

From: [REDACTED]
To: PAC
Subject: Submission against the proposed AFL stadium
Date: Tuesday, 7 February 2023 12:09:00 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: John Borojevic
Your email: [REDACTED]
Additional The State Government shouldn't be blackmailed by the AFL into

comments::

creating a stadium so that we can have an AFL Team. The AFL generously funded the creation of GWS and Gold Coast and didn't require their respective state governments to create dedicated stadia (and the AFL is still funding GWS and Gold Coast!). So why require a (roofed) stadium of Tasmania and only offer a piddling 2% of the cost. I would rather not have a team and cancel the current Hawks and Roos contracts than submit to the AFL's bullying, despicable and duplicitous tactics. Tasmania has many more pressing needs - housing, health, education and public transport to name a few - that would be better served by \$750 million and which would have far better cost-benefit ratio outcomes. Tasmania should not have people begging or sleeping on the streets (outside the P.O. on Main Rd Moonah in recent weeks!), or in tents on The Domain and beside the Southern Outlet. A fraction of \$750 million can fix homelessness and reduce all the problems it exacerbates (crime, mental health issues, general health issues etc). We already have historically low unemployment and a shortage of building tradespeople, so a stimulus infrastructure build like this is unnecessary for jobs, will be very difficult to deliver and will detract from the workforce needed to deliver desperately needed housing for homeless Tasmanians. How can our Housing Minister, or our Health Minister support this? We already have higher levels of tourism than many Tasmanians would wish for, we don't need a stadium to deliver (dubious at best) tourism benefits. Hobart's entertainment precinct (the docks, Salamanca) and close-by CBD, mid-town and North Hobart are already vibrant. We don't need a stadium to "revitalise" anything, our entertainment precinct vital signs are all good. And big international acts won't come to Tasmania, transporting their heavy equipment here is too hard and costly. Our airport can't even cope with some of their plane sizes. Better to spend a fraction of this money supporting our quality local entertainment and events, especially those outside Hobart like Festivale and Unconformity to better spread the tourism spend across the state. If the Tasmanian Government is to spend on sporting infrastructure how about a fraction of this \$750 million is spent on high and growing participation sports like basketball, soccer and netball which have been massively underfunded on a per-participant level compared to Aussie Rules football and have inadequate and crumbling infrastructure (the decrepit Moonah Sports Centre being one example). Also spend more on supporting minor sports to grow. (One could argue in terms of actual participation in playing Aussie Rules is almost a minority sport now - but it gets the lions share of state sports funds which is unjust and inequitable.) There are so many better things on which to spend \$750 million. I could go on, but won't. Just don't waste this money on a stadium. Just don't!