

Annexure A – Request for Information – Items requested by the Tasmanian Planning Commission 19 November – Corporation responses

As at 17 February 2025

No.	TPC Key Issue	Previous MPDC Response
1.	<i>The project that is to be assessed by the Commission, the land to which the project relates, and the plans and details of the project to be provided, are outlined in the Guidelines (see sections 1.1.1 and 1.3).</i> <i>Specifically, the project and the corresponding land that is to be assessed by the Commission includes incidental or related use and development that incorporates services and infrastructure that is necessary for stadium to operate as proposed.</i> <i>This includes:</i> - roads or access ways used by vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists moving between the stadium building and the broader network, including the northern access road; - land and infrastructure associated with pedestrian/cycle pathways or standing areas; - landscaped and developed areas that will be utilised as part of the stadium operation including land and routes used for emergency evacuation and assembly; - areas of land that will be disturbed, remediated, or landscaped as part of the project; - land and infrastructure for public/event/private transport; - works or structures on existing road, pedestrian, cycle or public transport assets to cater for pedestrians, cyclists, altered traffic arrangements, public/event/private transport; and - the diversion of existing or the provision of new or augmented utility services. <i>The project site identified in the reports is inconsistent and does not align with the description of 'project site' in the Guidelines, which includes land related to associated use and development, as follows:</i> <i>Project site: means the land on which any use or development is proposed (including any associated use or development), whether privately or publicly owned. If any such land is only part of the land comprised in any title, then the whole of that land is included.</i>	Project to be assessed As described at section O.2.2 on page 11 of the <i>Macquarie Point Multipurpose Stadium Summary Report (Summary Report)</i>, the Project for the purposes of the Project of State Significance (PoSS) integrated assessment and approvals process comprises the following: - the Multipurpose Stadium and surrounding concourse, and arrival plaza areas; - the proposed relocated area for the Goods Shed, to be integrated to the north of the Multipurpose Stadium, while remaining as a standalone structure and facility; - practice cricket wickets which are required to service the multipurpose functionality of the facility; and - a below ground carpark located below the Antarctic Facilities Zone. Car parking will be used for operational and accessibility purposes to support the operations of the Multipurpose Stadium. It will also be used to support the broader precinct. This does not include the broader list of infrastructure identified by the Commission in the text in the adjacent column. Please refer to Annexure B which provides a detailed memorandum outlining the scope of the Project, in light of the <i>State Policies and Projects (Project of State Significance) Order 2023</i> dated 16 October 2023 (Order), including examples of components that either form part of the Project or do not, and the reasons for this. In summary, the scope of the Project depends on the Order. Related infrastructure and services that are necessary <i>solely</i> to support the stadium or are otherwise convenient should be considered as part of the Project, whereas infrastructure that has a broader precinct-wide function, and is proposed to be assessed and approved as part of a separate process, should not be. While many of the projects which do not form part of the Project support the integration of the Project with the city, particularly on major event days, they are not dependent on the Project to proceed. Therefore, these projects are not put forward for the purposes of approval through the PoSS integrated assessment and approval process and as approval will be sought by the relevant proponent separately. However, these projects have been considered and outlined in the reports submitted by MPDC to support an integrated assessment. Please also refer to proposed conditions 7 and 8 on page 256 of the Summary Report which outline how approval of the Project is intended to inter-relate to the approval and delivery of many of these projects. Project site / site boundary The 'project site' is the 'site boundary' shown in <i>Figure O-4: Site details and title details</i> on page 14 of the Summary Report. The 'site boundary' describes the title boundaries of the land on which any use or development is proposed (including any associated use or development), which is equivalent to the Commission's use of the term 'project site.' The term 'site boundary' was used in the Summary Report in preference to the term 'project site' as it was considered to more accurately reflect the boundaries of the site where the Project will be located. The location of the 'site boundary' is also shown in other various maps as the combination of the 'PoSS scope boundary expanded to include ancillary Stadium function' and the 'PoSS underground car park' (see for example Figure O-2 on page 11 of the Summary Report). This was done to outline with more specificity where within the site boundary the Project components would be located. For completeness, the 'PoSS scope boundary 2023' was also provided in Figure O-2 on page 11 of the Summary Report and is intended to show how the Project has evolved since the plan included in Schedule 1 of the Order.
2.	<i>The plans for the project are not provided as a consolidated set of plans with detailed description of the use and development that will form the basis of the Commission's assessment. The plans are dispersed through various unrelated reports. A greater number and variety of plans is sought.</i>	A consolidated set of architectural plans are provided in Appendix A of the Summary Report. A detailed description of the Stadium Design is provided in Appendix B of the Summary Report. We submitted a 269-page Summary Report along with 41 different appendixes containing expert reports and other material in response to the Guidelines as written, noting the Guidelines requested advice in the form of a series of reports. In response to this additional request, a consolidated set of plans and updated drawings plans, with supporting statements are provided at Annexure B, C, D and E. (The consolidated plans and updated drawings, with supporting statements also respond to items 4, 5, 41, 42, 43, 44, 49 and 51). The consolidated set of plans has been updated with three new drawings, revision P3, available at Annexure B. (This also responds to items 4, 5, 41, 42, 43, 44, 49 and 51).
3.	<i>Proposed uses and activities, hours of operation and capacity for each use, and maximum number/types/times of events for which approval is sought should be described in greater detail.</i>	This information is detailed at: - Pages 21 – 23 of the Summary Report (1.1 Stadium Use and Activities). It is important to note that timeframes and operating periods depend largely on fixturing and scheduling and the commercial deals entered into for venue hiring rights. Operating periods ordinarily include time before and after the event where patrons, visitors and staff remain at the venue. - Page 14 and 36 of <i>Appendix G: Financial Impact Report</i> which details an 'average annual core event calendar' and an 'optimistic event calendar'. Attendance projections for crowd capacity and number of events per year are detailed for both calendars; and - Appendix F (Transport Modelling Report) of Appendix N of the Transport Study, which models the transport impacts of events at different times.

No.	TPC Key Issue	Previous MPDC Response
		It is not proposed to set a cap on the numbers, types, or times for events. Activity is proposed in keeping with the nature of the use of the surrounding areas noting the use of the nearby Cenotaph open area as an event space, the existing use of facilities on site for events, and the activities of the port. <i>Appendix G: Financial Impact Report</i> provides both core and optimistic event calendars, and a comparison between these scenarios is provided in Table 24 of Appendix B of the Financial Impact Report. The material provided above responds to our understanding of the Guidelines.
4.	<i>Plans provided present a concept design rather than the Guidelines request for plans to be resolved to a 'detailed design stage, where constructability, structural engineering and significant building code compliance issues have been adequately resolved and will not alter the proposed development'. Provision of those detailed plans will assist.</i>	We have continued to work with user groups and consultants which has led to further detail being added to the internal design and allocation of specific rooms within the allocated areas. Plans will be provided to provide an update. We consider the plans provided comply with the Guidelines and are resolved to a sufficient degree that enable the Commission to undertake the necessary assessment and so that the proposed development will not be altered. The development of the designs has been informed by our specialist construction advisor, extensive engineering team including roofing and structural specialists, and building code compliance has been considered in the design process by a building surveyor as part of the design review team. We have also appointed a Building Surveyor who will review the final plans against building code requirements and will support the finalisation of plans to separately seek building approval. Please see the updated consolidated response of additional information provided at Item 2.
5.	<i>Greater detail is sought on the design of the stadium itself (including its architectural details and finishes) as well as the site layout, subdivision, access, cut and fill, signage, utilities infrastructure upgrades, urban design details and landscaping details.</i>	We will provide the Commission with most up-to-date version of the plans as noted in the above item. The site layout is set out in the Mac Point Precinct Plan as referenced in the Summary Report in the <i>Overview Chapter</i>, and provided at Attachment JJ to the Report. Further information on the site layout and landscaping is outlined in <i>Attachment I - Urban Design Framework</i> and in the in the architectural plans provided at Attachment A to the Summary Report. The site layout will again be shown in the updated plans provided in response to the above request. Urban design is addressed in <i>Chapter 2 – Landscape and Urban form</i> and in <i>Attachment I – Urban Design Framework</i> of the Summary Report and is responded to at item 7 of this table. A response to the requested additional information on subdivision is provided at item 45 of this table. Access to the site is addressed in <i>Chapter 4 – Movement</i> and in <i>Attachment N – Transport Study</i> of the Summary Report. Responses to requested further information on transport related matters is provided at the relevant items of this table. A Cut and Fill Report is provided at <i>Attachment D</i> to the Summary Report. This provides specific information on the cut and fill scope proposed. Please advise if there is specific further information is requested. A response to the requested additional information on signage is provided at item 41 of this table. Utility infrastructure upgrades are included in <i>Attachment BB – Services Report, Macquarie Point Infrastructure Strategy</i> attached to the Summary Report. Please advise if there is specific further information is requested. Please see the updated consolidated response of additional information provided at Item 2.
6.	<i>Further information, analysis and/or evidence on core strategic planning matters, as follows:</i> <i>Whether and how the site and area is capable of accommodating the traffic, transport and pedestrian access needs, and the provision of actual strategies that provide evidence that demonstrate that these matters are proposed to be addressed in an effective manner (section 6.0 of the Guidelines);</i>	The Guidelines provide at section 6.1.2 that reports providing an overall framework supported by suitable models are to "informed by consideration of relevant transport plans and strategies, at a local and regional level, identified in section 2, including Keeping Hobart Moving – Transport Solutions for Our Future (draft) State of Tasmania Oct 2023 and The Greater Hobart Cycle Plan." The Guidelines also provide at section 2.2.1 that the Reports are to provide a cross reference to government policy and strategy and 2.2.1(3) requires the Reports to address "plans and strategies related to the role of the City of Hobart across a range of relevant areas including: - traffic and traffic congestion management; - active transport; - parking and carparks; - use and management of Council owned reserves and parkland; - strategies for pedestrian and cyclists; - management and redevelopment of the Hobart aquatic centre; - the Central Hobart Plan; and - strategies for urban design details in Sullivans Cove." A general response to the requirements of section 6.0 of the Guidelines is detailed at: - pages 109 – 120 of the Summary Report, which detail strategic modelling for transport and the 2030 transport plan which finds that "when events occur in the PM, the resulting PM peak periods were found to be comparable to, or less congested than, the Base Case (non-event day) Monday to Friday morning in bound peak period"; - pages 81 – 88 of the Summary Report, which identifies City of Hobart strategies and plans; - pages 88, 175, 180 and 193 of the Summary Report which addresses the "Keeping Hobart Moving – Transport Solutions for our Future (DRAFT)"; - page 13 of <i>Appendix N – Transport Study</i> which notes, with respect to whether the site and area are capable of accommodating traffic, that "the CBD location significantly contributes to what can be a sustainable event travel plan. The location assists by its

No.	TPC Key Issue	Previous MPDC Response
		<i>proximity to existing public transport services and car parking as well as bars and restaurants that will assist by flattening the spectator egress profile. However, the location does also complicate the road network as the nearby network is physically constrained, and at peak times is reaching capacity. The capacity limitations result in a need for mode shift for stadium travel choices to mitigate impacts to background traffic and delays in reaching the stadium. However, there are no embedded travel behaviours for Macquarie Point so there is an opportunity to start positively from day one";</i> - page 16 of <i>Appendix N – Transport Study</i>, which confirms the integration and review of plans and strategies informing the framework and methodology; - page 198 of <i>Appendix N – Transport Study</i>, which provides details of the "Keeping Hobart Moving – Transport Solutions for our Future (DRAFT)" and "Greater Hobart Cycling Plan" amongst other key strategies in the active transport workshop; - generally, in <i>Appendix N – Transport Study</i>, which provides a technical response to the Guidelines in sections 2, 4, 5.2, 5.3 and 6. This includes considerations such as the alignment of public/mass transport and parking strategies with the information and outcomes of related travel demand management and transport assessment processes, the need to ensure plans and redesign for mass/public transport fit with the need to provide pedestrians with safe, amenable, convenient pathways and platforms, and the capacity of the existing mass/public transport system. The report also provides strategies for the provision of drop-off/pick-up areas generally, and arrangements and infrastructure for people with specific access needs. It also discusses the potential for events to be held during or overlapping with peak weekday/weekend travel patterns, and the options and strategies to assess this period as a base scenario. In response this further request, a planning report has been prepared and is provided at Annexure F. (The report also responds to items 7, 9, 18, 27 and 65) The planning report has been updated to reflect the updated drawings in the consolidated set of plans and is available at Annexure C. (The report also responds to items 7, 9, 18, 27 and 65)
7.	<i>whether the use and development is compatible with the urban planning/urban design frameworks and strategies that have been established for Sullivans Cove and Hobart City, and to what degree any departure from the established framework is warranted, and if so, can be ameliorated (sections 2.2 and 4.2 of the Guidelines);</i>	It is noted that the request for further information goes further than sections 2.2 and 4.2 of the Guidelines which do not require an assessment as to <i>"whether the use and development is compatible with the urban planning/urban design frameworks and strategies that have been established for Sullivans Cove and Hobart City, and to what degree any departure from the established framework is warranted, and if so, can be ameliorated"</i>. Section 2.2 of the Guidelines provides at 2.2.1(3): <i>The scope of the policy and strategy addressed are to include:</i> ... <i>Plans and strategies related to the role of the City of Hobart across a range of relevant areas including: ...strategies for urban design details in Sullivans Cove.</i> Similarly, section 4.2 of the Guidelines provides: <i>The reports are to describe the existing urban form of Sullivans Cove and describe and analyse:</i> ... <i>the effect of any impacts from the proposed project on the existing spatial and built form and historic and cultural value of Sullivans Cove.</i> <i>The reports are to describe:</i> <i>the planning history of the spatial and built form of Sullivans Cove and how the proposed project relates and responds; and</i> <i>the history of master plans and site development plans for the Macquarie Point site and how the proposed project relates and responds.</i> <i>In preparing the reports, without limiting the scope, specific consideration is to be given to:</i> ... <i>to what degree the proposed project contributes to or detracts from a human scale environment;</i> <i>to what degree the formal modulation, articulation, architectural expression, pattern of fenestration, design details, materials and colours of the proposed project complement or detract from existing forms and reinforce and contribute to or detract from spatial patterns of Sullivans Cove;</i> <i>how the proposed project relates to and affects the expression of the wall of the Cove and the Cove floor;</i> <i>to what degree the proposed project contributes to or detracts from a continuous built wall edge to Evans Street, and details of any interface at Evans Street;</i> <i>The reports are to be informed by:</i> <i>the Sullivans Cove Planning Review 1991; and</i> <i>the Sullivans Cove Planning Scheme 1997.</i> It is accordingly unclear where the Guidelines require an assessment of compatibility with the urban planning/urban design frameworks and strategies and to what degree departure from this framework is warranted. Additionally, the Order supplants the approval processes otherwise required by legislation, including the <i>Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993</i>. In this regard, compatibility with

No.	TPC Key Issue	Previous MPDC Response
		the frameworks and strategies for Sullivans Cove and Hobart City as provided by the <i>Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993</i> have been supplanted by the Order. It is not clear to us as to where the Guidelines provide for an assessment compatibility with the frameworks and strategies for Sullivans Cove and Hobart City or why this is appropriate. The Project has been declared a Project of State Significance and is intended to be a landmark feature for the City of Hobart and for Tasmania. The Project needs to be considered and assessed in that context. A specific response to the requirements provided in sections 2.2 and 4.2 of the Guidelines is detailed at pages 104 – 124 of <i>Appendix I – Urban Design Framework</i>. Notwithstanding the references to the Guidelines, we have sought the preparation of a supplementary report from a statutory planner responding to these matters. Please see the updated planning report referenced at Item 6.
8.	<i>detailed consideration of the full economic societal costs and benefits of the project and whether providing for the use and development will be likely to facilitate economic development (section 3.0 of the Guidelines); and</i>	A specific response to the requirements of section 3.0 of the Guidelines is detailed at: <i>Appendix E – Cost Benefit Analysis;</i> <i>Appendix F – Economic Impact Assessment;</i> <i>Appendix G – Financial Impact Report; and</i> <i>Appendix H – Social and Cultural Analysis Report.</i> The scope of the economic and social analysis that has been undertaken is in keeping with the scope of the Project as outlined in our submission and referred to above in item 1. A letter responding to this request is provided at Annexure G (The letter also responds to items 14 and 57)
9.	<i>overall, whether/how the project furthers the objectives of schedule 1 of the State Policies and Projects Act 1993 and is in accordance with relevant State Policies relating to use and development of coastal land, site contamination and water quality¹ (section 2.1 of the Guidelines).</i> <i>These policies are outlined in Appendix D of the Guidelines.</i>	Section 3.1 (<i>State Policies and Projects Act 1993</i> and Resource Management and Planning System legislation) and the conclusion in the Summary Report (page 218) outline in detail how the Project furthers the objectives of schedule 1 of the <i>State Policies and Projects Act 1993</i>. The <i>State Policy on Water Quality Management 1997</i> is considered in section 7.3 (Water Quality Management) of the Summary Report, along with <i>Appendix S – Stormwater Management Plan</i> and <i>Appendix BB – Services Report – Infrastructure Strategy</i>. In relation to the <i>State Coastal Policy 1996</i>, this is considered on page 73 (State Policies) of the Summary Report. As noted in that section, for a detailed assessment of the considerations identified under that policy, including water quality management, natural values, coastal inundation, sustainability, urban design and heritage, please refer to the following sections of the Summary Report and supporting consultant reports: <i>PoSS Summary Report: Chapter 2 – Landscape and Urban Form and Chapter 7 – Environmental Quality and Hazards;</i> <i>Appendix S – Stormwater Management Plan;</i> <i>Appendix R – Natural Values Assessment;</i> <i>Appendix U – Coastal Inundation Assessment;</i> <i>Appendix I – Urban Design Framework; and</i> <i>Appendix L – Historic Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment.</i> In relation to the <i>National Environment Protection (Assessment of Site Contamination) Measure 1999</i>, the PoSS Summary Report is accompanied by a comprehensive Site Remediation Strategy, which addresses this NEPM. Notwithstanding the above, we have sought the preparation of a supplementary report from a statutory planner responding to these matters. Please see the updated planning report referenced at Item 6.
10.	<i>The costs associated with the total capital investment in all infrastructure and services necessary for the stadium to operate as proposed in the three different forms of economic assessment (section 3.0 of the Guidelines).</i>	There is nothing in section 3.0 of the Guidelines dealing with the assessment of economic development and social, cultural and community wellbeing which requires an assessment of "<i>the total capital investment in all infrastructure and services necessary for the stadium to operate.</i>" The reports that were prepared assess the total capital investment in all infrastructure and services necessary for the stadium to operate as proposed, noting that some projects (such as the Northern Access Road and sewer replacements) are subject to separate approvals and funding, and will progress regardless of whether the Project proceeds. Other projects (such as the Collins Street pedestrian bridge) are not necessary for the Stadium to operate and have not been included in the assessments provided on that basis. As noted in our [previous] covering letter, MPDC has responded to the Guidelines and this request for additional information in our capacity as being responsible for progressing the Project within our functions as set out in the <i>Macquarie Point Development Corporation Act 2012</i>. The scope of the economic and social analysis that has been undertaken is in keeping with the scope of the project as outlined in our submission and referred to above in item 1.
11.	<i>The Economic Impact Assessment and the Financial Impact Assessment should also assess the project in comparison to a base case/no project alternative in line with the general and specific requirements of sections 3.2, 3.3 and 3.5 of the Guidelines.</i>	A specific response to the requirements of section 3.3 of the Guidelines in relation to the base case / no project scenario is detailed at page 30 of <i>Appendix G – Financial Impact Report</i>, which provides that it is impractical to model the impact Horizontal Fiscal Equalisation (HFE) due to complexities and interdependencies noting that there is high complexity and uncertainty in considering impacts, given that it requires understanding what the contribution is spent on and what other States and Territories will do in the timeframe. Further to this, it is noted that the Australian Treasurer has subsequently announced that the Australian Government's contribution will be exempt from Horizontal Fiscal Equalisation process.

No.	TPC Key Issue	Previous MPDC Response
		A specific response to the requirements of section 3.5 of the Guidelines is detailed at page 7 of <i>Appendix E – Cost Benefit Analysis</i> which details the base case. A supplementary economic report is provided in response to this item at Annexure H. (The report also responds to items 12, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63 and 64)
12.	<i>Further detailed elaboration of the evidence base for some key assumptions related to both capital costs and revenue (section 3.1 and 3.5 of the Guidelines).</i>	Please see the supplementary economic report referenced at item 11. Advice from WT Partnership, specialist quantity surveyors, is also provided with the regard to capital cost assumptions. These are provided at Annexure I.
13.	<i>A probability analysis of key assumptions and the sensitivity analysis undertaken should include a range of plausible scenarios (section 3.5 of the Guidelines).</i>	A specific response to the requirements of section 3.5 of the Guidelines is detailed at: - page 21 of <i>Appendix G – Financial Impact Report</i>, which includes detailed scenario analysis. The range of plausible scenarios includes changes in event calendars, inclusion of revenue generating elements, capital expenditure and delay; and - page 7 of <i>Appendix G – Financial Impact Report</i>, which notes that it is not common to undertake probabilistic operational financial modelling for social infrastructure such as stadia. To do so would require the determination for all revenue and cost items; the distribution of the financial item, the probabilities associated with the relevant items, and the respective upper and lower bounds. These would then be simulated through a 'monte-carlo' analysis to produce a probabilistic estimate based on unfounded and untested assumptions. The resulting outputs would not add additional relevant information to the investment decision. Noting the broad nature of this item, it is assumed this is clarified in items 59 and 60 later in the table of requests. Please clarify if this is not correct.
14.	<i>Information on the research undertaken that provided a means for community groups to express their views on social and cultural effects of the project (section 3.4 of the Guidelines).</i>	A letter responding to this request is referenced at item 8. In addition, the Mac Point Draft Precinct Plan – Consultation Summary, October 2023 is also attached at Annexure J as referenced in the letter.
15.	<i>To fully consider the effects of the proposal on the landscape there is a need for a greater number, variety and level of detail of visualisations (section 4.1 of the Guidelines).</i>	A total of 8 viewpoints have been included to demonstrate the potential visibility of the Stadium when viewed by sensitive receptors within its surrounding context. The viewpoints / receptor locations used in the photomontages were selected to represent a range of visual locations and illustrate views from areas of perceived sensitivity. Visualisations are provided in response to this item at Annexure K. Additional visualisations and accompanying heritage commentary provided at Annexure D and E. (This package includes responding to items 17, 20, 52, 53, 54, 55 and 56).
16.	<i>Clarification of the elevation of the stadium shown in some photomontage based visual simulations which do not appear to correspond to the elevation of reference points in the view field.</i>	Clarification on the visualisation is provided in response to this item at Annexure L.
17.	<i>A broader either geographically or thematically analysis of landscape (for example, consideration of people's perception of place and the project's relationship with the River Derwent, consideration of the experience of residents of the city, and analysis of the impact of night lighting) (section 4.1 of the Guidelines).</i>	Visualisations provided in response to this request are referenced at item 15. A further Urban Design Framework is provided in response to this item at Annexure AA.
18.	<i>Further analysis of the effects of the proposal on the spatial and built form of Sullivans Cove including factual supporting evidence. The reports should document or consider relevant established Sullivans Cove planning principles, such as the principles of the Sullivans Cove Planning Review 1991 (Section 4.2 of the Guidelines).</i>	It is noted that the request for further information goes further than section 4.2 of the Guidelines which does not require the Reports to "document or consider relevant established Sullivans Cove planning principles, such as the principles of the Sullivans Cove Planning Review 1991." Section 4.2.4 of the Guidelines provides that the reports are to be <i>informed by</i>: <i>the Sullivans Cove Planning Review 1991; and</i> <i>the Sullivans Cove Planning Scheme 1997.</i> A specific response to the requirements of section 4.2, including 4.2.4, is detailed at: - pages 60 – 68 of the Summary Report; - page 108 of <i>Appendix I – Urban Design Framework</i>; and - forms the basis of <i>Appendix G – Site Development Plan</i>. Notwithstanding the requirements set out in the Guidelines, we have sought the preparation of a supplementary report from a suitably qualified expert responding to these matters as additional information. Please see the updated planning report referenced at Item 6.
19.	<i>Further information and analysis of the effects of the project on Aboriginal cultural values and landscape, and evidence on consultation with the Aboriginal community (section 5.1 of the Guidelines).</i>	Summary of engagement with the Aboriginal community and related reports are provided at Annexure M, N and O.

No.	TPC Key Issue	Previous MPDC Response
20.	<i>Further evidence/analysis on, and visualisations showing, specific effects of the project (including its use) on individual places of historic heritage cultural significance (section 5.3 of the Guidelines).</i>	Visualisations provided in response to this request are referenced at item 15.
21.	<i>Specific details/conservation management plans/guidelines relating to the dismantling and reconstruction/storage of the Goods Shed and Red Shed and advice on the resultant heritage values of either of these buildings (section 5.3 of the Guidelines).</i>	It is noted that we have responded to the Guidelines as drafted. It is unclear where at section 5.3 of the Guidelines the "Specific details/conservation management plans/guidelines relating to the dismantling and reconstruction/storage of the Goods Shed and Red Shed" are required in the Guidelines. Section 5.3.5 of the Guidelines provides that the following information is to be provided: ▪ "details of any proposed disturbance, relocation or demolition relating to places of historic cultural heritage significance, including: ○ whether the works are approved as part of any conservation plan; ○ how affected elements will be recorded; ○ any proposed reuse or storage of materials; and ○ detailed justification for the works." Section 5.3.5 of the Guidelines requires details as to whether the works are approved as part of any conversation plan. Accordingly, as part of the approval for the works, being the dismantling and reconstruction/storage of the Goods Shed and Red Shed, the Report confirms that a conservation management plan will need to be implemented. In this regard, a specific response to section 5.3.5 of the Guidelines is detailed at: ▪ page 115 of <i>Appendix L – Historic Culture Heritage Impact Assessment</i> which notes a specific mitigation measure for the Goods Shed include the development of guidelines for the dismantling and storage methodology. Additionally, it notes with respect to the "resultant heritage values", 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." ▪ page 163 of <i>Appendix L – Historic Culture Heritage Impact Assessment</i> which notes a specific mitigation recommendation to "prepare a conservation management plan for the Red Shed prior to any action for dismantling and relocation"; and ▪ page 257 of the Summary Report provides proposed Heritage Conditions including that "Prior to the commencement of development excluding preparatory buildings and works under condition 11.5 of this Schedule), a Conservation Management Plan must be submitted to and approved by the Minister in consultation with Heritage Tasmania." Including management measures to facilitate the: ○ removal, storage and relocation of the Goods Shed; ○ removal, storage and relocation of the Red Shed;" Given the location of the Red Shed relocation has not yet been confirmed, this is the most appropriate way to manage the relocation. It is noted the Red Shed is not listed Tasmanian Heritage Register, however, relocation options will consider its local listing as culturally significant. We confirm that Conservation Management Plans are under development which will include detail confirming the ability to relocate the Goods Shed as proposed. We will provide further advice on this as the work progresses. The Conservation Management Plan is progressing, however, as a complex document will require additional time to be prepared. It is expected to be provided in March.
22.	<i>Further information on both the supporting factual evidence and probability assessments related to assumptions on mode share, travel origins, pedestrian movement patterns, and parking demand including the assumptions and scenarios outlined in the Guidelines (section 6.0 of the guidelines).</i>	A response to further information request on transport and movement matters is provided at Annexure P. This includes responses to items 23, 24, 25, 26, 28, 66, 67, 68, 70 and 71).
23.	<i>Where proposals/assumptions concern achieving outcomes related to mode share, pedestrian movement, use of on-street parking and congestion management generally, further information to demonstrate how these outcomes could be achieved (section 6.0 of the Guidelines).</i>	Please see the supplementary transport report referenced at item 22.
24.	<i>Further advice is required on how the stadium's operation relates to what appears to be unfunded and unscoped transport system improvements. In some places, the reports for the project appear to refer to specific locations of potential future transit corridor improvements while the reports do not refer to other potential projects such as a central city transit centre (section 6.0 of the Guidelines).</i>	The Transport Study's consideration of transport system improvements are derived from: ▪ the Hobart City Deal (Northern Access Road); ▪ City of Hobart Central Hobart Plan (Collins Street redesign); ▪ Northern Suburbs Transit Corridor – City Deal (Rapid Bus); and ▪ 2023 Mac Point Draft Precinct Plan (Event Bus Plaza, Collins Street Active Transport Bridge) The transport system improvements have been provided for in the Reports as stipulated by section 6.1.2 of the Guidelines which requires that "the reports are to provide an overall framework supported by suitable models and assessment methods that ... are informed by consideration of relevant transport plans and strategies, at a local and regional level, identified in section 2". In this regard, section 2.2.1(1) notes that the "scope of the policy and strategy addressed are to include... agreements such as the Hobart City Deal between multiple levels of government, or agreements between one level of government and other organisations that are relevant to the integrated assessment of the project." , Section 2.2.1(3) of the guidelines identified "plans and strategies related to the role of the City of Hobart across a range of relevant areas including: ▪ traffic and traffic congestion management; ▪ active transport; ▪ parking and carparks;

No.	TPC Key Issue	Previous MPDC Response
		▪ <i>use and management of Council owned reserves and parkland;</i> ▪ <i>strategies for pedestrian and cyclists;</i> ▪ <i>management and redevelopment of the Hobart aquatic centre;</i> ▪ <i>the Central Hobart Plan; and</i> ▪ <i>strategies for urban design details in Sullivans Cove.</i> It is noted that the request for further information goes further than section 6.0 of the Guidelines which does not require a particular assessment of "<i>other potential projects such as a central city transit centre</i>". It is noted that a central city transit centre would replace the existing central bus services, and would result in an increase in levels of service. The consideration of the existing facilities on the status quo therefore appears reasonable. We have considered those transport projects that stakeholders had identified in existing strategies and plans as noted above. Please see the supplementary transport report referenced at item 22.
25.	<i>The stadium project includes transport infrastructure and services that are considered necessary for its operation. Information is sought on actual proposals for the use and development, or cost estimates for elements of the project such as:</i> ○ <i>the event bus fleet and its operation;</i> ○ <i>pedestrian improvements catering for peak flows; and</i> ○ <i>access road development and infrastructure catering for public/mass transport,</i> <i>(section 6.0 of the Guidelines).</i>	Section 6.3.4 of the Guidelines requires that "<i>reports are to provide maps, plans and graphics that describe and show:</i> ▪ ... ▪ <i>the mass/public transport (coaches, buses, ferries) fleet, capacity and key routes during peak movement periods;</i> ▪ ... ▪ <i>the detailed design of:</i> ○ <i>mass/public transport infrastructure to be used during peak periods; and</i> ○ <i>infrastructure/arrangements for general drop off/pick up locations and for people with specific access needs.</i> A specific response to section 6.3.4 of the Guidelines is detailed at: ▪ pages 24, 49 – 65 and 72 of <i>Appendix N – Transport Study</i>, which provide detail as to the Northern Access Road in the context of the Reports and Guidelines; ▪ page 57 of <i>Appendix N – Transport Study</i>, which describes the specific design requirements for the event bus plaza and straightened bus bays for accessibility pick up / drop off; ▪ page 63 of <i>Appendix N – Transport Study</i>, which details the local area transport and access plan; and ▪ page 32 of <i>Appendix JJ – Mac Point Precinct Plan</i>, which details the event day public transport; It is noted that the request for further information goes further than section 6.0 of the Guidelines which does not require an "<i>actual proposals... or cost estimates for elements of the project such as:</i> ▪ <i>the event bus fleet and its operation;</i> ▪ <i>pedestrian improvements catering for peak flows; and</i> ▪ <i>access road development and infrastructure catering for public/mass transport</i>". Please see the supplementary transport report referenced at item 22.
26.	<i>Further analysis and evidence would assist to understand the effects of proposed uses on existing uses in the vicinity of the project site and proposed management and programming regimes relating to the proposed uses and their effects on surrounding uses (including effects relating to traffic, parking, noise and pedestrian movement) (section 7.0 of the Guidelines).</i>	A specific response to the requirements of section 7.0 is detailed at: ▪ pages 173 and 175 – 178 of the Summary Report; ▪ <i>Appendix N – Transport Study;</i> ▪ page 30 of <i>Appendix EE – Car Parking & Access Review;</i> ▪ <i>Appendix Q – Noise and Vibration Assessment; and</i> ▪ <i>Appendix AA – Construction Management Plan.</i> Please see the supplementary transport report referenced at item 22. A noise and vibration report is provided in response to this item at Annexure Q. (This report also responds to item 33)
27.	<i>Further information and analysis would assist to understand how visitors and locals are likely to use the site outside major events, and on the relationship of the uses proposed as part of the project:</i> ○ <i>in relation to each other;</i> ○ <i>with future uses within the wider Macquarie Point Site; and</i> ○ <i>with allowable uses within the wider area more generally (section 7.0 of the Guidelines).</i>	A specific response to section 7.03 of the Guidelines regarding the "<i>level and characteristics of use of the stadium by Tasmanians and visitors outside of major events</i>" is detailed at: ▪ page 32 of the <i>Macquarie Point Multi-Purpose Stadium Project of State Significance Summary</i>, which describes the landscaping and open space experience outside of events; ▪ page 64 of the <i>Macquarie Point Multi-Purpose Stadium Project of State Significance Summary</i>, which describes the functional elements of the stadium design interface with the public realm that ensures activation outside of events; and ▪ page 174 of the <i>Macquarie Point Multi-Purpose Stadium Project of State Significance Summary</i>, which describes land use conflicts outside of events (Regular Use). This assessment of impacts during <i>Regular Use</i> on other uses is considered for the Port & Cruise Terminal (page 180), Hunter Street Businesses, Hotels, Apartments and UTAS School of Creative Arts (page 182), the Queens Domain (page 183), the Cenotaph, Regatta Grounds and Domain Shipyards (page 186), Federation Concert Hall (page 188), Royal Hobart Hospital (page 189), ABC Broadcast Centre (page 190), the Bahai Centre for Learning (page 191), the Residential Apartments & Old Woolstore Apartments (page 192), Future Residential Precinct (page 193). The Mac Point Precinct Plan provided at <i>Attachment JJ</i> to the Summary Report outlines the zones and broader intended uses of the Macquarie Point site.

No.	TPC Key Issue	Previous MPDC Response
		Please see the updated planning report referenced at Item 6
28.	<i>Specific details of event management planning and integration with other activities (for example events in the surrounding area and operational activities of TasPorts) should be provided (section 7.0 of the guidelines).</i>	It is noted that the request for further information goes further than section 7.0 of the Guidelines which does not require "specific details of event management planning". Section 7.02 of the Guidelines requires that the Reports assess "the potential for land use conflicts between existing activities in the locality and the operation of the stadium as well as measures that may be taken to avoid or minimise the likelihood of conflicts." Further, section 7.0.3 of the Guidelines requires specific consideration be given to "actions that may be taken to avoid or minimise the likelihood or consequence of any adverse effect" in preparing the Reports. A specific response to sections 7.02 and 7.03 of the Guidelines is detailed at: - pages 172 – 195 of Summary Report; - pages 180 – 181 of the Summary Report, in particular, address noise & vibration, car parking demand, as well as changes to traffic routes & congestion impacting TasPorts at construction, regular use and major events phases; - page 175 of <i>Macquarie Point Multi-Purpose Stadium Project of State Significance Summary Report</i> which provides that "an overarching Event Management Plan will be established". In addition, condition 6 in Part 2 of Schedule A of the proposed conditions outlines that an events management plan has to be submitted and approved before use commences, which is considered to be an appropriate control on event planning in these circumstances. Please see the supplementary transport report referenced at item 22.
29.	<i>Evidence or analysis should be provided on wind effects and pedestrian comfort levels associated with the proposed building design, or any measures to minimise or manage wind effects (section 8.1 of the Guidelines).</i>	Page 149 of <i>Macquarie Point Multi-Purpose Stadium Project of State Significance Summary Report</i> noted that: "wind speed effects on pedestrian comfort will be a focus of further modelling, including wind tunnel modelling, which will be prepared to accompany the next stage of the design of the Multipurpose Stadium to ensure appropriate comfort levels are achieved." This is supported by page 16 of <i>Appendix O – Wind Comfort Assessment</i> which notes that "any approval of the Project should include a condition requiring that during the detailed design stage, testing of wind effect occurs, to ensure that the Project satisfies the wind comfort criteria for ground level areas." In addition, condition 2.2.6 in Part 2 of Schedule A of the proposed conditions outlines that the development plans must be generally in accordance with the development plans included in the Reports for the Stadium, modified to show the outcomes of wind modelling undertaken as part of the detailed design process to ensure the Project satisfies appropriate wind comfort criteria for ground level areas. This approach is consistent for projects of this scale and nature. Despite this, we will provide a response to this issue by way of an update to this table and any supporting material in due course. We are obtaining advice from our consultants on this request. A wind effects report requires additional time to be prepared and is expected to be provided by 28 February
30.	<i>Further analysis on the extent and effects of overshadowing on occupants of other buildings and public open spaces (and its users) is sought (section 8.2 of the Guidelines).</i>	Overshadowing is discussed in several parts of the Summary Report. In Chapter 1, the existing solar access of the Project site and adjacent area is described, and the effects of shadow impacts from the proposed project are analysed. This chapter also includes shadow diagrams and measures to minimise negative overshadowing effects. Chapter 2 and 9 provide an analysis of overshadowing impacts on the worst day of the year (June 21st). Appendix B - Stadium Design Description also discusses overshadowing, including the existing solar access of the project site and adjacent area, the effects of shadow impacts from the proposed project, and measures to minimise negative overshadowing effects. In addition to the static images provided in the Summary Report and Appendix B, an animation showing the minimal effects of overshadowing is published on the Macquarie Point Development Corporation website at www.macpoint.com/sun-and-shadowing An electronic copy of the simulation and supporting factsheet available at the above address has been provided.
31.	<i>Analysis of lighting should be based on a detailed lighting plan rather than concept level assumptions, and there should be consideration of effects to the behaviour of fauna species such as birds (section 8.3 of the Guidelines).</i>	A specific response to section 8.3 of the Guidelines is provided at: - pages 11 – 17 of <i>Appendix P – Lighting Assessment</i>, which deals with lighting impacts on fauna and flora at page 16; - page iv of <i>Appendix R – Natural Values Assessment</i>, which concludes that "given the expected illumination, limited operational timeframes, and relatively small impact area overlapping with fauna habitat of minimal value, meaningful impacts to threatened fauna species from lighting are not anticipated – key requirements to be adhered to in relation to lighting are noted as avoiding refuge sites, foraging or dispersal routes, minimising light spill, and considering fauna responses with appropriate light selection, all of which should be feasible to achieve in relation to the expected species and habitat values in the surrounding area at risk of potential lighting impacts;" and - pages 20 – 21 of <i>Appendix R – Natural Values Assessment</i>, which deals with lighting impacts, including on swift parrots, hooded plover and short-tailed shearwaters. It is noted that the request for further information goes further than section 8.3 of the Guidelines which states: "The reports are to describe the existing light conditions of the project site and the vicinity. The reports are to describe all sources and integration of proposed lighting and its use during different activities, including during events and outside of events. The reports are to evaluate the potential for adverse effects arising from lighting, including the cumulative impact, taking into account surrounding sources of lighting. The reports are to consider the nature of adjacent use and development potentially adversely impacted from lighting on the site, and whether there are any potential effects on fauna or on traffic safety. If necessary, the reports are to outline control measures to prevent light spill. - The reports are to review and detail appropriate light spill assessment methodology, standards and acceptable limits. Where relevant, the choice of a particular methodology over alternative methodologies is to be explained. Assessment of impacts and

No.	TPC Key Issue	Previous MPDC Response
		<i>effects are to include information on the significance, duration and timing of the impact. Assumptions and judgements are to be stated clearly and the nature and magnitude of uncertainties are to be clearly defined."</i> A statement from Introba regarding the lighting assessment is provided in response to this item at Annexure R.
32.	<i>Further analysis of tolerable risks to be considered at a detailed design stage, and detail of mitigating solutions, in relation to hazards is sought.</i>	This issue is unclear, broad and non-specific, which is difficult to respond to. The Commission has not described which aspects of the Reports provided require further analysis and do not reference a corresponding section in the Guidelines. Additional information on the environmental condition of the site is at Annexure S. (This includes response to items 34, 35, 36, 37, 72, 73 and 74) The requested flooding report requires additional time to be prepared and is expected to be provided by 28 February.
33.	<i>Reports relating to noise should consider noise levels at all levels of multistorey buildings and include an analysis of whether receivers on the Eastern Shore should be considered in the assessment (section 8.4 of the Guidelines).</i>	It is noted that the request for further information goes further than section 8.4 of the Guidelines which does not require an assessment of noise levels at "all levels of multistorey buildings" and "whether receivers on the Eastern Shore should be considered in the assessment." Section 8.4.1 requires that "the reports are to describe the existing noise and vibration conditions of the project site and vicinity. The reports are to describe all sources of noise and vibration that can be reasonably identified from the use of the proposed project, considering all types of expected and possible events." This includes taking into account: - the maximum potential impact (maximum capacity and maximum sound amplification) for each proposed or possible type of event; ... - noise levels estimated at the boundary of land owned or controlled by the Proponent and at the curtilage of noise-sensitive uses in the locality; - how and where noise and vibrations are likely to travel, based on contour predictions; A specific response to the requirements of section 8.4.1 of the Guidelines are detailed in: - page 22 of <i>Appendix Q – Noise and Vibration Assessment</i> which notes that "where results are noted as negligible, it indicates that the predicted level is less than 20 dB(A)". - pages 33 – 42 of <i>Appendix Q – Noise and Vibration Assessment</i> which provides a map of the noise contours for the PA System, Game Siren, Crowds, Patrons Arriving/Departing, Patrons Outdoor Entertainment, Music Concert (worst-case scenario), Building Services, Bus Hub, Loading Dock and Waste Collection and Temp Gensets. - page 34 of <i>Appendix Q – Noise and Vibration Assessment</i> which notes that "considering the distance to the Royal Engineer Building is over 50 metres, the vibration level would likely be dissipated to an insignificant level. Sensitive receptors beyond the boundary of the site are unlikely to perceive this level of vibration." A noise and vibration report responding to this item is referenced at item 26.
34.	<i>Many of the supporting reports refer to an earlier master plan for Macquarie Point that did not include the proposed stadium and which had a substantially different site development configuration. Consequently, many of the supporting reports are either at a preliminary stage where the Guidelines have not been addressed or are not adequate as they refer to a different project.</i>	It would be helpful if the Commission could please be specific about which supporting reports refer to an earlier master plan for Macquarie Point that did not include the proposed stadium and which had a substantially different site development configuration. If this is correct, it will be remedied. Please see the additional environmental condition information referenced at item 32.
35.	<i>Estimates of material excavation do not appear to be based on the current proposal and an assessment should be undertaken on the time and operational impact of stockpiling and assessing excavated material or the capacity of local landfill depots to receive materials (sections 8.6 and 8.7 of the Guidelines).</i>	It is noted that the request for further information goes further than sections 8.6 and 8.7 of the Guidelines which do not require an "assessment... of the time and operational impact of stockpiling and assessing excavated material or the capacity of local landfill depots to receive materials". Rather, the assessment effects of waste management and environmental hazards identified in sections 8.6 and 8.7 are related to human health rather than operations. Section 8.6 of the Guidelines requires that: "the reports are to identify the sources, nature and quantities of all solid wastes likely to be generated as well as any hazardous or controlled wastes that will be collected and disposed of separately from wastewater streams, and describe the management of these waste materials. The methods of use, storage, treatment or disposal of each type of waste are to be described." "The reports are to review and evaluate the potential for human health to be affected by wastes from the proposed project, including during handling, transport, or as a result of disposal. The reports are to describe any measures required to adequately mitigate or manage any identified human health impacts." Section 8.7.2 of the Guidelines requires that "If any hazards are identified, the reports are to describe any potential effects on the project site, any potential effects on public health and any measures to manage risks. The reports are to detail any emergency management requirements and responses relating to environmental hazards, considering the proposed use." A specific response to section 8.6.1 of the Guidelines is detailed at page 52 of <i>Appendix AA – Construction Management Plan</i> which provides with respect to the removal of excavated materials from site. In addition, a cut and fill report is provided at Appendix D. Please see the additional environmental condition information referenced at item 32.
36.	<i>Further assessment of risks and potential impacts to the environment from the project's construction and operation interacting with groundwater is sought. The outcome of this assessment should be translated into suitable environmental management strategies (sections 8.5 and 8.7 of the Guidelines).</i>	Please see the additional environmental condition information referenced at item 32.

No.	TPC Key Issue	Previous MPDC Response
37.	<i>Stormwater management reports should assess known risks such as the potential for 'liquid emissions' to enter stormwater, and include proposed strategies to achieve a suitable level of compliance with water quality objectives (section 8.5 of the Guidelines).</i>	Condition 3.1.4 in Part 2 of Schedule A of the proposed conditions requires that prior to the commencement of development, urban design and landscaping plans (UDLPs) must be submitted to and approved by the Minister in consultation with the City of Hobart and relevant agencies. The UDLPs must implement the 'Stormwater Management Plan' included in the Reports, to the extent required by the final Macquarie Point IIAS. Implementing the 'Stormwater Management Plan' includes the recommendations in the stormwater management plan of: ▪ completing further investigations into the viability of stormwater harvesting from the stadium roof for internal stadium reuse to offset potable water demands; ▪ embedding the elements of the Site's proposed stormwater system in design requirements for separable development packages, such as residential and commercial buildings; ▪ embedding the elements of the Site's proposed stormwater system into design requirements for surfaces (e.g. concourse areas, roads and accessways, pedestrian and open space area, etc) outside of the stadium itself; ▪ requiring designers to apply locally accepted Water Sensitive Urban Design approaches to progressive stormwater system design; and ▪ as required, revisit MUSIC modelling as design stages progress to ensure overall Site objective are being achieved. We consider this to be an appropriate approach given the outcomes of the assessment contained in the Stormwater Management Plan and the conclusion that sufficient space exists on Site for the integration of the recommended control measures. Notwithstanding this, please see the additional environmental condition information referenced at item 32. A storm water plan providing additional information is provided in response to this item at Annexure T.
38.	<i>A Contaminated Land Auditor should provide an assessment on the site suitability of the proposed development so it can be ascertained whether the proposed use and development can be implemented in manner that protects human health and the environment (section 8.7 of the Guidelines).</i>	It is noted that the request for further information goes further than section 8.7 of the Guidelines which does not require an "assessment of site suitability by a Contaminated Land Auditor". In any event, page iii of <i>Appendix V – Site Remediation Strategy</i> notes "Under the Macquarie Point Development Corporation Act 2012 (amended 2015), Mr David Lam of Tetra Tech Coffey has been appointed as the Environmental Auditor for the Site and has been accredited by EPA as an auditor recognised by the amended Act. The role of the Auditor is to review the progression of investigation, and remedial planning and execution works at the Site. It is understood that the Auditor shall ensure that the works are carried out in compliance with local Tasmanian legislation and guidelines with consideration given to the requirements of the Victorian EPA Environmental Audit Framework where relevant Tasmanian legislation or regulation does not exist. The ultimate outcome of the Environmental Audit is to obtain a Site Suitability Statement confirming the Site's suitability for intended future uses." Please see Annexure U for advice from the Environmental Auditor in response to this item.
39.	<i>A detailed construction environment management plan, specific to the project, should be provided (section 9.2 of the Guidelines).</i>	It is noted that the request for further information goes further than section 9.2 which does not require a "detailed construction environment management plan". Section 9.2.1 requires that Reports "provide full details on the timeframe and staging for construction. The reports are to discuss and assess the potential effects of construction activities on the environment, surrounding land uses and infrastructure." In any event, a construction management plan is provided at <i>Appendix AA – Construction Management Plan</i> which notes that the "Construction Management Plan (CMP) demonstrates that the works associated with the construction of the proposed stadium are possible and can be carried out in a manner that will not unduly impact on the environment and the community. The CMP is an initial document is subject to change and will likely next be updated after engagement of the Design & Construct Contractor ("Contractor"), that is anticipated in the final quarter of 2025, and prior to site works commencing" In addition, condition 4 in Part 2 of Schedule A of the proposed conditions on page 253 of Summary Report provides that: "Prior to the commencement of development for the Project (excluding preparatory buildings and works under condition 10), a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) must be submitted to and approved by the Minister." Please see the advice from the Environmental Auditor referenced above at item 38. The requested advice in relation to the Construction Management Plan is provided at Annexure B. (This also responds to item 72)
40.	<i>Further analysis of the effects of emergency evacuation procedures and management of people movement on the transport and traffic flow function of the major road network is sought (section 9.4 of the Guidelines).</i>	The requested advice in relation to emergency management is provided in response to this item at Annexure V. (This also responds to item 69)
41.	<i>Information on signage should provide details of actual locations, dimensions or treatments rather than concept stage advice (section 9.1 of the Guidelines).</i>	Our Submission provided provides these details. An overview is provided in the Summary Report in section 9.2 <i>Stadium Signage Size and Use</i> on page 200 with details set out in Attachment Z – Signs, including the location, dimensions and treatments: ▪ Stadium naming signs on pages 13-18 ▪ Site totem signs on pages 19-20 ▪ Gate entry signs on pages 21-22 ▪ Directional signs on pages 23 This is consistent with the information required at section 9.1 of the Guidelines. Please see the updated consolidated response of additional information provided at Item 2.

No.	TPC Key Issue	Previous MPDC Response
42.	<i>A single consolidated and internally consistent set of architectural and landscape drawings that describe the project in detail (including all the elements referenced under part A above) and include visualisations.</i>	Please see the updated consolidated response of additional information provided at Item 2.
43.	<i>Greater resolution of the architectural, urban and landscape design solutions and commensurate detail in the drawings, consistent with normal practice for State significant development projects in Australia.</i>	Please see the updated consolidated response of additional information provided at Item 2.
44.	<i>A site plan of the full project site (including all 'incidental or related use and development', as described under part A above.</i>	We would appreciate further particulars with respect to this request, noting that the following Reports have already been provided to the Commission: ▪ Appendix GG – Site Development Plan; and ▪ Appendix JJ – Mac Point Precinct Plan. Please see the updated consolidated response of additional information provided at Item 2.
45.	<i>A plan of subdivision.</i>	Please see the subdivision plan provided in response to this item at Annexure W.
46.	<i>A site and floor plan of the full site with accompanying statement showing clearly and explicitly:</i> • <i>what is included in the cost plan relied on;</i> • <i>what is not included;</i> • <i>how the latter is proposed be delivered (staging in relation to the costed works);</i> • <i>how it is proposed to be funded; and</i> ▪ <i>proposed staging, timeframes and interdependencies of key elements, and including critical path sequencing for such works.</i> <i>This should include Enabling Works, Early Works and Main Works as described in the Construction Management Plan (Appendix AA).</i>	We continue to manage the site including remediation, removal, replacement and upgrades of utilities, supporting interim activation activities, planning for and supporting more permanent development and working collaboratively with neighbours, including in relation to other works planned and being undertaken near the site. For example, the Corporation meets regularly with TasWater and has provided access to a section of the site to support TasWater to have lay down space and to access a section of TasPorts land to progress the relocation of its existing wastewater treatment facility on nearby land owned by TasWater. Working closely with other parties is important normal activity for the Corporation and helps inform work programming, however, approvals are not being sought for works planned or being undertaken by those, and we are not the proponent for these. It is unclear how the requested additional information would benefit the Commission in undertaking its assessment of the PoSS against the Guidelines. Many of these matters are not of the nature that would be typical for an assessment under the Resource Management and Planning System of Tasmania.
47.	<i>A statement from the structural engineers stating their level of confidence that the roof structure and associated heights, form and detail is achievable.</i>	It is noted that designs have been developed, with specialised engineers being a core part of the development and design team. This includes AECOM and Schlaich Bergermann Partner (SBP) who bring experience in delivering stadium roof structures. It is unclear why a statement is required to verify the engineering work submitted. It is noted no other verification statements are sought in relation to other elements of the design or to confirm the professional work or integrity of the work prepared. It is unclear how this information would benefit the Commission in undertaking its assessment of the POSS against the Guidelines. This matter is not of the nature that would be typical for an assessment of a project under the Resource Management and Planning System of Tasmania. A statement from Schlaich bergermann partner regarding the roof structure is provided in response to this item at Annexure X.
48.	<i>Key reports that are referred to but not provided (for example, the Emergency Management Plan that is related to critical incidents and public safety).</i>	It would be appreciated if the Commission could specify exactly which reports it is requesting. In relation to an emergency management plan, we note that an Emergency Management Report has been provided in Appendix CC. It would be uncommon for a Emergency Management Plan to be provided as part of an assessment of a project under the Resource Management and Planning System of Tasmania. An emergency response management plan is proposed as part of the proposed Operation Environment Management Plan, pursuant to condition 5.3.1.3 in Part 2 of Schedule A of the proposed conditions. Information in response to this item can be found at Annexure V of our submission of 31 January.
49.	<i>Accommodation schedules, Gross Floor Area (GFA) and Net Lettable Area (NLA) schedules associated with each proposed use, including details of commercial tenancies.</i>	It is noted that this is additional to the information that is sought in the Guidelines. We have prepared a summary of the opportunities for commercial tenancies in response to this request at Annexure Y. Gross Floor Areas information is provided at Annexure C. Information was also provided at Annexure B and Annexure Y of our submission of 31 January. Please see the updated consolidated response of additional information provided at Item 2.
50.	<i>Contingencies (plans and costs) for key risks (for example, if extent of soil contamination is greater than anticipated - remediation, program, cost and time contingencies).</i>	We have a detailed knowledge of the site including remediation completed and contamination levels, which have been verified by testing and an independent environmental audit process. The project includes contingency allocations. The working cost plan summary as at concept design is available on the Corporation's website at www.macpoint.com/stadium-poss-application, which shows contingencies have been included, as is standard in large projects. In respect of other matters, these are not of the nature that would be typical for an assessment under the Resource Management and Planning System of Tasmania.
51.	<i>A concept servicing plan for water and sewer services and diversions.</i>	Please see the updated consolidated response of additional information provided at Item 2.
52.	<i>Visualisations (in accordance with professionally developed and accepted guidelines) and elevation plans/sections showing the impact and effect of the proposal on each identified place and precinct of historic cultural heritage significance, from a range of relevant locations, as indicated in section 5.3.5 of the Guidelines.</i>	Visualisations provided in response to this request are referenced at item 15.
53.	<i>A comprehensive set of visualisations (in accordance with professionally developed and accepted guidelines) and elevation plans/sections showing the effects of the proposal on the landscape and townscape character of the project site and broader area and specific static and sequential views into and out of the site, responding to each of the specific matters in section 4.1 of the Guidelines.</i>	Visualisations provided in response to this request are referenced at item 15.

No.	TPC Key Issue	Previous MPDC Response
54.	<i>Visualisations are to include the visual experience from residential suburbs on both the western and eastern shore, and people's visual and spatial experience of the project based on evidence of where pedestrians move and spend time in the broader area around the project site and the city.</i>	Visualisations provided in response to this request are referenced at item 15. Please note visualisations are provided as per the standards for visualisations.
55.	<i>All visualisations and elevations provided in the reports are to include the location and area of the stadium name sign.</i>	Visualisations provided in response to this request are referenced at item 15.
56.	<i>The accuracy of photomontages is to be verified through the provision of suitable information including the location and elevation of the camera viewpoint, identified reference points within the field of view and for the model of the stadium.</i>	Visualisations provided in response to this request are referenced at item 15.
57.	<i>The Guidelines for the project outline the basis of assessment method and information that will enable the Commission to assess, through comparison, the effect of the "with-the-stadium" and "without-the-stadium" scenarios for Tasmania. To assist the Commission with its assessment of economic matters the following information is requested: The estimates and projections used in the economic and financial reports are to be based on the full capital costs required for the full operation of the stadium to realise stated benefits. Specifically, these costs are to include the cost associated with the provision or development of services and infrastructure that are necessary for the project to operate (Including, for instance, the northern access road). The basis for doing this is outlined Infrastructure Australia Guide to Economic Appraisal 2021, including on page 26.</i>	The scope of the economic and social analysis that has been undertaken is in keeping with the scope of the Project as outlined in our submission and referred to above in item 1. A letter responding to this request is referenced at item 8.
58.	<i>The reports are to provide and be based on the best estimate of this total capital cost at the present time, broken into the key components with year-by-year total capital cost estimates, and for these estimates to be used consistently through the proponent's economic and financial models.</i>	The scope of the economic and social analysis that has been undertaken is in keeping with the scope of the Project as outlined in our submission and referred to above in item 1. Please see the supplementary economic report referenced at item 11. A spreadsheet providing the key components cost is provided at Annexure Z.
59.	<i>The information provided in each of the economic and financial reports, is to be consistently applied to "base", "optimistic" and "pessimistic" cases, based on plausible variations in estimates and assumptions, given the early-stage base estimates for capital and other inputs presented in the submission.</i>	Please see the supplementary economic report referenced at item 11
60.	<i>Numbers for costs and revenue / benefits are to be used consistently, through the economic and financial reports. For example, the estimated full cost including the required supporting works (but not after subtracting the undefined "value-management" activities), impacted by for example a 20 per cent variation in total capital cost – whether through construction delay or initial "underestimation" in the planning process. A "delay scenario" should take into account the penalties that State would face under the agreement with the AFL.</i>	Please see the supplementary economic report referenced at item 11
61.	<i>The Financial Impact Assessment is to be revised so that it can provide information on the likely impact on the State's finances of building and operating the stadium. Specifically the reports are to:</i> <i>remove non-incremental revenue – (ie the revenue earned by other stadia or venues;</i> <i>include debt-servicing costs (noting that under the limited-scope capital cost provided in the proponent's submission, the State is required to borrow \$375 million as its initial contribution and there is a further \$145 million to be funded); and</i> <i>include the cumulative impact on future deficits and debt services costs of the State borrowing to fund all capital works and all ongoing operational deficits.</i> <i>For each scenario:</i> <i>the revised modelling of debt servicing is to reflect the difference between the full capital cost estimates and the known external funding contributions (ie from the Commonwealth and the AFL); and</i> <i>modelling is to remove non-incremental revenue (from activities that already exist as identified in the report) where this accrues to stadia and venues already owned, operated or otherwise controlled by the State.</i>	As noted in our covering letter, we have responded to the Guidelines and this request for additional information in our capacity as being responsible for progressing the Project within our functions as set out in the <i>Macquarie Point Development Corporation Act 2012</i> . The scope of the economic and social analysis that has been undertaken is in keeping with the scope of the Project as outlined in our submission and referred to above in item 1. Please see the supplementary economic report referenced at item 11
62.	<i>The base assumptions for level of interstate visitors and nights stayed by visitors is to be revised to show actual assumptions, that is:</i> <i>average assumed % of total interstate visitors 25%;</i> <i>average assumed % of additional interstate visitors 18% (72% of total); and</i> <i>average assumed night stayed for each additional interstate visitor 4.3.</i>	Please see the supplementary economic report referenced at item 11
63.	<i>As part of the provision of base, optimistic and pessimistic cases the following alternative assumptions are to be modelled:</i>	As referenced in the associated reports, the base scenario includes conservative estimates of the benefits of the project. Please see the supplementary economic report referenced at item 11

No.	TPC Key Issue	Previous MPDC Response
	• average assumed % of total inter-state visitors 20% (rather than 25%); • average assumed % of additional inter-state visitors 14.5% (rather than 18%); • average assumed night stayed for each additional interstate visitor 3.1 (rather than 4.3); • 20% reduction in the assumed number of Tasmanians avoiding interstate travel; and • 20% reduction in the assumed nights stayed for Tasmanians avoiding interstate travel.	
64.	Information and data is to be provided that provides the basis of base and optimistic cases for: • the planned capacity and assumed utilization of the stadium and how this relates to the capacity and attendance of stadiums in Tasmanian and relevant comparably sized stadiums in other states; and • attendance level for AFL games and how this relates to attendance of AFL games currently in Tasmania (which would be projected in the 'without-stadium' scenarios).	Please see the supplementary economic report referenced at item 11
65.	An independent professional report accurately detailing relevant principles and mapped concepts of the existing Sullivans Cove Planning Review 1991 and objectively stating the degree to which the project (including its built form, massing, bulk, scale, alignment, orientation, detail and landscaping) complies with or is at odds with these principles/concepts, as indicated in section 4.2 of the Guidelines.	Please see the updated planning report referenced at Item 6.
66.	Transport / mode share scenarios • Further information to describe the expected / preferred and travel patterns and behaviour for residents in southern Tasmanian. The reports should detail the changes that are required, in terms of time, cost, flexibility and convenience, that are needed to alter a P50 / expected travel behaviour to the planned mode share. • Transport scenarios presented should include: ○ a high level of event patron demand for social activities in the Hobart CDB / waterfront for periods both prior to and following events at the stadium; ○ an equal use of the stadium for the southern Tasmanian residents within a 90 minute drive of the CBD; ○ a high proportion/P10 use of private cars to travel to the stadium/locality/area; and ○ a low level of use by interstate visitors.	Please see the supplementary transport report referenced at item 22.
67.	Parking • Maps and information on the potential / current availability of carparking (on-street, formal and multi storey) within a 30 minute walking distance to the stadium. • Actions the proponent is proposing to take to provide or restrict the use of new or existing car parking are to be outlined. Where these actions relate to responsibilities of other authorities, identify the outcomes and the extent of any agreement with those authorities.	Please see the supplementary transport report referenced at item 22.
68.	Pedestrian Movement • Peak pedestrian movement scenarios are to include a high level of event patron demand for social activities in the Hobart waterfront / CBD locality prior to and following an event. • A specific pedestrian movement scenario based on a high level of movement to events at the Princes Wharf/Salamanca Place locality following an event at the stadium should be given. • The reports are to present maps that show the routes and volumes associated with pedestrians having safe, visible, amenable, direct and convenient access to and from the stadium. • The reports are to provide details and plans of the infrastructure, routes and queuing areas associated with pedestrians having safe, visible, amenable, direct and convenient access to and from the stadium under a range of likely peak pedestrian movement scenarios.	Please see the supplementary transport report referenced at item 22.
69.	Emergency Management • The reports are to provide details and plans of the volumes of people, routes and spaces within the stadium, the site and external to the site that enable safe and orderly emergency evacuation to safe areas and / or assembly areas for spectators / staff. • Evacuation plans are to: ○ consider a range of scenarios and the assumptions on timeframes and volumes for evacuation and assume a high level of traffic on surrounding roads. The assumptions for these scenarios are to be explicitly stated; and ○ be informed by simulation modelling of pedestrian movement patterns.	Please see emergency management advice referenced at item 40.

No.	TPC Key Issue	Previous MPDC Response
70.	Mass Transport Services - The reports should provide a strategy for the delivery of proposed event bus service that details the routes, frequency and duration of bus services, cost to users and total user travel times. - Plans of infrastructure required to operate the proposed event bus service at the Stadium / CBD pick up drop off location including bus and passenger queuing and boarding information is to be provided.	Please see the supplementary transport report referenced at item 22.
71.	Transport Infrastructure - Plans for new or altered infrastructure associated with: - the northern access road, - use of event bus and ride share vehicles - pedestrian and cycle routes as part of the overall development plans for the site. - The project description to include a detailed description of the transport infrastructure and services necessary for the stadium to operate as proposed and to realise stated benefits and how this relates to the operation of land uses and infrastructure that exist or are proposed in the locality.	Please see the supplementary transport report referenced at item 22.
72.	Ground Water - A Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) is sought that reflects strategies for groundwater that are based on technical inputs including estimated inflows rates, values and quality, to demonstrate their suitability and practicality of proposed strategies. - A Groundwater Impact Assessment report is sought that documents potential risks and impacts related to groundwater during the construction and operation of the project, including: - the potential interaction between groundwater, surface water features and any proposed stormwater management for the project; - volumes, quality, inflow rates and potential treatment and storage of groundwater requiring extraction during the construction and operation of the project; and - impact to sensitive receptors or receiving environments, including environmental values and water bodies, and surrounding infrastructure due to changes in groundwater levels and water quality associated with the construction and operation of the project, such as: - changes to water quality associated with transportation of onsite and offsite contaminants - exposure of potential acid sulfate / acid sulfate soils (PASS/ASS) and/or saltwater intrusion - discharge of poor-quality groundwater to receiving environments - settlement resulting from drained soils (including at onsite and offsite infrastructure) - groundwater fluctuations related to buried segments of Hobart Rivulet.	Please see the additional environmental condition information referenced at item 32. Please see information in relation to the construction management plan at item 39.
73.	Solid Waste and Hazardous Material Management - Estimated volumes and weight of excavated materials, including the carpark construction. - Details of how the management of potentially contaminated soil and all types of confirmed contaminated soil (Level 2, 3 and 4) impacts the constructability, programming and management of the project. - Information on where materials are proposed to be disposed of, the capacity of proposed landfill destinations to accommodate proposed volumes and any logistical or financial requirements for additional landfill infrastructure.	Please see the additional environmental condition information referenced at item 32.
74.	Site Suitability Assessment - Information that shows what use and development proposal existing site suitability statements relate to. - Information that addresses gaps that are identified within the Site Remediation Strategy, as well as in relation to the full scope of the site as assessed by the Commission. - New or updated site suitability statements from an Environmental Auditor that relate to the proposed use and development.	Please see the additional environmental condition information referenced at item 32.

No.	TPC Key Issue	Previous MPDC Response
75.	<i>Unintentional errors in the reports as follows:</i> <i>‘Building elevations – east and west’ (MPS-COX-DR-01-A30-0000) and ‘site plan proposed’ (MPS-COX-DR-01-A11-2000) are missing from the primary set of plans;</i> <i>One of the plans provided is not identified in the drawing list (‘General arrangement northern car park’ - MPS-COX-DR-01-A20-0100);</i> <i>The North South elevation plans do not scale at 1:400 as stated;</i> <i>The summary report (7.2 on page 150) repeats the shadow diagrams for the summer solstice for all of the seasons (winter solstice, spring equinox and summer solstice); and</i> <i>Figure 14 on page 41 of the Heritage Impact Assessment (Appendix L) does not include on the plan the number notations that are referenced in the caption.</i>	Please see comments below: - MPS-COX-DR-01-A30-0000 is now replaced as MPMS-CXC-DR-01-A30-2000-1 and MPS-COX-DR-01-A11-2000 is now included, in Annexure B to our letter of 31 January - Now replaced by MPMS-CXC-DR-01-A12-0000 in Annexure B to our letter of 31 January - MPMS-CXC-DR-01-A30-2000-2 in Annexure B to our letter of 31 January now corrected the earlier issue - Now superseded by MPMS-CXC-DR-01-A80-0000 in Annexure B to our letter of 31 January