From: [redacted]
To: PAC
Subject: Submission against the proposed AFL stadium
Date: Thursday, 9 February 2023 10:41:07 AM

I am against the proposed AFL Stadium at Macquarie Point for the following reasons:

The proposed stadium is simply too big in height and scale. It would dominate the harbour, river and foreshore.

The proposed stadium would eliminate the peaceful and serene, open-air, wide-view aspects of, and toward, the Cenotaph. The Cenotaph and memorial services would be overshadowed by the height and bulk of this stadium.

The heritage-listed goods shed, recently refurbished with plans in place for a 2,500sqm events area, would be demolished if the stadium goes ahead. The Longhouse, which the aboriginal Community has been developing as a meeting area with food gardens attached would be lost.

There has been no consultation with the community about this proposal. A packed Hobart Town Hall meeting, in November 2022, clearly showed that the residents do not want this stadium.

There's been no thorough, evidence-based analysis of the economic and social benefits to the community, comparing this proposal to other options for Macquarie Point.

Once the construction is finished, most stadiums generate only a few jobs because such sites are exceedingly under-used. Other options for Macquarie Point would provide more ongoing jobs, economic stimulus and improve the livability of Hobart.

The Government's stadium business case suggests the new stadium will host 7 AFL games per year, and yet the AFL dictates how and where the stadium should be built. The AFL is proposing to pay just 2% of the proposed total cost of $750M+.

The Stadium business case finds only a 50 cent return for every dollar invested in the project (a Benefit Cost Ratio of 0.5), noting that "social infrastructure such as stadiums rarely return a Benefit Cost ratio above 1.0 and usually the economic costs will outweigh the identifiable and quantifiable economic benefits."

A cost-benefit analysis from MI Global Partners, commissioned by the Tasmanian government last year shows that the stadium will lose $300 million over 20 years of operation. This does not include the costs of supporting an AFL team in the state.

The case does not properly look at upgrading the 19,000 seat Bellerive Oval. The average AFL attendances for the past 5 years at Bellerive have been:
2022 – 7,141
2021 – 5,394
2020 – 9,882
2019 – 10,879
2018 – 10,920

Simply put, a 19,000 seat stadium is quite adequate for years ahead.

With so much money ($750m+) being spent on the stadium, it's likely that the state and federal governments would be forced to spend less than otherwise on health, housing, education, and public transport.

Your name: Sharon Armstrong
Your email: [redacted]
Additional The amount of money already spent on studies and proposals for

comments::	Macquarie Point delivered a great plan with the site being used for cultural and entertainment and science based facilities. This has now just been thrown out the window by a sports-focused (to the detriment of any other possibility) government. Tasmanians deserve a site that compares with South Bank in Brisbane - so good it was the Expo 88 site. Could we really say the same for Macquarie Point? Not with an AFL stadium we won't! We already have a stadium at Bellerive more than big enough. It is currently good enough for the AFL teams from Melbourne to play but suddenly it's not good enough for our own "team"? As a Tasmanian ratepayer, taxpayer, and resident, I do not support this site being used for sports. I do not support my tax dollars being used for the promotion of AFL by being strong-armed by the AFL hierarchy who blackmail Tasmania by making us construct an over the top stadium in order to allow a home based AFL team. This condition was never placed on other cities and it should not be placed on ours; let alone that we are using an historic site and destroying what heritage is left there all for the promotion of sport.