
From: Roz Pearson [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, 21 December 2023 1:02 PM
To: TPC Enquiry
Subject: Feedback Submission re: construction of a Stadium on MacQuarie Point

Categories:

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

I wish to submit my concerns over the planned construction of a Stadium on MacQuarie Point. Vica Bayley has most succinctly identified many issues with this proposal as such:

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

- The proponent should specifically report against the extent to which the proposed project is consistent with all elements of all current relevant planning documents for the site, including:
 - o The Sullivans Cove Planning Scheme 1997
 - o The Macquarie Point Site Development Plan
 - o Macquarie Point Reset Masterplan 2017-2030
- The Commission should assess the project against compliance with prescriptions in these planning documents.
- The Aboriginal Heritage Act (1975) is acknowledged as deficient and is currently under review. Projects of this scale and significance should not be assessed until that process has been completed.
- Consultants engaged by the proponent should not have existing government contracts and questionable consultants like Price Waterhouse Coopers should be excluded.
- An independently verified report detailing the full, updated cost estimate of the project should be provided.
- The proposed source of the funding should be detailed.
- A report prepared under 'Site description, features and context', should include:
 - o future flood modelling, taking into account sea level rise;
 - details on remaining site contamination issues including proposed treatments, if any.
- A detailed independent visual impact assessment must be provided, with impacts from a variety of viewpoints modeled, including, but not limited to:
 - o The Tasman Bridge;
 - o The Derwent River;
 - o The Cenotaph;
 - o Various locations within Sullivans Cove;
 - o kunanyi/Mt Wellington.
- Details and plans of any proposed cut and fill should include proposed building footings.
- A cost-benefit analysis should detail:
 - o The full financial cost of the project;
 - o The opportunity cost of not using the site in accordance with the previously agreed and finalised development management plan;
 - o The cost associated with paying out commercial contracts entered into in line with the previously agreed and finalised management plan;
- A social and cultural analysis report should:

- o Consider the recruitment and accommodation of the construction workforce required to deliver the project and the impacts on housing availability across the construction period;
 - o The perspective of the Tasmanian Aboriginal community and the effective abandonment of a Truth and Reconciliation Park;
 - o The impact of the development on the built cultural heritage values of the Sullivans Cove precinct.
-
- Reports examining the urban form of Sullivans Cove should also analyse the effect of any impacts from the proposed project on the existing cultural heritage values of the Cove.

 - Mass transport and public transport analysis should only consider those aspects of public transport that are existing, or formally form part of this proposal, as there are no guarantees other mass transport proposals that have been mooted will eventuate.

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

 - Noise impact assessment must consider the activities of adjacent businesses and residences and the likely impact of all aspects of the operation of the project on neighbours, including construction and operation.

My biggest concerns are as follows:

The spending of such a massive amount of money on a huge structure that really will only service a select few - those interested in sport and those who might be able to afford tickets to a big event. That money would be of more use being spent on social housing for people on low incomes.

The building of such a monstrosity in a very picturesque and historical part of town - an area more suited to the Reconciliation Park concept that would be accessible to all and a suitable tribute to First Nations People who were displaced from the area.

The logistics of moving potentially 23,000 people to and from the site when public transport as it now stands is totally inadequate and so too is parking.

Regards,
Roz Pearson