From: [redacted]
To: PAC
Subject: Submission against the proposed AFL stadium
Date: Thursday, 9 February 2023 3:11:45 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:	Cheryl Lalor
Your email:	[redacted]
Additional	The site suggested for the new football stadium is the Hobart

comments::	equivalent to Bennelong Point in Sydney. This says so much about the Tasmanian Government's priorities. The estimated $750,000 cost should be spent on facilities that promote the health and welfare of the people of Tasmania - which at the moment are drastically underfunded. The whole proposal - reliant on funding from AFL Australia- ignores the fact that we already have two AFL stadia which currently are never fully used. Interest in AFL at the grass root level has dropped to the extent that it's difficult for districts to raise local teams. Young people seem not to be interested in playing the game now. The big question is WHY the government thinks that this is a good idea!!!