

**Simon Scott**

---

**From:** Rosemary Costin [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Friday, 30 December 2022 6:23 PM  
**To:** PAC  
**Subject:** Proposed Stadium Macquarie Point  
**Attachments:** Submission.docx

Dear Committee Secretary

I write in opposition to the proposed stadium and have attached my submission.

Kind regards

Rosemary Costin.

Simon Scott  
Committee Secretary  
Parliamentary Standing Committee of Public Accounts  
Parliament House  
HOBART TAS 7000

Dear Sir

**Re: Inquiry into the Tasmanian Government's process into the feasibility planning for a new sporting and event stadium in Hobart.**

**1. Process used to select Macquarie Point as the site for a proposed new stadium.**

It is astounding that the Tasmanian Government and the AFL, a commercial organisation, have decided how to use this prime waterfront land at Macquarie Point without consulting the Tasmanian community and ignoring the long-understood vision for Macquarie Point. A Master Development Plan had already indicated that 7 precincts would be established on the site with mixed use including spaces for the arts, a Truth and Reconciliation Park and public open spaces. The size required for the stadium will make it difficult to fulfill any of the other suggested uses for Macquarie Point other than in a very tokenistic way.

Additionally, a noisy stadium is not compatible with the adjacent Cenotaph or needs of visitors to the Cenotaph who require a place for quiet reflection and remembrance.

I am also embarrassed to see the Tasmanian Government so readily handing over prime waterfront land to the AFL, a commercial entity. The Government does not look decisive, it looks weak and an easy tackle by the AFL. Was the decision to build a stadium a result of standover tactics by the AFL?

"You can have your footy team but first give us Macquarie Point and a new Stadium."

The stadium will sever the view of the Derwent Estuary and meaningful connection of people to the Derwent Estuary. From a planning perspective, I believe that the Stadium will result in people relating to a functional artificially lit noisy commercial building rather than to a unique waterfront landscape connecting to the Derwent Estuary and the skyline.

The State Government has announced that it will now undertake analysis of the site's suitability, the stadium's functionality, a traffic analysis, planning and procurement pathways. Surely this analysis should have been undertaken **before** the State Government decided to commit a substantial sum to the project.

**2. How a new roofed stadium became a condition of a licence to enter the AFL.**

I am curious why a roofed stadium became a condition of a licence to enter the AFL when this condition was not imposed on other states. Is it because the Tasmanian Government will agree to any conditions demanded by the AFL to have a Tasmanian team? From the sidelines it looks like the Government was "blackmailed" into bankrolling a new stadium for the AFL and providing a choice

block of waterfront real estate. I believe this does not demonstrate that Tasmania is “ open to business”, but rather, Tasmania is the “Pushover State.”

**3. The figures and assumptions contained within any State Government commissioned reports and economic impact assessments of the proposed Macquarie Point stadium; including any subsidies required and assessments of any ongoing operating costs.**

Amusing that the Tasmanian Government has quoted interstate celebrities, sporting entities, and overseas entertainers as part of the evidence that the Stadium build is forecast to be economically sound. I would like to see an analysis of how the build will impact on the supply of existing tradespeople and businesses available for the affordable housing projects that Tasmania so desperately requires. Will Tradies vote with their feet and elect to work on the Stadium ? The final business case figures for the stadium are different from the initial quoted costs for the Stadium and quite frankly, this makes the whole business case look like a set of “ rubbery figures” cooked up on the run or in a quick scrum with the AFL. Can the Tasmanian Government demonstrate which essential services in Tasmanian will be cut, frozen or neglected because of the costs to build the Stadium? Affordable Housing? Health Services? Education?

**4. The Tasmanian Government’s expectation regarding financial contributions from the Australian Government, AFL and third parties.**

We don’t need a stadium to watch the ball being passed; its already in play with the Federal Government expected to “ cough up “ a substantial \$240 million. The stadium has not been an existing priority for Federal government funding so it is unrealistic to expect that the Federal government would quickly agree to fund the project. It would require the Commonwealth to make a considered assessment, and this would delay the proposed commencement of the build. Investors for the remaining \$85 million have not been identified. As the Stadium proposal does not have a clear social licence or bipartisan support from all political parties, there is a risk potential investors may be reluctant to commit in the short term.

**5. The level of borrowing and costs on the assumed \$375 million Tasmanian Government contribution to the construction of the proposed new stadium.**

What essential services in the short term will be cut, underfunded or frozen to finance the Stadium. Will future budgets for health/hospitals, affordable housing or public education be cut?

**6. The future of the Blundstone arena and UTAS Stadium , including State Government ownership and future capital and operational expenditure.**

Will the new Stadium erode the financial viability of the 2 existing stadiums in Hobart and Launceston and deplete the pool of willing sponsors available into the future? Tasmania already has two perfectly adequate stadiums that are able to be upgraded and maintained into the future. It is financially reckless to put these existing venues at risk.

**7. The role of the Major Stadiums business unit within State Growth and the newly established statutory authority Stadiums Tasmania in relation to the new stadium.**

The 2021-2022 budget papers indicate that \$65 million was allocated to the Stadium Authority Trust. The 2022-2023 budget papers list \$1250 000 for an AFL taskforce and Stadium feasibility study. Tasmania’s population is projected to rise to 528, 000 by June 2023. Already Tasmania requires investment in its essential services, particularly health, elective surgery wait lists, affordable housing, and education. Our health workforce is ageing and exhausted after managing Covid. People

are sleeping in the street; families are separated as they cannot find a home and children cannot succeed at school if their family is homeless. I know people waiting and waiting and waiting for so called “ elective surgery” , living in pain or having to lie down in a farm paddock “ to stuff my guts back in because I cant get a hernia repair at hospital” . **The unmet need in Tasmania is for these basic services, not an expensive stadium masquerading as a modern day “bread and circuses” political distraction.**

**8. Any other incidental matter incidental thereto.**

The roads into and out of Hobart in peak hour are clogged. Why add to this mess by proposing to build a major piece of infrastructure to funnel in more traffic? It is concerning that rapid access to the Royal Hobart Hospital is already an issue at peak traffic times. How many people will die because they cannot get to the door of the RHH?

The Tasmanian Government needs to gain a social licence for the project by taking it to the next State election.

The Tasmanian Government have allowed themselves and Tasmania’s budget to be taken hostage by the AFL. Or did they sign up to this circus willingly? The original issue at stake is a Tassie team , not funnelling off millions of dollars from the State budget to build an unnecessary stadium when alternatives already exist .

It is the Stadium that should be on an “elective” waiting list, not the many Tasmanians suffering disability, pain, poor health, and homelessness.

Yours sincerely

Rosemary Costin

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

30/12/2022