cynical as to benefits of the Project, in circumstances of its limitation of economic and social benefits to exclude the benefits based on the use of the Stadium and the AFL team; the exclusion of consideration of benefits which by their nature are inapposite to quantification in monetary terms; and the inclusion of other projects and infrastructure as matters generating 'costs' of the Project while not forming part of it, despite those projects and infrastructure being provided separately over time, and in ways which will benefit Hobart in general.
155. The consequence is a wholesale exaggeration of costs for the purposes of the assessment and a wholesale undervaluation of benefits.
156. The Draft IAR focuses on the cost benefit analysis and goes beyond the reasonable scope of economic considerations for the purposes of an assessment under the SPP Act and the Objectives of the Resource Management and Planning System of Tasmania. This has the effect of diminishing the broader social, community and economic benefits of the Project.
157. Economic project impacts should consider the social and cultural benefits, and economic impacts of a project, as well as a cost benefit analysis (**CBA**). A CBA should not be considered in isolation.
158. Economic benefits include:
- (a) the creation of 1,510 – 3,229 total FTE jobs over the construction period;
 - (b) the Construction Phase is estimated to generate incremental GSP of \$250m – \$269m;
 - (c) between 203 – 204 FTE jobs could be created on an ongoing basis as a result of the Stadium's operations; and

- (d) during the Operating Phase, the Stadium is projected to generate incremental GSP of \$27m – \$32m per annum.

Conditions

159. While no specific conditions are proposed in respect of economic effects, a range of conditions will be relevant particularly in operational terms.

D. Historic Heritage

What are the central questions?

160. The central questions within scope of the SPP Act assessment are:
- (a) What heritage places and precincts exist in and around the Project Site, and what significance and values do they have?
 - (b) What effect would the Project have on the values of places or precincts of historic heritage significance?
 - (c) What is the impact of relocating and modifying places with heritage values, specifically the Goods Shed and the Red Shed?
 - (d) How can potential impacts on heritage values be mitigated and managed?
 - (e) What is the historic archaeological potential and significance of the Project Site, and what would be the effect of the Project in this respect?
 - (f) What measures can be implemented to avoid or ameliorate any adverse effects on the historic archaeological significance of the Project Site?

How are the questions addressed in application material?

161. The POSS Submission addresses relevant issues in the Summary Report at Chapter 6, and in:
- (a) *Appendix L - Historic Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment - Purcell and GJM Heritage August 2024 (HIA)*; and
 - (b) *Appendix M – Historical Archaeological Assessment Sensitivity Report and Method Statement - Alan Hay 20 August 2024 (HAA)*.
162. Issues relevant to historic heritage were addressed in responses to RFI item 20, and in the RFI Material including *Annexure E - GJM Heritage and Purcell Architecture heritage response 17 February 2025*.

What relevant issues were raised in the Draft IAR?

163. Historic cultural heritage and community values are addressed in section 4.0 of the Draft IAR.
164. The Commission found that the Project would have significant negative effects on the values of places, buildings and activities of historic cultural heritage significance and community significance. It considered that the scale of the Stadium would dwarf historic heritage elements and diminish their presence.
165. The Commission focused on specific aspects of the Project and how it would impact the historic significance in the area by particular reference to the:
- (a) the Hobart Cenotaph (section 4.1);
 - (b) the Regatta Grounds/ Lower Domain precinct (section 4.2);
 - (c) visual effect on heritage listed places (section 4.3.1);
 - (d) dismantling/ relocation of heritage listed buildings (section 4.3.2); and
 - (e) historic archaeology (section 4.3.3).
166. The key conclusions of the Draft IAR can be summarised as follows:
- (a) the use, location, bulk, form and appearance of the Project would have significant detrimental impact on the values of places or precincts of historic heritage significance;
 - (b) the Stadium roof would contribute materially to the negative effects on the historic cultural heritage significance of listed places and that any changes that increase the height and bulk of the roof would exacerbate the effects;
 - (c) the proposed design details are not sufficient to ameliorate the effects of the Stadium's built form on the historic cultural heritage significance of surrounding places;
 - (d) the impacts could not be resolved by:
 - (i) design details applied to the proposed Stadium building; or
 - (ii) the scheduling of Stadium events to avoid specific ceremonial activities at the Hobart Cenotaph;
 - (e) in respect of heritage listing buildings that will be dismantled/ relocated:
 - (i) Red Shed - The Commission considered that the dismantling and removal of the Red Shed from the Project Site would not unreasonably affect the historical significance of the building or of the site should it be re-erected in an appropriate located or appropriately stored;

- (ii) Goods Shed - The Commission considers that the proposed relocation of and alterations to the Goods Shed would have negative effects on the values and experience of that building;
- (f) the Commission accepted that a "watching brief" to monitor historic archaeological elements within a specified area of the Macquarie Point Site is an appropriate response in relation to the construction of the Stadium building;
- (g) detailed design plans have not been provided for some associated infrastructure and works, including disturbance associated with landscaping and the cricket wickets. It highlights that it considers that they would require excavation/ disturbance to an unknown extent that could result in potential historic archaeological effects. The Commission is unclear on the impact that those works could have on historic archaeological features; and
- (h) insofar as archaeology, the Commission ultimately concluded that it considers that there is insufficient information for the Commission to have "confidence" that:
 - (i) there are no particularly high areas of historic archaeological sensitivity that could or should be avoided in the design of the associated infrastructure; and
 - (ii) that adequate techniques and timeframes during construction have been considered.

167. The Draft IAR also addresses issues which are outside of scope, including:

- (a) The Northern Access Road:
 - (i) In making its findings in respect of the Regatta Grounds/ Lower Domain precinct, the Commission considered the anticipated design and impact of the northern access road and its impact on the heritage significance of that area.¹⁰
 - (ii) The Commission concluded that the Northern Access Road and associated infrastructure would have significant effects of the values of the area for several listed reasons.¹¹
 - (iii) As stated in Representation 1 and the body of Representation 2, this assessment assumes an expansion of the Project scope beyond the Project as described.
- (b) Historic archaeology outside the Project Site:

¹⁰ Draft IAR at [4.2 (a), (b), (c), (d), (g) and (h)]

¹¹ Draft IAR at [4.2(c)]

- (i) The Commission states that the Proponents reports have not considered the entire area of the land associated with the Project as they only consider the specific footprint of the Stadium building.¹²
- (ii) As stated in Representation 1 and the body of Representation 2, this assessment assumes an expansion of the Project scope beyond the Project as described.
- (c) Mooted housing development:
 - (i) While the Commission acknowledged in the Draft IAR that this is a matter not within scope, it states that the mooted housing development for Regatta Point is likely to affect the cultural and historic values of the area.

What did representations say?

168. Representations raise the following historical heritage related matters:

- (a) negative impact on places of heritage significance (including Evans and Hunter Streets, the Engineers Building, the Cenotaph, Henry Jones IXL Warehouses), including negative visual impact;
- (b) proposed mitigations measures are inadequate to address the impact on heritage places;
- (c) relocation of the Goods Shed and removal of the Red Shed;
- (d) lack of Conservation Management Plans for the Goods Shed and the Red Shed;
- (e) Tasmanian Museum and Art Gallery (**TMAG**) recommend the establishment a Memorandum of Understanding for the transfer, assessment and conservation of any archaeological materials discovered during works.
- (f) TMAG request its involvement in protocols for any archaeological materials discovered during works and the collection and management of sporting memorabilia;
- (g) construction noise and vibration impacts on heritage fabric.
- (h) Tasmanian Heritage Council considers the conditions proposed in HIA and HAA to be acceptable subject to inclusion of additional matters in the Conservation Management Plan, including those relating to the Stadium signage, the Goods Shed, the Royal Engineers Building, the Cenotaph, Evans St and general precautions.

¹² Draft IAR at p 65-66 [4.3.3] (e), (g), (h) and (j)

Outline of Proponent's position

Identification of the heritage places and precincts and assessment of significance and values

169. Table 1 of the HIA¹³ provides a list of each of the identified heritage sites and the assessed significance (i.e. State or local) and a summary its values.
170. Section 7.0 of the HIA contains the datasheets for all the identified sites within the defined study area.
171. The Draft IAR appears to proceed on the basis that the HIA accurately identifies relevant heritage places and precincts.

The effect / impact of the use, location, bulk, form and appearance of the Project on the values of places or precinct of historic cultural heritage significance

172. Table 133 of the HIA¹⁴ provides an overview of the assessed:
- (a) potential direct impacts;
 - (b) potential indirect impacts;
 - (c) overall magnitude of impact/ effect; and
 - (d) general cultural landscape impacts
- of each heritage site.
173. The assessed heritage impact ranges from *'imperceptible/none'* to *'very high'* across the study area.
174. While the Project is stated to have limited visual impacts from certain viewpoints, it will have a *'very high'* magnitude of impact, and result in *'major effect'*, on the Sullivans Cove historic urban landscape generally.
175. It is acknowledged in the HIA that the impacts identified in Table 133 cannot be avoided and mitigation measures will not fully ameliorate the impacts to historic cultural heritage significance of the affected sites.
176. In this respect, the Proponent highlights that there is a necessary weighting of positive and negative impacts within the context of the Project and that due to its very nature some level of impact is unavoidable.
177. The question of visual impact is separately addressed in section A above.

¹³ HIA, pp 49-50.

¹⁴ HIA, pp 56-57.

The impact of the relocation and modification of places with heritage values, specifically the Goods Shed and the Red Shed.

178. It is proposed to relocate the Goods Shed to the northern part of the Project Site which aims to preserve the Goods Shed's connection to its cultural heritage as a railway building.
179. The HIA provides that the retention, relocation and activation of the Goods Shed as part of the project provides an opportunity for greater public use and, with appropriate interpretation, a greater awareness of place.¹⁵ This is a positive heritage outcome.
180. The Commission concluded that the proposal for the Goods Shed would have a negative effect on the values and experience of the building, however it states that '*...the treatment of the Goods Shed is not considered to be an issue of critical significance for the Project*'.¹⁶
181. If the specific impact mitigation measures recommended by in the HIA are implemented through conditions, the Goods Shed can achieve an appropriate outcome from a heritage perspective.
182. The draft conditions accompanying the Bill provide for the demolition of the Red Shed. A condition in Schedule 4 requires the preparation of an archival record for approval by the Tasmanian Heritage Council. In its representation, the Tasmanian Heritage Council noted that it does not have a view on the Red Shed as it is not listed in the Register. The Tasmanian Heritage Council considers the Red Shed is a matter for Hobart City Council.

How potential impacts can be mitigated and managed

183. In respect of mitigation, the HIA refers to the *Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment*¹⁷ which states that best practice uses the '*mitigation hierarchy*', where measures should be proposed to first prevent or avoid, then reduce, and lastly, where possible, offset and/or remedy, any significant adverse impacts.
184. This approach is consistent with the study of landscape and visual impacts, as outlined above.
185. There are a few matters that have informed the HIA of the Project which inform how mitigation of impacts is approached. Firstly the site was selected as preferred site for the Project and secondly, an agreement between the Tasmanian Government and the AFL requires that the Stadium be enclosed.

¹⁵ HIA page 110

¹⁶ Draft IAR at page 63 [4.3.2 (h)]

¹⁷ That is, the Landscape Institute and Institute of Environmental Management & Assessment Guidelines, as used in the preparation of the landscape and visual impact assessment discussed at section A above.

186. The HIA found that the proposed roof will have the greatest visual impact on the setting of the historic centre of Hobart Sullivans Cove, Constitution and Victoria Docks, the Domain and the Hobart Cenotaph.
187. The HIA states that the reduction in the overall height of the roof would be the single most effective measure that would ameliorate the adverse impacts. Failing the reduction in height of the roof, the HIA found that the heritage impacts of the Project should be reduced by moving to mitigation through design development in accordance with the Landscape Institute and Institute of Environmental Management & Assessment Guidelines.
188. It was recommended that an iterative design review be undertaken that seeks to reduce the visual bulk to allow views of distant landforms and reduce visual impact through a number of design considerations.¹⁸
189. The HIA also outlined specific mitigation measures in addition to the above outlined recommendations for particular heritage place and Activity Centres, namely:
 - (a) 41 Hunter Street (UTAS Centre for the Arts, formerly part of H. Jones & Co.);¹⁹
 - (b) the Hobart Cenotaph, Anzac Parade, and Queen's Battery;²⁰
 - (c) Henry Jones & Co. IXL Jam Factory;²¹
 - (d) Hobart Railway Goods Shed;²²
 - (e) Royal Engineers Building and Stone Post;²³
 - (f) Victoria Dock and Constitution Dock;²⁴
 - (g) Red Shed;²⁵ and
 - (h) Regatta Point Activity Area.²⁶
190. To help offset the impacts, the following recommendations were made:²⁷
 - (a) preparation of a program of interpretation of heritage places (and indigenous values) within the boundary and immediate surroundings of the Project;

¹⁸ HIA at page 55

¹⁹ HIA [7.1.1] at page 69

²⁰ HIA [7.1.2] at page 77

²¹ HIA [7.1.7] at page 97

²² HIA [7.1.9] at page 111

²³ HIA [7.1.11] at page 123

²⁴ HIA [7.1.14] at page 154

²⁵ HIA [7.1.15] at page 159 - 160

²⁶ HIA [7.1.21] at page 195

²⁷ HIA at page 55

- (b) preparation of a drawn and photographic recording of impacted heritage places prior to construction preparation commencing. This is to extend to the Hydro Electric Commission building fronting Evans Street;
 - (c) preparation of construction management plans that protect heritage places during construction;
 - (d) use of vibration monitoring on nearby unreinforced masonry heritage buildings or features (such as the Hobart Rivulet diversion tunnel). The scope of vibration monitoring should be developed in consultation with structural engineering advice,
 - (e) locate building services plant and equipment to limit visual impact; and
 - (f) prepare adaptive re-use / refit guidelines for the Goods Shed (Site 9) and Red Shed.
191. While a reduction in the height of the Stadium by the partial removal of the roof may not be possible within the confines of the Project requirements, the mitigation hierarchy allows for a more discrete approach to reduce impact.
192. The recommendations outlined above to offset the impact, as extracted from the HIA, are proposed to be implemented in accordance with appropriate conditions.

Identifying the historic archaeological potential and significance of the site and the likely effect the project will have

193. The HAA found that the Project Site generally has low archaeological sensitivity, due to it largely being reclaimed land that has been previously disturbed. The detailed assessment of Archaeological Sensitivity and Significance can be found at section 7.0 of the HAA.
194. At Table 8.1 the HAA contains a review of the archaeological elements identified as present or as formerly present within the project area which addressed the following matters for each identified Archaeological Element:
- (a) Condition;
 - (b) Archaeological Sensitivity;
 - (c) Heritage Listing;
 - (d) Archaeological Significance; and
 - (e) Archaeological Mitigation Action.
195. While the HAA states that the Project Site has some historical significance at a local level for demonstrating patterns of development in Hobart's waterfront, its potential to yield new

information that will contribute to an understanding of Tasmania's history is stated to be limited.

196. The most significant remaining archaeological components are identified to be the Engineers Jetty and Seawalls, and potentially the Lumber Yard Slip, both of which were assessed to have low local significance for their ability to provide limited information about early maritime structures and the development of Hobart's waterfront.
197. The HAA concluded that significant archaeological materials that *may* remain within the project area consist of large elements of maritime infrastructure, such as sea walls, jetty and slipway.
198. To the extent that matters raised in the Draft IAR identify matters that have not been addressed and are within the scope of the project (as the Proponent defines it), these matters will be addressed by additional evidence to be submitted prior to the hearing.

What measures can/ will be implemented to avoid or ameliorate any likely adverse effects on the historic archaeological significance of the project site

199. The recommendations made in the HAA are as follows:
 - (a) That the general requirements for managing historical archaeological heritage on site outlined in Section 9.1 of the HAA be adhered to during works.
 - (b) The area indicated as low archaeological sensitivity be subject to close monitoring during ground disturbing works as specified in the Archaeological Methodology provided in Section 9.2 of the HAA.
 - (c) The unanticipated discovery plan, or 'watching brief', outlined in Section 9.3 of the HAA, be implemented for all ground disturbing works that will take place within the project area.
 - (d) That copies of the HAA be lodged with the Commission, Hobart City Council and the State Library of Tasmania.
200. The methodology of each of the recommendations are outlined in detail within the HAA and require compliance with *the Tasmanian Heritage Council's Practice Note 2: Managing Historical Archaeological Significance in the Works Application Process*.
201. The Commission accepted in the Draft IAR that a "watching brief" to monitor historic archaeological elements during construction is appropriate.²⁸
202. These recommendations constitute an appropriate response to archaeological issues and can be implemented through conditions.

²⁸ Draft IAR [4.3.3 (d) and (k)]

203. While pre-construction assessments are necessary, and have been undertaken (as demonstrated by the HAA), there is an element of uncertainty. In this vein the recommendations of the HAA are aimed to ensure that any potential archaeological discoveries during the process are appropriately managed

Conditions

204. The draft conditions accompanying the Bill require the CEMP to include the requirements in Schedule 4 relating to historic cultural heritage. Schedule 4 requires the CEMP to include a Heritage Conservation Management Plan which amongst other things must provide for the dismantling, storage and re-erection of the Goods Shed and the preparation of an archival record of the Red Shed prior to demolition.²⁹
205. The conditions will be addressed further in response to matters raised in the course of hearing.

Evidence

206. The Proponent will rely on the expert evidence of Jim Gard'ner (GJM) in respect of historic heritage.

E. Aboriginal Cultural Heritage

What are the central questions?

207. The central questions within scope of the SPP Act assessment are:
- (a) identifying the known and potential Aboriginal cultural heritage within the Project area and its significance;
 - (b) the extent that the development may impact Aboriginal cultural heritage;
 - (c) identifying measures that will be undertaken so that adverse effects on Aboriginal cultural heritage are avoided or managed in an acceptable manner;
 - (d) the character of the landscape and any Aboriginal cultural values relating to the use, associations and meanings linked to the landscape character of the place;
 - (e) the extent that the development may/ will impact Aboriginal cultural heritage and landscape values; and
 - (f) how the Project will positively contribute to an understanding and appreciation and extension of Aboriginal cultural heritage and landscape values.

²⁹ Draft condition 4.3.11 (Summary Report p 253).

How are the questions addressed in application material?

208. The POSS Submission addresses relevant issues in the Summary Report at Chapter 6, and in:
- (a) *Appendix K - Previous Aboriginal Heritage Investigations;*
 - (b) *Appendix M - Historical Archaeological Assessment, Sensitivity Report and Method Statement - Aboriginal Heritage Investigations; and*
 - (c) *Appendix HH - Pre-Stadium Cultural and Landscape Values Assessment - Southern Archaeological (Cultural and Landscape Values Assessment Report).*
209. Issues relevant to Aboriginal cultural heritage were addressed in responses to RFI item 19, and in the RFI Material including:
- (a) *Annexure M - Macquarie Point Development Corporation Aboriginal community consultation 31 January 2025;*
 - (b) *Annexure N - Tasmanian Aboriginal community engagement and Aboriginal Culturally Informed Zone and Stadium August 2024; and*
 - (c) *Annexure O – Draft Southern Archaeology Aboriginal Heritage Assessment Report 30 January 2025 (Draft AHAR).*

What relevant issues were raised in the Draft IAR?

210. Aboriginal cultural heritage is addressed in section 5.0 of the Draft IAR.
211. The Commission firstly states that a separate assessment under the *Aboriginal Heritage Act 1975* (Tas) (**AH Act**) will be undertaken if a permit is granted for the Project.
212. A summary of the comments contained in the Draft IAR are outlined below:
- (a) Aboriginal cultural heritage materials (section 5.1)
 - (i) The Commission acknowledged that there have been a considerable number of Aboriginal Heritage assessments undertaken within the main body of the Macquarie Point site and the surrounding area, albeit being piecemeal and project specific in nature.
 - (ii) The Commission considers that the predictive model, mapping and classification of Potential Areas of Sensitivity for Aboriginal heritage material presented in the AHAR are based on a combination of evidence and sound professional judgment.

- (iii) Generally, the Commission acknowledged and extracted aspects of the Proponent's reports, at times not making any determination as to whether it accepted those matters.
 - (b) Aboriginal cultural values and landscapes (section 5.2)
 - (i) The Commission states that an assessment of the landscape character and values and the effect the project may have on these values was not provided. Consequently, they state that until feedback is provided through engagement and assessment by the Aboriginal community, the Commission is unable to make findings on these issues at this stage.
 - (ii) The Commission considers that in order to understand the effect the Project may have on cultural landscape values, information is needed in relation to the characteristic attributes of the place. This encompasses people's experience of association with and perceptions of the place.
 - (iii) The Commission stated that they consider that many of the observations and suggestions made in the *Appendix HH - Pre-Stadium Cultural and Landscape Values Assessment - Southern Archaeological* on how to approach and undertake a landscape values assessment appear to be sound and applicable to the Project. It views that the assessment must be based on and informed by the Aboriginal community.
213. The Draft IAR also addresses issues relevant to Aboriginal cultural heritage but which are outside the scope of the integrated assessment, insofar as it states that the Draft AHAR, specifically the analysis of the effects of the Project on heritage sites and the effect of the Project on the broader area, does not consider the full scope of the Project.³⁰
214. For example, the Commission highlighted that there is an amalgamated Aboriginal heritage site on the western banks of Cenotaph Hill. It states that the development of the northern access road would involve works within this registered Aboriginal heritage site which may affect its values.³¹
215. This assessment assumes an expansion of the Project scope beyond the Project as described. Separate approval will be required for works that go beyond that which the Project is defined.
216. The Draft IAR incorrectly stated that an assessment of the cultural landscape assessment was not provided. This report formed *Appendix HH - Pre-Stadium Cultural and Landscape Values Assessment - Southern Archaeological*, submitted 17 September 2024. It also

³⁰ Draft IAR at [5.1(i)]

³¹ Draft IAR at [5.1 (g)]

appears to generally ignore the engagement with community, including the reports provided and the summary emphasised in the RFI Material.

What did representations say?

217. In relation to Aboriginal heritage, representations raised the following issues:

- (a) impact on cultural heritage and values;
- (b) inadequate engagement with the Tasmanian Aboriginal community; and
- (c) lost opportunity for meaningful action for reconciliation.

Outline of Proponent's position

identification of the known and potential Aboriginal heritage within the Project area and its significance

218. Several Aboriginal cultural heritage investigations have been previously undertaken within the Project Site and in its vicinity:

- (a) *Archaeological Test Evacuations 2015 (Austral Tasmania)*;
- (b) *Archaeological Salvage Excavations 2021 (Austral Tasmania/ Aboriginal heritage Investigations)*;
- (c) *Archaeological Acquittal Report, 2021 (Aboriginal Heritage investigations)*; and
- (d) *Phase 3 Archaeological Salvage Excavations 2023 (AMAC Archaeological)*.

219. Summaries of those reports and their relevance to the project and copies were provided in *Appendix K - Previous Aboriginal Heritage Investigations*.

220. The AHAR was later prepared to report the results of the background analysis for the Project Site and referred back to previous work at the place. This report summarised the known Aboriginal sites within the study area at Table 5.

221. A significance assessment is contained at section 14 of the AHAR. The assessment was undertaken using the guidelines from the *Australia ICOMOS Burra Charter 2013 (Burra Charter)* which is a document that underpins heritage management in Australia. The five values identified in the Burra Charter are aesthetic, historic, scientific, social and spiritual values. The values and significance of the place is summarised in Table 15:

Table 15 summarises the values and significance for the place.

Values	Significance rating	Comment/justification summary
Social and spiritual	Very high	Significant place for community - rated by Colin Hughes
Traditional	Very High	Historical and ongoing connections – rated by Colin Hughes and Darren Watton
Aesthetic	Medium	Many sites in the area
Historic	High	Many references to Aboriginal people visiting the site after colonisation – contact material on site.
Scientific	Overall – High Site content - High Rarity – High Representativeness - High	Shell material, stone artefacts and contact material – rare, uncommon, high material content and diversity, not well represented – high contribution to research and understanding.

Table 7: Values and significance summary.

222. The Commission has accepted this assessment of values and significance.³²

the extent that the development may/ will impact Aboriginal heritage

223. The Commission's position is that Aboriginal cultural heritage sites, places, or objects remain to be governed and protected by the AH Act.³³ Therefore, there would be ongoing/existing protections in place.

224. Identified sites are protected under s 9 and relics are protected under s 14 of the AH Act. Any impact to an Aboriginal cultural heritage site or relic by an activity requires a permit under the AH Act or a new development footprint to be devised which avoids the Aboriginal heritage site/s or relics.

225. Notwithstanding assessments of the potential impact of the Project upon Aboriginal cultural heritage material have been undertaken for the purposes of the Project.

226. The AHAR states that the Project may impact Aboriginal cultural heritage in its current planned location. On that basis a plan was developed (see Figure 98 of the AHAR) based upon overlays, landscape considerations and background research which shows Potential Areas of Sensitivity (**PAS**) that may be impacted by this development. This plan is intended to be used as a guide for several recommendations put forward.³⁴ The Commission appear to accept this methodology in the Draft IAR.³⁵

identifying measures that will be undertaken so that adverse effects on Aboriginal cultural heritage are avoided or managed in an acceptable manner

³² Draft IAR at [5.1(f)]

³³ Draft IAR at [5.0]

³⁴ See pages 169 – 171 of the AHAR for the full list and outline of the recommendations.

³⁵ Draft IAR at [5.1(c)]

227. The recommendations consider the significance of the sites (and the potential for other artefacts in the immediate area), the AHAR states that these recommendations are considered the best mitigation response for this project.
228. Seven recommendations were put forward in the AHAR for the study area based upon the results of this assessment and are fully outlined at section 16.
229. To summarise, the recommendations proposed the avoidance or monitoring of PAS during works, the preparation of an Unanticipated Discovery Plan, and that contractor inductions occur. It is recommended that if any Aboriginal cultural heritage material is encountered during proposed works, that work should cease immediately and the process in the Unanticipated Discovery Plan should be enacted.
230. These recommendations are all capable of being incorporated into conditions to ensure compliance.

the character of the landscape and any Aboriginal cultural values relating to the use, associations and meanings linked to the landscape character of the place;

the extent that the development may/ will impact Aboriginal cultural and landscape values; and

how the Project will positively contribute to an understanding and appreciation and extension of Aboriginal cultural and landscape values.

231. These central questions in relation to cultural landscape values will be addressed together.
232. The Proponents submission included the Cultural and Landscape Values Assessment Report. This report acknowledged that Macquarie Point is a significant cultural landscape.
233. At the outset, the Cultural and Landscape Values Assessment Report highlighted the difficulties in capturing the Aboriginal cultural and landscape values in the time available. It also emphasised that consultation on Aboriginal cultural and landscape values which require a nuanced and specific approach to be effective.
234. Within the Cultural and Landscape Values Assessment Report an assessment of the Aboriginal cultural values and landscape based upon all the above has been completed along with recommendations, however this was done in a preliminary manner and in draft form. Those key findings, considerations and recommendations are listed at pages 18 – 21 of the Cultural and Landscape Values Assessment Report.
235. While the purpose of the Cultural and Landscape Values Assessment Report was to provide an assessment of the Aboriginal cultural values and landscape, the authors state that while they can provide some advice and/or overview of this, a key finding of the report

is that it is the Aboriginal people themselves that should provide the answers to this. Effective consultation and ownership of the process by Aboriginal people is critical.

236. *Annexure N - Tasmanian Aboriginal community engagement and Aboriginal Culturally Informed Zone and Stadium August 2024*, which was provided in response to the RFI, outlines some of the consultation that has occurred with the Aboriginal community in relation to the Culturally Informed Zone and the Stadium. It outlines the key findings from that initial consultation which will inform the design.
237. In response to the RFIs, *Annexure M - Macquarie Point Development Corporation Aboriginal community consultation 31 January 2025*, was also prepared. It refers to the Cultural and Landscape Values Assessment Report and points to the finding that additional time is required to meaningfully engage with the Tasmanian Aboriginal community. As a result, the Proponent outlined that it has requested that this consultation with the Aboriginal community be ongoing, and the Cultural and Landscape Values Assessment Report remains at a draft stage. It also advised that the authors of the Cultural and Landscape Values Assessment Report have distributed the executive summary of the draft report to a number of groups for comment within the Aboriginal community.
238. As such consultation with the Aboriginal community is ongoing and once the consultation has been completed the report will be amended to document the results of the consultation. Following this, these matters will be further addressed at the hearing.

Conditions

239. The draft conditions accompanying the Bill require the CEMP to include an unanticipated discovery plan,³⁶ which provides for the protection works, salvage and relocation of any Aboriginal cultural heritage or historical buildings or artefacts discovered unexpectedly.
240. The conditions will be addressed further in response to matters raised in the course of hearing.

F. Transport and Movement

What are the central questions?

241. The central questions within scope of the SPP Act assessment are:
- (a) whether the Project has been appropriately designed to accommodate people arriving by active and public transport;

³⁶ Draft condition C2 and 1-3 and 6 of Schedule 3.

- (b) to what extent the Project should allow for access by vehicles, having regard to likely private vehicle, public transport (buses) and service vehicle access needs, and how such access is provided;
- (c) planning for movement in emergencies; and
- (d) potential impacts on the broader transport network.

How are the questions addressed in application material?

242. The POSS Submission addresses relevant issues in the Summary Report at Chapter 4 (Movement) and Section 9.5 (Emergency Management), and in:
- (a) *Appendix N - Transport Study (WSP, August 2024) (Transport Study)*;
 - (b) *Appendix CC - Emergency Management and Incident Response report (Intelligent Risks, August 2024) (EMIR Report)*; and
 - (c) *Appendix EE - Car Parking & Access Review: Traffic Engineering Report (Salt3, September 2024)*.
243. The Mac Point Precinct Plan (POSS Submission Appendix JJ) was informed by an Event Transport Access Study (WSP, October 2023).
244. Issues relevant to transport were addressed in responses to RFI items 22-26, 28, 48, and 66-71, and in RFI Material including:
- (a) *Annexure P - WSP transport and movement matters 31 January 2025 (Additional Transport Comments)*; and
 - (b) *Annexure V - Revised EMIR Report (January 2025)*.

What relevant issues were raised in the Draft IAR?

245. Transport and movement are addressed in section 7.0 of the Draft IAR. In this section, the Draft IAR identifies potential issues in respect of:
- (a) pedestrian movement, with a particular focus on post-event (section 7.1.1) and evacuation (section 7.1.2) scenarios;
 - (b) mass passenger transport and transport modes (section 7.2), with a focus on the concept of event buses and potential for the aspirational mode share target outlined in the POSS Submission to be achieved;
 - (c) impacts on the broader transport system (section 7.3); and
 - (d) provision and use of car parking at the stadium and elsewhere (section 7.4).

246. The Draft IAR also addresses issues which are outside of scope, including:
- (a) delivery of the Northern Access Road; and
 - (b) delivery of pedestrian and other transport infrastructure which is not proposed as part of the Project.
247. The Draft IAR makes no reference to the proposal for transport and movement to be managed in accordance with detailed plans prepared prior to commencement of use of the Project, including the requirements of proposed draft conditions for the OEMP sub-plans and the EMP, or that these plans are prepared in consultation with relevant stakeholders and approved by the Minister, consistent with best practice for major projects.

What did representations say?

248. The representations raise various concerns regarding transport and access. Key issues include inadequate infrastructure to support event-day operations, unrealistic assumptions in the transport modelling—particularly around behavioural change, private vehicle use, and truck movements—and unresolved conflicts between pedestrian and vehicle traffic, especially around key access points like Evans Street and Dunn Street. Additional concerns relate to insufficient on-site parking, disruption to surrounding properties and community facilities, and the lack of a comprehensive transport management plan, although some submitters suggest that integrated solutions such as light rail or ferry terminals could help address broader congestion challenges. Some representations acknowledge that transport impacts can be acceptably managed.

Outline of Proponent's position

Reasonable expectations for traffic and transport associated with stadium events

249. Introducing a new stadium into any environment will result in impacts on traffic and transport networks.
250. By its nature, traffic³⁷ associated with any large events will give rise to temporary issues of congestion and potential conflict. This much is demonstrated by events in any chosen city, including in Hobart during events such as cruise ships visits, during fun runs, marches and parades. Notwithstanding their disruptions to ordinary traffic movements, temporary traffic controls are accepted at a community scale in the context of such events, and in the vicinity of stadia, across Australia.

³⁷ Of all modes.

251. In the case of the Project, modelling which assumes a major event, on a Friday night, with a higher proportion of people using private cars than reasonably expected, indicates that delays will be no worse than those experienced by people travelling to work or school on a Monday to Friday.

Design for traffic and transport

252. The basis for the design of Project environs and its integration with the transport network for and beyond the Precinct is explained in submission material including the Transport Study and in the Additional Transport Comments. As the latter document explains, design and planning has been carried out to a level of resolution appropriate for the present assessment. It does not represent the final detailed design by which all potential issues identified in the Draft IAR would be specifically addressed.
253. The current design has enabled testing of various scenarios, which demonstrate that transport operations as proposed can be implemented from the commencement of operation.

Mode share targets

254. The Draft IAR suggests the transport plan is '*vision led and unrealistic*' and people will tend to use their private vehicles to access major events. These comments do not appear to consider behaviours in how people access events, locally or nationally, now, or the transport plans, policies and strategies that the Hobart City Council and State Growth have in place, or the success of event buses for major events at other venues.
255. They also neglect to attribute to the Project the capacity to serve as a catalyst for transport investment and planning, including as part of the broader Mac Point Precinct Plan.
256. As the RFI Materials explain in the Additional Transport Comments (p 2), the mode share target is aspirational, but connected with reality and is based on consideration of:
- (a) reference to other new and exemplar stadia in Australia and globally;
 - (b) reference to the local context in Hobart and in Tasmania;
 - (c) existing travel behaviours associated with stadia in Tasmania;
 - (d) audience profile for various events;
 - (e) timing of various events;
 - (f) strategic planning mode share targets for business-as-usual transport planning in Greater Hobart and more broadly in Tasmania; and

- (g) learned behaviour of regular patrons and staged introduction of new transport services over time.
257. As the Transport Study notes, a specified volume of mass and public transport services are necessary to achieve what is identified as the '*optimum*' future mode-share, and access, arrangement. Having regard to scenario testing (and the conservative assumptions therein), it is apparent that this '*optimum*' arrangement is not necessary in order for access to be *acceptably* managed.
258. Section 7.2 of the Draft IAR presents criticisms of relevant material provided in the POSS Submission and RFI Material, without fairly recording its content or the basis on which it is presented. By specific reference to the enumerated paragraphs of that section:
- (a) The Draft IAR accurately notes the aspirational, base mode share target of 60 per cent non-car access. It is not necessary that the 60 per cent non-car access mode share target be achieved in order for the Project, or its traffic and transport related effects, to be considered acceptable. Scenario testing included in the POSS Submission addresses the highly conservative scenario of a 40,000 person attendance, and a 46 per cent non-car mode share (well lower than the "Base Target" of 60 per cent or the "Stretch Target" of 70 per cent), and concludes that the transport network would operate acceptably in such circumstances.
 - (b) The event bus concept, and the basis on which it can operate to contribute to achievement of a mode share figure consistent with the aspiration of a 60 per cent non-car mode share, is addressed including in the Transport Study.
 - (c) The assessment of the Project does not proceed on the basis of any bus fleet existing in 2025. Rather, it has regard to planning for the future of the public transport network, and identifies that the ultimate scale of the event bus operation will be dependent on investment in other bus services, which may be incrementally delivered over time.³⁸
 - (d) It is not proposed to provide '*event only*' facilities beyond the Stadium boundary, including to ensure that the Project does not detract from achievement of legacy benefits to Hobart and to Tasmania. Rather, it is proposed to use existing or planned assets where possible, including through management of any time conflicts, to maximise other infrastructure investment.³⁹
 - (e) In considering the operation of the transport network (including but not limited to event buses), regard must be had to the nature of event traffic and, in particular, the duration of periods of peak movement. It is not appropriate for base design

³⁸ RFI Annexure P, p 4.

³⁹ RFI Annexure P, p 4.

criteria to respond to a scenario in which every attendee of an event, at maximum Stadium capacity, seeks to use one transport mode at the same moment.

- (f) As Annexure P notes, detailed design, including of the number of event bus stops, is a future process. Current concept designs enable scenario testing and other considerations, and lead to the conclusion that planned infrastructure can operate acceptably in tested scenarios.
- (g) As above, detailed design is a matter to follow. Universal access is an important consideration in all relevant respects. The Draft IAR selects a single statement from the Transport Study, which identifies that curved curbs are “not ideal for universal access”, and is critical of the design of the Project on that basis. It makes no reference to the immediately following paragraphs of the Transport Study, which identify how curved curbs shown in the concept plan will be straightened in ongoing planning processes.⁴⁰
- (h) the basis on which the Commission says in paragraph (k) that park-and-ride event buses are not capable of achieving a '*sufficient level*', or what the Commission means by '*sufficient level*', are not clear.

259. Established patterns of behaviour in the Tasmanian context are informative, but not decisive of how attendees of the Stadium would choose to travel particularly on the basis of learned behaviour over time. These matters are addressed in the Transport Study and the Additional Transport Comments, in terms not acknowledged in the Draft IAR.

- (a) The characteristics of an event bus option listed in paragraph (m) are desirable – and their identification in the Draft IAR is consistent with the POSS Submission and RFI Material. The approach to considering future services, and how considerations in the POSS Submission identify optimum as well as acceptable circumstances, are addressed above.
- (b) Paragraph (n) is unconnected to any assessment of the transport or traffic impacts of the Project, and does not fairly reflect the basis on which ferries are considered as a possible future option in relevant material.
- (c) As above, it is not necessary to establish that the “optimum” scenario can be achieved in order for the Project and its impacts to be acceptable.
- (d) The matters addressed in paragraph (p) repeat matters addressed in paragraphs above.
- (e) The scenario contemplated in paragraph (q) was scenario tested and established to result in acceptable impacts to the transport network. It is presumed that the

⁴⁰ Appendix N, p 59.

Draft IAR's reference to potential conflicts with pedestrian movement depend on the Commission's own assessment of potential pedestrian movements, which are inconsistent with the POSS Submission and RFI Material; which appear to overlook the contribution of existing and future developments and uses including bars, cafes and restaurants that would assist in flattening the spectator egress profile; and which in any event do not acknowledge the accepted levels of conflict capable of being addressed through EMP and otherwise.

- (f) The Proponent agrees with the aspiration expressed in paragraph (r), but notes the limitations on its ability to control or achieve broader transport planning aspirations including improving access for people and communities with existing transport disadvantage.

- 260. The comments attributed to staff of the Department of State Growth (**DSG**) at page 97 of the Draft IAR relate to matters addressed above, and otherwise which are being addressed through separate initiatives of the DSG or other agencies including but not limited to the Northern Access Road. Any matters raised by DSG in representation or otherwise will be addressed by the Proponent as appropriate.

Emergency management

- 261. The EMIR Report explains that the current draft Emergency Management Plan has not been made public having regard to sensitive security matters.
- 262. In light of questions raised in the Draft IAR, the Proponent will provide further information regarding space which would be available around the Stadium and in its environs, including as relevant to the question of space available for egress during emergency evacuation scenarios.
- 263. Emergency evacuation is proposed to be provided for in accordance with international standards for safety at sport venues, as outlined in the *Guide to Safety at Sports Grounds – Sixth Edition*.⁴¹ The EMIR Report identifies how this can be achieved on the basis of the proposed design.
- 264. While the Draft IAR contemplates a possibility that a full evacuation may not be possible within 8 minutes by reference to its own identification of '*likely pedestrian pinch points*'⁴² and assumption of conflicts between pedestrians and vehicles:
 - (a) the Draft IAR does not identify the basis for this identification, by reference to work undertaken by appropriately qualified persons or otherwise;

⁴¹ A document published by the UK Sports Grounds Safety Authority.

⁴² Draft IAR, paragraph 7.1.2(h) and Figure 7.1.2.1.

- (b) it does not appear to have regard to the evacuation routes identified in the EMIR Report or to likely pedestrian volumes and movement patterns in potential evacuation scenarios; and
- (c) it appears to assume pedestrians will move towards, and not away from, the Stadium during a complete evacuation scenario.

265. It is appropriate for management of potential interactions between pedestrian and vehicle movements to be addressed in the preparation of the Operational Transport Management Plan as is proposed in the EMIR Report and would be required by the draft conditions. Emergency measures would also be addressed in the Events Management Plan required by the conditions as proposed.

Northern Access Road

- 266. As explained in Representation 2, the Northern Access Road does not form part of the Project. It is subject to separate processes of assessment, approval and delivery.
- 267. However, given the commitment to the delivery of the Northern Access Road through those other processes, it is appropriate for the integrated assessment of the Project to proceed on the basis that it will form part of the transport network.
- 268. Through draft conditions accompanying the Bill, the Northern Access Road must be delivered prior to the use of the stadium or an alternative access arrangement for bus patrons must be identified in the Operational Transport Management Plan (Condition D11).⁴³

Conditions

- 269. The draft conditions accompanying the Bill:
 - (a) require the Operational Transport Management Plan ;⁴⁴
 - (b) require a Public Domain and Landscape Plan which covers wayfinding and signage;⁴⁵
 - (c) require an Events Management Plan, including emergency response management;⁴⁶
 - (d) require a Security Management Plan which addressing security management, lighting and crime prevention;⁴⁷ and

⁴³ Draft condition D1.

⁴⁴ Draft condition D11.

⁴⁵ Draft conditions B3 and B4.

⁴⁶ Draft condition D7

⁴⁷ Draft condition D8.

- (e) address the delivery of the Northern Access Road.⁴⁸

270. The conditions will be addressed further in response to d matters raised in the course of hearing.

Evidence

271. The Proponent will rely on the expert evidence of Graeme Steverson in respect of transport and movement.

G. Noise and Vibration

What are the central questions?

272. The central questions within the scope of the SPP Act assessment are:

- (a) how the Project has been designed to ensure noise and vibration impacts are acceptable in the context of:
 - (i) construction; and
 - (ii) operation of the Project;
- (b) whether there are any mitigation measures suitable to minimise or manage noise and vibration impacts.

How are the questions addressed in application material?

273. The POSS Submission addresses relevant issues in the Summary Report at Chapters:

- (a) 1.1.3 (Timeframes and Operating Periods);
- (b) 5.3 (Social and Cultural Analysis);
- (c) 6.3 (Places and Precincts of Historic Cultural Heritage Significance);
- (d) 7.2 (Noise and Vibration);
- (e) 8 (Potential Land Use Conflicts); and
- (f) 9.3 (Construction Management); and

274. Noise and vibration issues are also addressed in the following:

- (a) *Appendix Q– Noise and Vibration Assessment prepared by AECOM (21 August 2024) (NVA)*; and

⁴⁸ Draft condition D1.

- (b) *Appendix LL – Site Environment Management Plan prepared by AECOM (22 October 2021) (SEMP).*

275. Issues relevant to noise and vibration were addressed in the response to RFI items 26, 33 and 39 comprising:

- (a) *Annexure Q to the RFI response submitted on 31 January 2025 – Noise Assessment Supplementary Report prepared by AECOM (31 January 2025) (Noise Supplementary Report);*
- (b) *Annexure B to the RFI response submitted on 14 February 2025 – Construction Management Plan comments prepared by Zancon (14 February 2024).*

What relevant issues were raised in the Draft IAR?

276. The Draft IAR addresses noise in section 8.5. In this section, the Draft IAR identifies potential issues in respect of:

- (a) construction and operational noise impacts on sensitive receptors;
- (b) retention of "reserve capacity" in the noise environment; and
- (c) what mitigation measures would be implemented and the effectiveness of these measures.

277. The Draft IAR also addresses noise in sections 6.2.2, 6.2.3 and 6.2.4 as it relates to the Tasmanian Symphony Orchestra (**TSO**) and Federation Concert Hall, Upper Queen's Domain and other uses and activity in the surrounding area.

What did representations say?

278. Construction and operational noise and vibration related matters were raised in representations, which, in summary, relate to:

- (a) impact on the Tasmanian Symphony Orchestra;
- (b) impact on the amenity of nearby residents and businesses;
- (c) potential damage to heritage structures and artefacts;
- (d) inadequate mitigation measures proposed;
- (e) request for strict and enforceable conditions of approval.

Outline of Proponent's position

Construction noise

279. The NVA and the Noise Supplementary Report in summary indicate that:
- (a) bulk excavation and piling would result in the highest noise levels at sensitive receptors with two residential receptors expected to be '*Highly noise affected*' (>75dB);
 - (b) three residential receptors are likely to be affected by '*moderately intrusive noise*' (more than 20dB above the noise management level⁴⁹) during the substructure and stand construction;
 - (c) one residential receptor is likely to be affected by '*moderately intrusive noise*' during the stand, roof and façade construction.
280. Whilst construction noise will impact sensitive receptors to varying degrees at different stages of the construction process, these impacts are temporary in nature and would be acceptably managed through a combination of mitigation measures, including:
- (a) scheduling of works;
 - (b) selection of quieter construction methods and equipment;
 - (c) noise barriers and other physical works;
 - (d) ongoing monitoring; and
 - (e) ongoing community notification and engagement.⁵⁰
281. The final combination of mitigation measures would be resolved through the detailed design process and specified in the Operational Noise Management Plan and the CEMP.
282. The Draft IAR notes that there is a potential for cumulative construction noise from other projects under construction at the same time as the Project. At this stage of the design process, it is unclear whether construction timeframes will overlap. However, should this occur, the CEMP is an appropriate tool to manage impacts.

Operational noise

283. The main operational noise emissions will be generated during sporting events and concerts.

⁴⁹ Based on the *NSW Department of Environment and Climate Change Interim Construction Noise Guideline 2009*.

⁵⁰ Noise Supplementary Report, section 4.5.

284. The NVA and the Noise Supplementary Report in summary identified that:⁵¹
- (a) predicted noise levels from concerts will be audible relative to the existing ambient noise levels. A rock concert would be the '*worst case scenario*' with other concerts (pop or RnB) being less noticeable;
 - (b) noise from the PA system and game sirens are likely to be audible over existing ambient noise levels;
 - (c) noise associated with patrons entering and leaving the Project Site is unlikely to be noticeable for receptors except those the apartments on Evans Street directly opposite the Project Site;
 - (d) noise associated with patrons at the food and beverage premises is unlikely to be noticeable at the majority of receptors; and
 - (e) noise associated with the bus plaza, building services, temporary generators and loading dock and waste collections are unlikely to be noticeable over existing ambient noise levels.
285. In respect of concert noise, the impact must be understood in the context that it is proposed to hold one concert per year. The duration of concert related noise impacts is insignificant. Whilst the Draft IAR is concerned that concert noise has the potential to cause sleep disturbance during the night, the Draft IAR fails to acknowledge that only one concert is proposed per year and does not address how restrictions on operating hours could limit the impact of nighttime concert noise to the few sensitive receptors affected.
286. Noise from sirens during games should be considered as a discrete maximum noise emission rather than an averaged maximum over a 15 minute period. The area surrounding the Stadium would currently, and in the future, experience other similar maximum noise levels from time to time (for example, emergency vehicle sirens and helicopters servicing the hospital).
287. At 8.5(j), the Draft IAR comments that '*predicted noise levels in the vicinity of the Stadium during sporting events and concerts would exceed the existing ambient noise levels at nearby sensitive receptors.*' However, this is incorrect. Noise from sporting events and general operations of the Stadium are predicted to be '*just noticeable*' or '*unlikely to be noticeable*' relative to the existing ambient noise level.
288. Operational noise impacts, and appropriate mitigation measures will be addressed through expert evidence filed on behalf of the Proponent.

⁵¹ NVA, pp 15 and 16.

Reserve capacity

289. The *Environment Protection Policy (Noise) 2009* (**Noise EPP**) is a State Policy which aims to protect specified environmental values. The environmental values that are protected are:

'the qualities of an acoustic environment that are conducive to –

(a) the wellbeing of the community or a part of the community, including its social and economic amenity; or

(b) the wellbeing of an individual, including the individual's –

(i) health; and

(ii) opportunity to work and study and to have sleep, relaxation and conversation without unreasonable interference from noise.'

290. The Noise EPP goes on to provide that the values in (b) above are deemed to be protected for the majority of the population:

'where the acoustic environment indicator levels are not exceeded, and there are no individual sources of noise with dominant or intrusive characteristics'.⁵²

291. The Noise EPP provides that commercial activities should seek to retain '*reserve capacity*' in the acoustic environment to allow for other reasonable noise emissions.⁵³ However, the Noise EPP also acknowledges that:

(a) retention of '*reserve capacity*' may not be required when there is unlikely to be additional noise sources or the proposal is clearly of public interest;⁵⁴ and

(b) even where best practice environmental management is implemented, noise emissions may prejudice the protection of the relevant environmental values or provide insufficient reserve capacity. In these cases, the EPP provides that the EPA as the relevant regulatory authority should ensure that reviews of the noise activity take place to assess whether emissions can be further reduced.

292. The Draft IAR raises concerns that the Noise Assessment and the Noise Assessment Supplementary Report have not considered reserve capacity.

293. The Noise EPP is not prescriptive. It is a guide for assessing noise impacts. The provision of reserve capacity is one factor to be considered in assessing whether noise impacts are acceptable. The provision of reserve capacity is unnecessary when the Port and hospital

⁵² Noise EPP, cl 7(3).

⁵³ Noise EPP, cl 12(4).

⁵⁴ Noise EPP, cl 12(5).

operations already exceed the indicative levels in the Noise EPP and whilst traffic noise is assessed separately, the Stadium use would not regularly correlate with peak traffic times. Reserve capacity will be addressed through the Proponent's expert evidence.

Mitigation measures

294. The Draft IAR suggests that the acoustic mitigation measures are uncertain. The Noise Assessment and the Noise Assessment Supplementary Report outline a range of mitigation measures that could be used to minimise construction and operational noise impacts. At this point in the design and assessment process, it is appropriate for mitigation measures to be resolved and implemented through conditions of approval, including via an updated noise and vibration assessment based on the detailed design of the Stadium. The Proponent's draft conditions require the CEMP and OEMP to address noise and vibration impacts.

Conditions

295. The draft conditions accompanying the Bill require:
- (a) the CEMP to address construction noise management.⁵⁵
 - (b) an operational noise management plan.⁵⁶
296. The conditions will be addressed further in response to matters raised in the course of hearing.

Evidence

297. The Proponent will rely on the expert evidence of Neil Mackenzie in respect of acoustic impacts.

H. Lighting

What are the central questions?

298. The central questions within the scope of the SPP Act assessment are:
- (a) how the Project has been designed to ensure lighting impacts (including cumulative impact) during and outside events are acceptable having regard to adjacent uses and potential effects on transport and fauna; and
 - (b) appropriate mitigation measures to minimise or manage lighting impacts.

⁵⁵ Draft condition CN2.

⁵⁶ Draft condition D12.

How are the questions addressed in application material?

299. The POSS Submission addressed relevant issues in the Summary Report at Chapters:

- (a) 1.2 (Design and Development);
- (b) 7.3 (Lighting);
- (c) 9.2 (Stadium Signage Size and Use); and
- (d) 9.4 (Utility Services).

300. Lighting issues are also addressed in the following:

- (a) *Appendix P– Lighting Assessment and Electrical Hydraulic Infrastructure prepared by Introba (4 September 2024) (Lighting Assessment Report 2024).*

301. Issues relevant to lighting were addressed in the response to RFI item 31 comprising:

- (a) *Annexure R to the RFI response submitted on 31 January 2025 – Introba Lighting Assessment (31 January 2025) (Lighting Assessment Response 2025).*

What relevant issues were raised in the Draft IAR?

302. The Draft IAR addressed lighting effects in section 8.6. In this section, the Draft IAR identifies potential issues in respect of:

- (a) the lighting assessment being based on a concept design and whether the changes to the roof of the Stadium shown on the revised plans (*Annexure B - Consolidated plans 1 17 February 2025*) will impact light spill;
- (b) the lighting impacts on drivers and adjacent residents from:
- (c) façade lighting, illuminated signs or the lighting of entrances, plazas, practice wickets or the Goods Shed;
- (d) unrestricted operation of the Stadium, including lighting levels required until all patrons have left the site; and
- (e) the lighting impacts to the Hobart Cenotaph's decorative lighting.

What did representations say?

303. Representations expressed concern regarding the impact of light spill on the amenity of surrounding residences and businesses (including tourist accommodation), impact on the Cenotaph, and light impacts on fauna. Representation no. 862 requested a Glare and Reflectivity Impact Assessment.

Outline of Proponent's position

Lighting scheme design

304. The Lighting Assessment Report 2024 has assessed the lighting scheme proposed for the Stadium. The assessment has been undertaken in accordance with the *Australian Standard AS4282 Control of obtrusive effects of outdoor lighting (AS4282)*.
305. The assessment carried out is conservative. The full lighting output has been assessed against environmental zone A4 in AS4282 rather than the applicable TV zone which is the standard applied for major sport and event stadiums during TV broadcasts. Furthermore, the assessment has been based on AS4282-2019, which is more onerous than the current AS4282-2023, which does not set any limits for broadcast level lighting.
306. The Lighting Assessment Report 2024 is an assessment on a 'concept' lighting scheme as the project is not at the detailed design stage. As explained in Lighting Assessment Response 2025, the assessment involved lux modelling of the proposed sports lighting layout using AGI32 software and is therefore not an 'assumption'. As with major infrastructure projects, it is appropriate that the detailed lighting scheme be prepared as part of the detailed design process. The scheme would be required to comply with AS4282.
307. As recognised by the Lighting Assessment Report 2024, potential impacts would be further reduced in various ways, including operating restrictions and lighting controls. These measures would be addressed through the detailed design process and the Events Management Plan required by the conditions proposed by the Proponent.

Façade lighting

308. The detailed design of the Stadium façade and decorative lighting scheme would appropriately occur during the detailed design process. The final scheme would be required to comply with AS4282 to ensure amenity impacts are reasonable. The Proponent's proposed conditions address the detailed lighting design, including the façade design.
309. The recommendations in the Lighting Assessment Report 2024 would be incorporated into the detailed scheme, including dimmable, programmable lighting with a central control panel, shielding mechanisms where necessary and restrictions on lighting operating times.

Lighting curfew

310. AS4282 includes curfew and non-curfew times for lighting. Non-curfew is typically up to 11pm.

- 311. The Lighting Assessment Report 2024 provides that sports lighting would operate at full output during a broadcasted sporting event at night/dusk for the duration of the event and for some time before and after. Lighting at full output may be required during a daytime event (for example, when cloudy).
- 312. For most concerts and other non-broadcasted events, lighting would not be at full output (approximately 10-20% of full output). For maintenance and setup/pack-up, lighting would operate at a dimmed level (10-20% of full output).
- 313. Façade lighting would operate prior to, during and following events.
- 314. As part of the detailed design process, and in conjunction with relevant agencies, curfew restrictions would be set. This is appropriately achieved through a condition of approval.

Hobart Cenotaph

- 315. Section 2.5.2.5 of the Lighting Assessment Report 2024 recognises that the effectiveness of the Hobart Cenotaph's decorative lighting is contingent upon the nearby area being dimly lit.
- 316. Based on the horizontal and vertical lux value calculations of broadcast lighting at the Stadium, the overall light emitted is low. The Hobart Cenotaph is located to the north of the Project Site. The light spill to the immediate north of the Stadium is very low (<1lux) and will reduce with distance. On this basis, the Lighting Assessment Report 2024 concludes that the Hobart Cenotaph's decorative lighting will not be negatively impacted.
- 317. The detailed design will be required to comply with AS4282.

Potential impacts on fauna

- 318. The light spill would not have an unreasonable impact on fauna. The POSS Submission at *Appendix R - Natural Values Assessment prepared by North Barker Ecosystem Services (27 August 2024)* provides that there is no critical habitat for protected threatened species in the vicinity of the Project Site. Further, the Lighting Assessment Report 2024 finds that lighting spill would be minimal in all directions, particularly to the parkland to the north.

Potential impacts on the Port

- 319. The Lighting Assessment Report 2024 demonstrates that the light spill on the Port area is minimal, namely <1 horizontal lux and between 0 and 10 vertical lux at the water edge. This complies with AS4282, noting that the vertical lux standard of 25lux is not mandatory.
- 320. From a navigational perspective, the lighting would be perceptible but the measurable light contribution to the urban coast would be negligible.

Potential impacts on drivers

321. It is acknowledged that lighting glare may affect road safety. The Lighting Assessment Report 2024 concludes that such impacts as a result of the Project are acceptable.
322. Drivers are unlikely to be negatively affected by any direct lighting or glare as traffic is outside the focal point of the sports lighting and the roof and façade will provide shielding. Other appropriate shielding mechanisms would be developed in the detailed design. The vertical light emissions would be less than or comparable to street lighting (that is, <25 lux).
323. A condition of approval would ensure that the final lighting scheme would not negatively impact drivers and traffic safety.

Conditions

324. Draft condition D3 accompanying the Bill require a detailed lighting plan, which amongst other things ensures compliance with the Australian Standard
325. The conditions will be addressed further in response to matters raised in the course of hearing.

I. Other Environmental Effects

I1. Geotechnical

What are the central questions?

326. The central question within the scope of the SPP Act assessment is whether geotechnical conditions at the Project Site are appropriate for the construction of the Project, including having regard to any risk of landslip, ground subsidence and liquefaction, and what controls are appropriate to ensure such risks are avoided and minimised.

How are the questions addressed in application material?

327. The POSS Submission addresses relevant issues in Summary Report at Chapter 10 (Geotechnical Conditions), and in:
- (a) *Appendix II – Geotechnical Factual Report prepared by WSP (19 June 2024)*; and
 - (b) *Appendix X – Macquarie Point Stadium Development: Geotechnical Interpretative Report prepared by WSP (23 July 2024)*.
328. No issues relevant to geotechnical matters were raised in the Commission's RFI.

What relevant issues were raised in the Draft IAR?

329. Geotechnical matters are not addressed in the Draft IAR.

What did representations say?

330. The Environment Protection Authority, in its submission dated 24 October 2024 recommended additional geotechnical survey work be undertaken in the underground car park area to increase certainty regarding the geotechnical characteristics of the Project Site.

331. One representation echoed the EPA's submission, and another representation raised concern regarding the potential cost overruns as a result of geotechnical matters.

Outline of Proponent's position

332. A comprehensive geotechnical investigation has been undertaken to assess ground conditions at the Project Site.

333. This investigation involved a detailed analysis of existing subsurface data and the completion of additional boreholes to provide a thorough understanding of the Project Site's geological characteristics.

334. Data from over 700 boreholes on Project Site is available and has been consolidated into a 3D model.

335. These geotechnical investigations will help inform development across the Project Site, including the Stadium.

Conditions

336. Draft condition B9 accompanying the Bill requires detailed design drawings and associated geotechnical assessments to be submitted to and approved by the relevant regulator. The draft conditions will be addressed further in response to matters raised in the course of hearing.

12. Contamination, remediation and groundwater

What are the central questions?

337. The central questions within the scope of the SPP Act assessment are whether:

- (a) the disturbance, treatment and disposal of contaminated soils and groundwater during construction can be handled appropriately;
- (b) the impacts from disturbance of potential and actual acid sulfate soils can be acceptably managed;

- (c) the excavated material can be appropriately disposed of or reused.

How are the questions addressed in application material?

338. The POSS Submission addresses relevant issues in the Summary Report at Chapters:
- (a) 7.8.7 (Acid Sulfate Soils);
 - (b) 7.9 (Contamination); and
 - (c) 10.4 (Ground Related Risks).
339. Contamination, remediation and groundwater issues are also addressed in the following:
- (a) *Appendix D – Cut and Fill diagrams prepared by WSP (7 August 2024);*
 - (b) *Appendix T – Solid Waste and Hazardous Material Management prepared by Incognitus (August 2024);*
 - (c) *Appendix V – Site Remediation Strategy Update 2024 prepared by AECOM (17 June 2024);*
 - (d) *Appendix AA – Construction Management Plan prepared by Zancon (August 2024) (**Construction Management Plan**);*
 - (e) *Appendix FF – Conceptual Hydrogeological Model and Numerical Model Memo prepared by Hydro Earth Consulting (17 July 2024);*
 - (f) *Appendix KK - Preliminary Results of Acid Sulfate Soil Investigation prepared by AECOM (2 August 2024) (**Preliminary Acid Sulfate Soil Investigation**); and*
 - (g) *Appendix LL – Site Environment Management Plan prepared by AECOM (22 October 2021) (**SEMP**).*
340. Relevant issues were addressed in responses to RFI items 36, 38, 39, 50, 72-74 and in the RFI Material including:
- (a) *Annexure E to the RFI response submitted on 31 January 2025 – Supporting statement in relation to design detail prepared by Zancon (27 January 2025);*
 - (b) *Annexure U to the RFI response submitted on 31 January 2025 – Environmental Auditor Opinion – Remediation Approach prepared by Tetra Tech Coffey (30 January 2025); and*
 - (c) *Annexure B to the RFI submitted on 14 February 2025 – Construction management plan comments – carpark construction and site dewatering management (14 February 2025).*

What relevant issues were raised in the Draft IAR?

341. The Draft IAR addresses site contamination and suitability in section 8.1. In these sections, the Draft IAR identifies potential issues in respect of:
- (a) knowledge of contamination conditions of the Project Site; and
 - (b) management of acid sulfate soils.
342. Groundwater is addressed in section 8.2 of the Draft IAR. In this section, the Draft IAR identifies potential issues in respect of the management of contamination during the construction process, particularly during dewatering required for the basement carpark.
343. Excavated material management is addressed in section 8.4 of the Draft IAR, in this section, the Draft IAR identifies potential issues in respect of:
- (a) the storage, testing, reuse and disposal of excavated material;
 - (b) the volume of excavated material;
 - (c) construction timelines for bulk excavation; and
 - (d) current landfill capacity.

What did representations say?

344. In relation to contamination, remediation and groundwater, representations express concerns in relation to:
- (a) existing soil and groundwater contamination;
 - (b) inadequate information regarding the potential contamination risks;
 - (c) disposal of potentially contaminated fill to landfill.

Outline of Proponent's position

Land contamination

345. The Project Site contains contaminated soil having been used for industrial purposes over many years. Relevantly, identification and remediation of contamination would be necessary before any sensitive redevelopment of the Project Site.
346. As part of the Macquarie Point masterplan process and the development of the Project, numerous contamination investigations have been undertaken. These investigations have informed extensive remediation, which has already been carried out (but which is not referred to in the Draft IAR). Presently:

- (a) physical site remediation is substantially complete, with the site investigations presented in the POSS Submission and RFI Material having been undertaken to support future design and development on site.
- (b) work has been phased and spread across seven distinct areas of the Project Site, allowing for progressive sign-off as remediation occurs and provides an approval that the land is ready for future development to occur and be safely utilised by occupants. Four of these areas are now signed off, with Audit Areas 3 (part), 5 (part) and 6 remediated and waiting for sign off from the Environmental Auditor, which is expected to happen within 2025.
- (c) the only remaining remediation required in addition to these sign offs is the removal of a historic diesel pipeline at a small section of land (Audit Area 4 East), which will be phased in to works as appropriate and a known extent of buried stockpile of asbestos that is also located within Audit Area 4.

347. The Proponent has:

- (a) excavated 85,000 tonnes of contaminated soil;
- (b) removed or beneficially reused 72,000 tonnes of soil;
- (c) removed 2.3 million litres of contaminated groundwater;
- (d) conducted nearly 2,000 soil samples and 175 groundwater wells;
- (e) removed 1,400 spoil samples to confirm soil decontamination; and
- (f) removed nearly one kilometre of ageing oil and diesel pipelines, previously used by industry and the navy.

348. It has not faced any remarkable or unexpected issue in remediation activities or disposal of excavated material.

349. In respect of what contaminated material now remains, the Proponent agrees with the Draft IAR that without appropriate disposal, treatment and management contaminated material presents a risk to human health and the environment.

350. The Draft IAR raises concern that there are knowledge gaps in respect of the location and characteristics of contaminated soil. The Proponent contends that it is appropriate that more detailed land contamination investigations would be undertaken across detailed design and prior to major construction work. The detailed investigations would inform the CEMP in respect of the requirements for the treatment, management and disposal of contaminated material. Furthermore, conditions on any approval would set out a process for dealing with any encounter with unexpected contamination.

Acid sulfate soils

351. The results of the Preliminary Acid Sulfate Soil Investigations identified no actual acid sulfate soil and some potential acid sulfate soil in the fill and natural estuarine material within the central and eastern parts of the Project Site. The results also indicate that the fill material above the water table is likely to have sufficient natural Acid Neutralising Capacity (**ANC**) to prevent acidification during and after construction. The deeper estuarine soil may require additional management procedures to prevent acidification. This is a matter that can appropriately be managed via a condition of approval.
352. The Preliminary Acid Sulfate Soil Investigations provides that mitigation measures for potential acid sulfate soil identified include:⁵⁷

'Assessing if the underground car park or pile installation will expose PASS to oxygen (above the water table) and excavation of any potentially exposed PASS if so. Excavated PASS may require ex situ treatment such as liming or other measures to prevent potential acidification when exposed to air.'

'Consideration of protective measures for materials which will be in contact with PASS, noting that the saline conditions of groundwater at the Site are likely to require similar protective measures in any event.'

353. The management of potential acid sulfate soil through an acid sulfate soil management plan secured through a condition of approval is appropriate.

Groundwater

354. Groundwater investigations have identified areas of contaminated groundwater, including Light Non-Aqueous Phase Liquid (**LNAPL**) and Dense Non-Aqueous Phase Liquid (**DNAPL**) plumes below the Stadium building footprint. The LNAPL is from historical fuel storage on the Project Site and the DNAPL is from historic gasworks activities.
355. The SEMP explains that AECOM carried out a detailed assessment of LNAPL as part of the masterplan process in *Assessment of LNAPL Remediation End-Points 2020*. This assessment concluded that the LNAPL plumes are sufficiently stable and that future recovery of LNAPL is impracticable. It is noted that the development plan for the Project Site at that time did not include the same depth of subsurface constructions as is now proposed.
356. Given the groundwater depth ranges from 1 to 6 metres below ground level across the Project Site, there is potential for the subsurface construction to encounter groundwater. The basement carpark is proposed below groundwater and within 1m of a known

⁵⁷ Appendix KK of the POSS Submission - Preliminary Results of Acid Sulfate Soil Investigation prepared by AECOM (2 August 2024), p 3.

contamination plume. Potential risks to human health and the environment from interaction with or migration of the contaminated groundwater must be appropriately managed, as may be expected in accordance with the requirements of proposed condition 4 and its requirements for the CEMP.

357. Consistent with the recommendations in the SEMP and standard practice for major projects, a detailed assessment of groundwater contamination would be required as part of the detailed design process to inform the final design of the Stadium and constructional and operational requirements. This detailed assessment would specify any further remediation if required.
358. In respect of the suggestion in the Draft IAR that safety and construction issues may arise from groundwater management issues (particularly in respect of the development of the underground car park), it is noted that these matters are properly accounted for in the material and consistent with the construction of a pumpstation immediately adjacent to the site and four metres lower than the lowest point of the car park design.

Excavated material

359. The Construction Management Plan provides that excavated materials will be stockpiled on-site while the material is tested. The materials will then be re-used or disposed of based on the classification of the material.
360. The Draft IAR states that different volumes of excavated material are identified in the POSS Submissions and RFI response material.⁵⁸ This is incorrect. The CMP estimates that 180,000 tonnes of material would be removed from the Project Site to allow for the construction of the Stadium itself, while Annexure B of the material submitted on 14 February 2025 provides an additional estimate of 115,000 tonnes for the underground car park (for a total estimate for of 295,000 tonnes of excavated materials).
361. The total volume of excavated material will depend on the final design of the Project. A precise figure cannot be stated at this point in the assessment and approvals process. As is the approach for major infrastructure projects an estimate of the total volume of excavated material is provided, along with principles for how the material is to be dealt with at the assessment stage. Actual volumes of material excavated would depend on the final design. The CEMP and the SEMP required by proposed conditions would address the storage, testing, re-use and disposal of the material.
362. If the excavated material cannot be stored and tested on-site, the final CEMP and SEMP will provide a tailored solution for the storage and disposal of the material.

⁵⁸ Draft IAR, p 110 [8.4(b)].

363. It is a matter for the Proponent to dispose of excavated materials in accordance with the EPA's standards. It is for this reason that the capacity of landfill facilities is not critical to the assessment of the Project.
364. The Draft IAR identifies inconsistent estimated construction timelines for the bulk excavation stage. The Construction Management Plan indicates 8-10 months for site remediation and bulk excavation, *Annexure B to the RFI submitted on 14 February 2025 – Construction management plan comments – carpark construction and site dewatering management (14 February 2025)* indicates 7.5 months for the bulk excavation for the underground car park and the Noise Supplementary Report indicates 0-3 months for bulk excavation. It may be noted that:
- (a) timelines identified in documents are not in fact inconsistent, but instead are either broad and indicative, or relevant to the type of activities which are the direct subject of relevant documents;
 - (b) it is reasonable for timeframes to be indicative where the final CEMP would provide an updated estimate based on the final design and acknowledge contingencies in development timelines for a major project.

Conditions

365. The draft conditions accompanying the Bill require:
- (a) the CEMP to include management plans in respect of, amongst other things, soil management, water quality and management and acid sulphate soils;⁵⁹ and
 - (b) the detailed engineering plans which include water quality and water management requirements.⁶⁰
366. Conditions will be addressed further in response to matters raised in the course of hearing.

I3. Stormwater management

What are the central questions?

367. The central questions within the scope of the SPP Act assessment are:
- (a) the design and implementation of rainwater capture and reuse from the Stadium roof to meet appropriate discharge objectives;
 - (b) the design and implementation of bioretention systems as part of the proposed stormwater management system.

⁵⁹ Draft conditions CN2.

⁶⁰ Draft conditions SW8 and SW9.

How are the questions addressed in application material?

368. The POSS Submission addresses the relevant issues in the Summary Report at Chapter 7.5, and in:
- (a) *Appendix S – Stormwater Management Plan prepared by BMT (26 August 2024) (SWMP)*; and
 - (b) *Appendix BB – Services Report: Macquarie Point Infrastructure Strategy prepared by JMG (21 August 2024).*
369. Issues relevant to stormwater were addressed in responses to RFI items 37 and 72 and in the RFI Material, including:
- (a) *Annexure T – BMT Stormwater Management Request for Information Response (31 January 2025) (Stormwater RFI).*

What relevant issues were raised in the Draft IAR?

370. Stormwater is addressed in section 8.3 of the Draft IAR. In this section, the Draft IAR identifies potential issues in respect of:
- (a) the design and implementation of rainwater capture and reuse from the Stadium roof to meet discharge objectives;⁶¹
 - (b) the design and implementation of bioretention systems as part of the proposed stormwater management system;⁶²
 - (c) the capacity and capability of sediment ponds adjacent to excavations to manage groundwater dewatering demands.⁶³

What did representations say?

371. TasWater (representation no. 260) states that the issues it raised in its submission dated 7 October 2024 have been addressed and notes the sewer diversion design is progressing. TasWater's outstanding concern relates to its request for additional information relating to the historical capacity of the land so that it can condition appropriate developer charges.

⁶¹ This includes, the options to reduce contaminant loads off large roof areas, with the exception of capture and re-use (section 8.3 (i)), any capture and reuse of stormwater from the stadium roof in the stadium building design (section 8.3(k)), the cost and challenge of including inclusion the capture and reuse of stormwater from the stadium roof in the current stadium design (section 8.3(l));

⁶² This includes, the Proponent's proposed management of stormwater via bio-retention systems connected to the stormwater system ability to achieve the discharge targets when the stormwater from the roof is included (section 8.3(h)), the space within the site to accommodate the amount of area that would be required for the bio-retention system (section 8.3(j)),

⁶³ See section 8.3(n) of the Draft IAR.

372. Other representations expressed concern about potential overloading of the stormwater system and the potential flooding impacts, and the Project not achieving water quality targets and the potential impacts on marine ecology. Others agreed with the stormwater related comments in the Draft IAR.
373. Some representations expressed a desire for stormwater to be sustainably and appropriately reused.

Outline of Proponent's position

Stormwater Management Targets

374. Clause 31.3 of the *State Policy on Water Quality Management* (1997) allows the Board of the Tasmanian Environment Protection Authority (**EPA**) to develop best practice guidelines for stormwater management. These guidelines are contained in the *State Stormwater Strategy 2010*, which sets the following stormwater management discharge objectives:

'80% reduction in average annual load of Total Suspended Solids

45% reduction in average annual load of Total Phosphorus

45% reduction in average annual load of Total Nitrogen

90% reduction in average annual load of litter/gross pollutants (non-statutory)'

375. The *State Stormwater Strategy 2010* recognises that there may be alternative objectives that meet the Water Quality Objectives set out in the *State Policy on Water Quality Management 1997*.
376. The stormwater quality modelling using a Model for Urban Stormwater Improvement Conceptualisation (**MUSIC**) shows that stormwater management controls proposed in the POSS Submission meet the objectives for total phosphorus and total gross pollutants but not the other objectives.
377. Section 5.4 of the SWMP and the Stormwater RFI acknowledge that for all discharge objectives to be met, some or all of the Stadium roof runoff would require treatment. The Stormwater RFI explains that there are different means of achieving the objectives through design and operational measures. For example, stormwater could be temporarily stored and passed through additional bio-retention systems prior to discharge or roof runoff could be collected in larger storage tanks (larger than currently assumed in the SWMP) and reused internally. However, the cost of these measures must be weighed against the benefit achieved in circumstances where the discharge objectives are partially met.

378. The SWMP provides that the collection and reuse of runoff from the Stadium roof will assist in meeting the Stormwater Management Objectives but explains that the final design cannot be determined at this stage. At section 5.4.2, the SWMP states:

'The ability to effectively integrate rainwater collection and reuse systems (for Site buildings and potentially the stadium roof) cannot be determined at this early design phase of the Site. It is a recommendation of this assessment that so far as practicable rainwater collection and reuse does occur to assist in meeting Discharge Objectives for water quality, as well as offsetting potable water demands from regional supplies. Achievement of these criteria should further the Green Star credentials of the proposed development.'

'This has been excluded from assessment at this time, however, it is noted that collection and reuse of rainwater from stadium roofs is relatively common practice, and several stadiums across Australia, e.g. Bankwest Stadium, Marvel Stadium, Stadium Australia, People First Stadium (also known as Carrara Stadium) utilise rainwater collection and reuse systems. These stadiums appear to have generally larger collection tanks ranging from several hundred thousand litres to a couple of megalitres. Reuse types include toilet flushing, and or field irrigation for example.'

379. It is appropriate that further stormwater modelling would occur throughout the design process to ensure that the final design meets the stormwater management targets where possible. This is achieved through the condition 3.1 of the Proponent's draft conditions.

Capture and reuse of Stadium roof runoff

380. The Draft IAR is critical that the Project does not incorporate any capacity and reuse of stormwater from the roof.
381. The SWMP recommends collection and reuse of runoff from the Stadium roof, noting that this would assist in satisfying the Stormwater Management Objectives. However, the SWMP explains that the final design cannot be determined at this stage of the design process. At section 5.4.2, the SWMP states:

'The ability to effectively integrate rainwater collection and reuse systems (for Site buildings and potentially the stadium roof) cannot be determined at this early design phase of the Site. It is a recommendation of this assessment that so far as practicable rainwater collection and reuse does occur to assist in meeting Discharge Objectives for water quality, as well as offsetting potable water demands from regional supplies. Achievement of these criteria should further the Green Star credentials of the proposed development.'

'This has been excluded from assessment at this time, however, it is noted that collection and reuse of rainwater from stadium roofs is relatively common practice, and several stadiums across Australia, e.g. Bankwest Stadium, Marvel Stadium, Stadium Australia, People First Stadium (also known as Carrara Stadium) utilise rainwater collection and reuse systems. These stadiums appear to have generally larger collection tanks ranging from several hundred thousand litres to a couple of megalitres. Reuse types include toilet flushing, and or field irrigation for example.'

382. As set out above, it is appropriate that the final stormwater management plan be resolved through the detailed design process, which is required as a condition of approval.

Bio-retention systems

383. The Draft IAR contends that there is *'no evidence there is sufficient space within the site to accommodate the amount of area that would be required for the bio-retention system.'*⁶⁴
384. Section 6.2 of the SWMP recommends that elements of the proposed stormwater system be embedded into the design requirements for surfaces (e.g. concourse areas, roads and accessways, pedestrian and open space area, etc) outside of the Stadium building. The SWMP explains that bio-retention systems may be configured in a manner of different shapes and sizes, including being integrated into landscaping. It is appropriate the design of these systems occur as part of the detailed design process and be required through a condition of approval.

Existing drainage infrastructure

385. The Draft IAR raises concern that the capacity of existing stormwater systems to dispose of stormwater from the Project Site has not been validated. The validation of capacity of existing stormwater infrastructure occurs as part of the detailed design stage. If capacity is insufficient, the final stormwater management plan would require upgrades to be implemented.

Capacity of proposed stormwater treatment ponds for construction

386. It is proposed to use sediment ponds for the collection and treatment of stormwater during the construction process. These ponds are also proposed for storage of groundwater dewatering. The Draft IAR queried whether the ponds would have sufficient capacity to meet the requirements for both the construction runoff and groundwater dewatering.

⁶⁴ SWMP, p 26.

387. Similarly to the representation above, the capacity of the stormwater treatment ponds for construction is a matter that is appropriately dealt with through the detailed design process.

Conditions

388. The draft conditions accompanying the Bill require that prior to the commencement of the development for the Project the following must be approved by the Hobart City Council:
- (a) detailed engineering drawings for stormwater infrastructure;⁶⁵
 - (b) stormwater management plans and designs that includes a water quality and water management plan to prevent and manage on-site and surrounding water quality and stormwater drainage impacts.⁶⁶
389. The draft conditions also require stormwater connections from the Project Site to be provided or upgraded as necessary before occupancy or commencement of use or dealing of the final plan (whichever occurs first).⁶⁷
390. Developer charges raised by TasWater are appropriately secured via condition.
391. The draft conditions will be addressed further in response to matters raised in the course of hearing.

14. Flooding and coastal inundation

What are the central questions?

392. The central questions within scope of the SPP Act assessment are whether:
- (a) the runoff from the Stadium roof would exceed the available capacity of stormwater systems during certain flooding events (1% Annual Exceedance Probability); and
 - (b) the Project will contribute to flooding on adjacent land.

How are the questions addressed in application material?

393. The POSS Submission addresses relevant issues in the Summary Report at Chapter 7.8, and in:
- (a) *Appendix U – Macquarie Point Coastal Inundation Assessment prepared by BMT (23 August 2024)*; and

⁶⁵ Draft condition B8 and Schedule 7.

⁶⁶ Draft condition SW8 and SW9.

⁶⁷ Draft condition SW9.

- (b) *Appendix W – Overland Flood Assessment prepared by BMT (23 August 2024)*
(Overland Flood Assessment).

394. No issues relevant to flooding or coastal inundation were raised by the Commission in the Request for Information dated 19 November 2024.

What relevant issues were raised in the Draft IAR?

395. Flooding issues are raised in section 8.3 of the Draft IAR. In this section, the Draft IAR identifies potential issues in respect of:

- (a) the capacity of the proposed stormwater infrastructure to cater for excess water during flood events (1% Annual Exceedance Probability);⁶⁸ and
- (b) the capacity of overland flow paths to manage stormwater during flooding events, particularly in the vicinity of the Project Site.⁶⁹

What did representations say?

396. Representations raised potential flooding impacts caused by the Project, including the safety of patrons of the stadium and surrounding residents and businesses.

Outline of Proponent's position

397. Matters relevant to stormwater management, as relevant to flooding, are addressed in section I3 above.

Overland flow and flooding of adjacent areas

398. The SWMP proposes to design overland flow paths to capture excess water during 1% Annual Exceedance Probability flood events.

399. The Draft IAR raises concern that this design solution will intensify flooding in vicinity of the Project Site, including at the intersection of Davey Street with Hunter and Campbell Streets.

400. The Overland Flood Assessment demonstrates that the Project Site is free from inundation during 1% and 5% Annual Exceedance Probability (**AEP**) flood events with and without climate change projections. The modelling also indicates that:

- (a) during 1% and 5% AEP flood events with climate change projections, Davey and Hunter Streets are inundated to modelled depths of less than 0.24m;

⁶⁸ See section 8.3(e) of the Draft IAR.

⁶⁹ See section 8.3(f) of the Draft IAR.

- (b) during a 1% AEP flood event, the corner of Davey and Campbell Streets is subject to moderate peak flood depth and peak velocities exceeding 5 m/s before the flow enters the marina; and
 - (c) inundation of Davey Street results from flow originating from the constructed underground channel of Hobart Rivulet surcharging at Collins Street, at the Royal Hobart Hospital, along with upstream flow surcharging at Liverpool and Barrack Street.
401. Noting that there would be limited warning time available prior to a flood event, the Overland Flood Assessment states that there are potential evacuation routes from the Project Site that avoid the flood affected areas or alternatively patrons may shelter in place.
402. As explained in Representation 3, since the POSS Submission and RFI material, further modelling has been undertaken which shows areas immediately surrounding the stadium are safe for emergency egress, if required. Further, it is noted that the Hobart Rivulet has a very short surcharge event.
403. Emergency response measures are appropriately dealt with in the OEMP and the EMP required by the conditions proposed by the Proponent.

Conditions

404. The draft conditions accompanying the Bill require that prior to the commencement of the development for the Project the following must be approved by the Hobart City Council:
- (a) detailed engineering drawings for stormwater infrastructure;⁷⁰
 - (b) stormwater management plans and designsthat includes a water quality and water management plan to prevent and manage on-site and surrounding water quality and stormwater drainage impacts.⁷¹
405. The draft conditions also require stormwater connections from the Project Site to be provided or upgraded as necessary before occupancy or commencement of use or dealing of the final plan (whichever occurs first) .⁷²
406. The draft conditions will be addressed further in response to matters raised in the course of hearing.

I5. Wind effects

⁷⁰ Draft condition B8 and Schedule 7.

⁷¹ Draft condition SW8 and SW9.

⁷² Draft condition SW9.

What are the central questions?

407. The central questions within the scope of the SPP Act assessment are:
- (a) how the Project has been designed to ensure the impacts of wind on the safety and comfort of people using public spaces are acceptable;
 - (b) whether there are any mitigation measures suitable to minimise or manage wind effects.

How are the questions addressed in application material?

408. The POSS Submission addressed wind-related matters in Summary Report Chapter 7.1 (Wind) and in:
- (a) *Appendix O of the POSS Submission - Wind Comfort Assessment for Visitors and the Precinct Area dated 21 August 2024 prepared by Wackner Ingenieure (Wind Comfort Assessment Report).*
409. Issues relevant to wind were addressed in responses to RFI item 29, and in the RFI Material including:
- (a) *Annexure C to the RFI response submitted on 4 March 2025 – AECOM Australia response on Wind (4 March 2025) (AECOM Wind Memo).*

What relevant issues were raised in the Draft IAR?

410. Wind effects are addressed in Section 7.1 (Wind effects) and Section 6.1 (Temporal use and activation) of the Draft IAR. In these sections, the Draft IAR identifies potential issues in respect of:
- (a) pedestrian comfort levels for sitting and strolling outside the Stadium at the Aboriginal Culturally Informed Zone, southern plaza, and bus plaza; and
 - (b) appropriateness of the proposed mitigation measures; and
 - (c) nature of the assessment reports provided.
411. The Draft IAR makes no reference to the draft conditions which require development plans which incorporate the recommendations of a wind assessment undertaken during the detailed design phase to be approved by the relevant Minister prior the commencement of development

What did representations say?

412. In summary, the representations make the following points in relation to wind:
- (a) the wind impacts will result in uncomfortable spaces around the stadium;
 - (b) the Project will intensify wind issues in Hobart;
 - (c) mitigation of wind impacts should not be at the expense of functional spaces around the stadium.

Outline of Proponent's position

413. The Project Site is exposed to wind by virtue of its location. The Project has been designed so that wind will not adversely affect persons within or around the Stadium.
414. The Wind Comfort Assessment Report and the AECOM Wind Memo assessed the wind effects within and around the stadium based on an analysis of the regional wind climate and a wind tunnel study, which involves assessing wind velocity changes as a result of the stadium.
415. The AECOM Wind Memo assessed wind effects within and around the stadium using the wind comfort and safety criteria. The criteria measure the impact of wind on people in outdoor areas, based on the intended use of those spaces—such as walking through, strolling, or sitting. Comfort is measured on a five-point scale, with Class 1 indicating the highest level of comfort and Class 5 the lowest. Safety criteria address stronger wind conditions, including gusts exceeding 60–70 km/h, which may pose risks to pedestrian stability and safety.
416. AECOM Wind Memo in summary concludes that:
- (a) inside the Stadium, the highest wind comfort class is achieved at all measuring points within the lower and upper tiers;
 - (b) the northeastern edge of the Level 1 concourse may occasionally be subject to a wind comfort class 2, which is suitable for waiting areas and parks;
 - (c) outside the Stadium, the wind comfort criteria class ranges between 2 to 4 in summer and winter. According to the Wind Comfort Criteria Matrix, wind comfort class 3 is suitable for shopping and entrance areas and wind comfort class 4 for is suitable for use for sidewalks; and
 - (d) the comfort level of the areas outside the Stadium can be improved through appropriate landscaping and shelter elements.

417. The model shows that there is no wind safety concern. The wind comfort is good within the Stadium and, outside the Stadium, the wind comfort level is improved or no worse than the level currently experienced at the Project Site. Furthermore, the comfort level may be improved at areas outside the Stadium, through landscaping and shelter elements. These are matters of detailed design which are appropriately dealt with through a condition of approval. The detailed design process will ensure that the outside spaces are designed to minimise wind impacts at the same time as being functional and places for gathering and connection. Conditions of approval will also require final design testing.

Conditions

418. The draft conditions under the Bill require the submission of detailed development plans which have been informed by the recommendations of the wind assessments.
419. The draft conditions are will be addressed further in response to matters raised in the course of hearing.

16. Natural Values and Climate Change

What are the central questions?

420. The central questions within the scope of the SPP Act assessment are:
- (a) whether the impacts (if any) on flora and fauna are acceptable; and
 - (b) whether climate related risks can be acceptably managed.

How are the questions addressed in application material?

421. The POSS Submission addressed the relevant questions in the Summary Report at Chapters 7.6 (Flora and Fauna) and 7.10 (Climate Change), and in:
- (a) *Appendix R – Natural Values Assessment prepared by North Barker Ecosystem Services (27 August 2024) (Natural Values Assessment)*; and
422. *Appendix Y – Heat Risk and Climate Change Assessment prepared by BMT (31 May 2024).*

What relevant issues were raised in the Draft IAR?

423. The Draft IAR comments on natural values and biodiversity in the context of Project Design and stormwater issues:
- (a) at 3.3(d), the Draft IAR in summary states that the Stadium's building footprint means that there is little scope to establish soft landscaping to support biodiversity; and

- (b) at 8.3(m), the Draft IAR comments that if stormwater discharge targets are not met, there may be an increased risk to impacts on marine ecology of Timtumili Minanya/ Derwent River.

424. The Draft IAR does not identify any issues, or make any comments, relating to climate change.

What did representations say?

425. Relevant to natural values and climate change, the following matters were raised in representations:

- (a) impacts on flora and fauna, including potential impact on marine ecology from stormwater runoff;
- (b) sea level rise risks;
- (c) carbon footprint of stadium and operation.

Outline of Proponent's position

Design response

426. The Project has been designed to provide meaningful opportunities for soft landscaping in an urban context. The detailed landscape design phase would involve species selection to encourage improved biodiversity outcomes.
427. The detailed landscape design appropriately occurs post approval and prior to construction. The Proponent's draft conditions require a detailed landscape design as part of the UDLPs. The landscaping will be maintained via a condition of approval.

Impact on flora and fauna

428. The Draft IAR and some representations raise concerns of the possible risk of stormwater related impacts on the marine ecology of Timtumili Minanya/ Derwent River if the stormwater management objectives (addressed above) are not met.⁷³
429. Through the Natural Values Atlas and EPBC Protected Matters Search Tool, the Natural Values Assessment identified one threatened marine ecological community and 21 threatened marine species as possibly occurring in the area or known to occur in the area. The Natural Values Assessment recommends that measures to control contaminated stormwater runoff be implemented where water construction is proposed. In the event contaminated stormwater runoff is likely to occur, additional surveys would be required.

⁷³ See section 8.3(m) of the Draft IAR.

No water construction is proposed, and a stormwater management plan is proposed as a condition which will manage stormwater runoff.

430. Other impacts are addressed in other sections of this submission.

Sea level rise risks

431. Sea-level rise and the potential coastal hazards have been considered as part of the design of the Project. An assessment has been undertaken to develop a better understanding of the exposure of the Site to coastal inundation under current and future climate scenarios ss set out in Appendix U – Coastal Inundation Assessment of the POSS Submission.
432. The modelling demonstrates that the Site is not at risk of coastal inundation from a 1% Annual Exceedance Probability (AEP) storm event, including in climate change projections up to the year 2120. The Site boundary is at or above 3.0 m AHD in both current and proposed future levels which is above the 1% AEP storm surge level of 2.2 m AHD. The Site is therefore well protected from wave overtopping by surrounding infrastructure and buildings.

Carbon footprint of stadium and operation

433. The stadium is designed with upfront carbon reduction in mind. Recycled and low-carbon materials will be used in paths, concourses, and roadways wherever possible to minimise construction emissions. The roof structure has been designed to protect the playing surface to reduce the need for turf replacement.
434. Operationally, the stadium will be energy-efficient. It will be supported by a centralised heating and cooling plant that serves the broader Macquarie Point precinct—reducing equipment redundancy and improving energy efficiency. A photovoltaic array on the western grandstand roof will contribute renewable energy to the precinct-wide network, and the stadium aspires to be powered entirely by renewable sources. Energy-efficient LED sports lighting will also be installed to further reduce operational carbon emissions.

Conditions

435. The proposed conditions are discussed above, and will be addressed further in response to matters raised in the course of hearing.

J. Construction

What are the central questions?

436. The central questions in respect of construction of the Project are:

- (a) what effects may arise during the construction phase, across the range of issues within scope of the integrated assessment;
- (b) how those effects are appropriately managed.

How are the questions addressed in application material?

437. The POSS Submission addressed the relevant questions in Summary Report section O.4.2 (Construction timeframes), as well as Chapters 7 (in respect of environmental effects) and 10 (geotechnical), and in:

- (a) *Appendix D – Cut and Fill diagrams prepared by WSP (7 August 2024);*
- (b) *Appendix AA – Construction Management Plan prepared by Zancon (August 2024) (Construction Management Plan);*
- (c) *Appendix BB – Services Report: Macquarie Point Infrastructure Strategy prepared by JMG (21 August 2024);*
- (d) *Appendix II – Geotechnical Factual Report prepared by WSP (19 June 2024*
- (e) *Appendix LL – Site Environment Management Plan prepared by AECOM (22 October 2021) (SEMP).*

438. Relevant issues were addressed in responses to RFI items 39 and in RFI Material including:

- (a) *Annexure C – Macquarie Point Multipurpose Stadium -Project of State Significance (PoSS) Submission: BM Plus G Supporting Statement Detailed Design Stage Plans prepared by David Blackett (29 January 2025);*
- (b) *Annexure D - Jensen Hughes supporting statement concept design prepared by Tamara Blyth (31 January 2025);*
- (c) *Annexure E - Zancon supporting statement detailed design stage plans prepared by Adam Zantis (28 January 2025); and*
- (d) *Annexure X – Schlaich Bergermann Partner statement regarding the roof structure prepared by Knutt Goeppert (20 December 2024).*

What relevant issues were raised in the Draft IAR?

439. The Draft IAR identifies effects during construction as relevant to various issues including noise and traffic/transport.
440. Section 9.0 of the Draft IAR addresses “Construction program and sequencing”, including:
- (a) identifying as an issue the need to consider the relationships between construction activities associated with the Project and with other projects (whether related or not);
 - (b) asserting that:
 - (i) because application material does not provide any construction program encompassing all components of the Commission's conceptualisation of the project (i.e., to include all uses and developments identified by the Commission but which do not form part of the Project and which are therefore not addressed in application material); and
 - (ii) because application material does not provide a certain construction program for the Project (and by reference to indicative construction timelines said to be ‘inconsistent’ across various documents),while the Commission “has some awareness of issues and relationships associated with design and delivery of elements of the project and other construction projects in the area, it does not have information that enables it to discuss or make findings on these issues”; and
 - (c) noting that “the uncertainty of the construction program and staging poses significant time and cost risks to the delivery of the Project”.
441. The Draft IAR does not refer to the proposed requirement for a CEMP.

What did representations say?

442. Representations raise a range of concerns regarding construction impacts and management of the Project. Key issues expressed lack of detail in the construction program, particularly around staging, traffic management, and mitigation of noise and vibration impacts on sensitive nearby uses such as the Federation Concert Hall, Tasmanian Symphony Orchestra facilities, heritage buildings and permanent and temporary accommodation uses.
443. Several representations highlight impact on car parking availability and vehicle access and congestion during construction, especially at key access points like Evans Street and the Dunn Street car park, and contend there is not a comprehensive strategy to manage construction-related disruptions.

444. Some representations raised about the adequacy of the Construction Environmental Management Plan (**CEMP**), particularly in relation to contaminated land, groundwater risks, and the need for enforceable permit conditions to ensure impacts are properly managed.

Outline of Proponent's position

Environmental effects during construction

445. All major projects give rise to environmental effects during construction. The Project is no different. Notwithstanding their temporary nature, potential effects require careful consideration to ensure appropriate management.
446. This would be the case in respect of any development of the broader Precinct, whatever form it took. However, in contrast to potential development scenarios which might involve any number of discrete, smaller-scale projects and developers, the singular nature of the Project and the process of its integrated assessment mean there is an opportunity to ensure construction related effects are managed in an integrated fashion.
447. It is proposed that construction of the Project be managed in accordance with a CEMP, as one piece of the broader environmental management framework established by conditions as proposed, consistent with best practice for major projects.
448. Specific impacts, such as noise during the construction phase, are addressed in preceding sections of this document. Where recommendations arise in various technical disciplines (for example, the identified benefit of a construction noise management plan), they are reflected and can be expected to be implemented through the preparation of the CEMP.

Relationship with other activity

449. It is appropriate that regard is had to other construction activity in the vicinity of the Project at the time the CEMP is prepared, in the interests of both managing cumulative or interrelated effects and (as relevant to the delivery of the Project, rather than issues within scope of the integrated assessment per se) to achieve efficiencies in Project construction management.
450. Draft conditions C1-C5 and the EPA conditions in Schedule 5 of the draft project permit under the Bill require the preparation and implementation of a CEMP, to the satisfaction of the Minister, which must address a range of specific matters and contain sub-plans relevant to noise and vibration, air quality, soil management, water quality and water management, pedestrian and traffic management, acid sulphate soil management, historical heritage and Aboriginal cultural heritage.

451. Amongst other things, this is a purpose for draft conditions include a requirement for consultation protocol with affected stakeholders for the Construction Traffic Management Plan and a communication plan including direct stakeholder and public notification.
452. Potential cumulative effects of construction activities in the broader area are addressed in document relevant to specific species of impact.

Construction program and staging

453. At the highest level, it is anticipated that construction would occur over up to 42 months, with timelines involving commencement of construction in late 2025 (subject to approvals and contracting), and operation in mid-2029. Activities during that indicative period, and indicative schedules for them, are provided in application material including the CMP.
454. All timeframes presented in application material are indicative, as they must be at the present stage of Project development and design. It would be unusual, if not unprecedented, for a project's construction program to be fixed prior to the grant of necessary approvals, or for a project to be assessed on the basis of a certain, fixed construction program.
455. The Draft IAR proposition of 'inconsistency' in presented materials is addressed at paragraph 364 above.
456. Risks of the type identified in paragraph (j) of section 9.0 of the Draft IAR exist in the context of any major project. As with all such projects, the Project will need a construction program, and appropriate contractual management. The risks to be managed through those processes are not relevant to issues within the scope of the integrated assessment under the SPP Act.

Conditions

457. The conditions will be addressed further in response to matters raised in the course of hearing.

V INTEGRATED ASSESSMENT

458. This Part addresses the integrated assessment of the Project, including the consideration of all of the matters within scope as addressed above and in the POSS Submission and RFI Material.
459. As set out above, the benefits and impacts of the Project must be considered in the context of existing, explicit strategic support for the redevelopment of Macquarie Point, which expects substantial changes to development and land use.
460. Those matters evidence the merits of the Project and its proposed design in that context, as developed through the consultation and processes detailed in the POSS Submission and RFI Material. The POSS Submission and RFI Material, together with further material and evidence to be produced, and the range of matters which would be addressed in other Representations and otherwise in hearing, show how the range of potential effects of the Projects can be properly managed in accordance with conditions.

A. The Project should proceed

461. The environmental, social, economic and community issues relevant to the Project include:
- (a) material benefits to the State, and the community of Hobart and Tasmania, in social, economic, and community terms;
 - (b) environmental and other effects inherent in the construction of a stadium and associated developments, which are both manageable, and consistent with established strategic expectations for change at Macquarie Point.
462. An integrated assessment of environmental, social, economic and community issues relevant to the Project leads to the conclusion that:
- (a) it is a Project worthy of approval, and should proceed on conditions; and
 - (b) appropriate conditions have been formulated to ensure potential effects are avoided and managed.

B. Conditions

463. Appropriate conditions are addressed in Part IV above.
464. Having regard to the task under section 26(2) of the SPP Act, the Proponent relies on the draft conditions accompanying the Bill which set out:

- (a) appropriate conditions to manage the construction and operation of the Project;
- (b) the agency responsible for the enforcement of each condition.

465. The conditions will be addressed further in response to matters raised in the course of hearing.

APPENDIX A - ABBREVIATIONS

Term	Definition
1991 Review	<i>Sullivans Cove Planning Review 1991</i>
Additional Transport Comments	Annexure P - WSP transport and movement matters 31 January 2025
AECOM Wind Memo	Annexure C to the RFI response submitted on 4 March 2025 – AECOM Australia response on Wind
AH Act	Aboriginal Heritage Act 1975 (Tas)
ANC	Acid Neutralising Capacity
AS4282	Australian Standard AS4282 Control of obtrusive effects of outdoor lighting
ASS	Acid Sulfate Soils
Burra Charter	Australia ICOMOS Burra Charter 2013
CBA	cost benefit analysis
CEMP	Construction Environmental Management Plan
Commission	Tasmanian Planning Commission
Construction Management Plan	Appendix AA – Construction Management Plan prepared by Zancon (August 2024)
Cultural and Landscape Values Assessment Report	Appendix HH - Pre-Stadium Cultural and Landscape Values Assessment - Southern Archaeological
DNAPL	Dense Non-Aqueous Phase Liquid
Draft AHAR	Annexure O – Draft Southern Archaeology Aboriginal Heritage Assessment Report 30 January 2025
Draft IAR	the Commission's Draft Integrated Assessment Report
DSG	Department of State Growth
EMIR Report	Appendix CC - Emergency Management and Incident Response report (Intelligent Risks, August 2024)
EMP	Environmental Management Plan
EPA	Board of the Tasmanian Environment Protection Authority
HAA	Appendix M – Historical Archaeological Assessment Sensitivity Report and Method Statement - Alan Hay 20 August 2024
HIA	Appendix L - Historic Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment - Purcell and GJM Heritage August 2024
Legislative Process	the draft <i>Macquarie Point Planning Permit Bill 2025</i> process separate to the PoSS process
Lighting Assessment Report 2024	Appendix P– Lighting Assessment and Electrical Hydraulic Infrastructure prepared by Introba (4 September 2024)
Lighting Assessment Response 2025	Annexure R to the RFI response submitted on 31 January 2025 – Introba Lighting Assessment
LNAPL	Light Non-Aqueous Phase Liquid
LUPA Act	<i>Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993</i> (Tas)
LVIA Guidelines	<i>Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment</i> , Landscape Institute and Institute for Environmental Management and Assessment (UK) (3 rd ed., 2013)
Mac Point Precinct Plan or Precinct Plan	<i>Mac Point Precinct Plan</i> (Macquarie Point Development Corporation, August 2024)
Ministerial direction	Ministerial Direction to the Tasmanian Planning Commission in relation to the Macquarie Point Stadium and Entertainment project dated 16 October 2023
MPDC Act	<i>Macquarie Point Development Corporation Act 2012</i> (Tas)
MUSIC	Model for Urban Stormwater Improvement Conceptualisation
Natural Values Assessment	Appendix R – Natural Values Assessment prepared by North Barker Ecosystem Services (27 August 2024)

Noise EPP	Environment Protection Policy (Noise) 2009
Noise Supplementary Report	Annexure Q to the RFI response submitted on 31 January 2025 – Noise Assessment Supplementary Report prepared by AECOM
Northern Access Road	northern access road identified in the Mac Point Precinct Plan which will provide access to the Port of Hobart and otherwise to the Macquarie Point precinct
NVA	Appendix Q– Noise and Vibration Assessment prepared by AECOM (21 August 2024)
Order	Order from the Governor declaring the Project is a project of State Significant under the SPP Act dated 16 October 2023
Overland Flood Assessment	Appendix W – Overland Flood Assessment prepared by BMT (23 August 2024)
PAS	Potential Areas of Sensitivity
Planning and Urban Design Report	<i>Annexure C - Ireneinc Planning and Urban Design Planning Report 17 February 2025</i>
PoSS	Project of State Significance
POSS Submission	material submitted by the Proponent in respect of the Project
Precinct	Macquarie Point Precinct
Preliminary Acid Sulfate Soil Investigation	Appendix KK - Preliminary Results of Acid Sulfate Soil Investigation prepared by AECOM (2 August 2024)
Project	Macquarie Point Multipurpose Stadium Project
Proponent	Crown in Right of Tasmania
RFI Material	Responses to requests for information
SCP	State Coastal Policy
SCPS	Sullivans Cove Planning Scheme
SEMP	Site Environment Management Plan
SPP Act	<i>State Policies and Project Act 1993 (Tas)</i>
SPP Act Minister	Minister administering the SPP Act
SPWQM	State Policy on Water Quality Management 1997
Stadium	Multipurpose Stadium and surrounding concourse, and arrival plaza areas
Stormwater RFI	Annexure T – BMT Stormwater Management Request for Information Response (31 January 2025)
Summary Report	<i>Macquarie Point Multipurpose Stadium: Project of State Significance Summary Report dated 17 September 2024</i>
SWMP	Appendix S – Stormwater Management Plan prepared by BMT (26 August 2024)
The Bill	<i>Macquarie Point Planning Permit Bill 2025</i>
TMAG	Tasmanian Museum and Art Gallery
Transport Study	Appendix N - Transport Study (WSP, August 2024)
TSO	Tasmanian Symphony Orchestra

•