

From: [REDACTED]
 To: PAC
 Subject: Submission against the proposed AFL stadium
 Date: Sunday, 5 February 2023 6:28:34 PM

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: Janet Hohnen

Your email: [REDACTED]

Additional If built, no doubt with time and cost blowouts, this huge complex

comments::

used/underused for a few days per year, would completely alter or eliminate those unique heritage, visual, environmental and 'human scale' attributes which characterise Hobart and set it apart from other Australian cities. This top down/ blackmailing approach to planning such a huge new feature in the most historic and strategically located area of the city, is not the right way to approach critical decision making. Previous Tasmanian governments have form in this arena (remember Gunns, pokie/casino monopoly, old growth forests etc). Beware! There is considerable uncertainty among AFL aficionados about whether the planned structure would even attract AFL spectators. AFL pays No Tax - no contribution to government finances, despite operating as a ruthless for-profit business and paying huge salaries to its top level officials. Instead it demands exorbitant taxpayer contributions- using funds which are sorely needed to help ordinary Tasmanians with the basic health, housing and education support to which they are entitled. I do not support this proposal