

Parliamentary Inquiry into Macquarie Point Stadium
Dept Premier and Cabinet, Dept State Growth.

Friday 10 Feb 2023

To whom it may concern:

We understand the attraction of a big one-off construction project, as part of the building -led recovery. However, our concerns are that with society falling apart in so many ways, some are listed below, a stadium is not the answer.

Why do 67% of Tasmanians reject the idea of this costly project? There are various reasons.

1. Use Tassie's existing stadiums better

Whilst an AFL team is supported, we have 2 current stadiums which are fit for purpose and are NEVER full during games.

Why does the AFL hold the power to demand this big spend before approving a 19th AFL team?

The new team should not be conditional on a stadium at Macquarie Point.

2. Use the money elsewhere on essential services

Tasmania desperately needs investment in people and HR right now. We are looking at a huge shortfall in GPs, bus drivers, Council planning staff and general workers, teachers, and nurseries where sadly, double shifts are considered normal these days.

It is critical that the need for personnel in all these public areas, and others, is addressed.

Essential workers who give so much to community should be remunerated better, with necessary safety measures also taken, as in the most recent case of the Metro bus drivers.

3. The Business Case for the stadium remains unconvincing

Reading the business case as posted online, it appears that the stadium is predicated on over 300 days of "activation", or 44 events a year.

Perth's stadium is an interesting example. They have a city of 1-2 million people, 2 well-supported AFL teams, the stadium is well serviced by trains. Their stadium was meant to be \$.75m and it virtually doubled in cost. I do not think it is a roofed stadium. Other similar sized cities to Hobart could be investigated by this committee.

The Commonwealth contribution sought by our state government of at least \$240m for a Hobart stadium would surely later be diverted from other areas of urgent need in Tas.

Also, we understand in the long run, there may only be a return of 50c in the \$1. Over 20 years it will be a loss maker to the tune of \$306 million according to MI Global Partners.

4. Supporters quoted on DSG website are not necessarily independent

Luke Martin and others who champion the cause may well have a vested interest in the building of the stadium. This should be investigated.

Thank you for this opportunity to comment. We look forward to hearing more detail from the government as to why this will be a success for all Tasmanians. There are many state and federal politicians of all persuasions who do not support this project.

Best regards,

Anne Harrison