

From: [REDACTED]
To: [PAC](#)
Subject: Submission against the proposed AFL stadium
Date: Friday, 10 February 2023 8:16:58 AM

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: Sue and Gavin Miller
Your email: [REDACTED]
Additional The AFL proposal needs an economic evaluation. A new stadium

comments::

would doubtless come with advertising screens and promotional opportunities. The tax payer would pay for this commercial infrastructure, yet the profits go to the AFL or whoever runs the advertising contracts. It seems that Tasmania having an AFL team is being used to leverage this arrangement. Also, for governments to be so fond of sport is a concern. We have had cheating, doping, racism, sexism, promotion of gambling to minors - and now, it seems, profiteering. Government should be curbing the excesses of sport, not supporting it. Such an expensive installation for such limited use is of real concern, as are the skewed profits. No return for the taxpayer there. But all this pales against the major drawback - Hobart gets an awful eyesore on the Derwent. -- Gavin Miller Say no to a football city! I desperately don't want Hobart to be turned into a football city! That is so not the image we should have! The thought of a huge football stadium competing with our beautiful harbour, mountain and heritage architecture just doesn't fit! (Let alone the dubious reputation of the game.) The stadium will not help solve our housing crisis. Perhaps instead, consider a small, well-designed sustainably managed village of attractive government owned, rental cottages and apartments. Trees, a village green, paths and cycle tracks, community vegetable gardens, medical centre, recycling priorities, collective work areas and corner shops; it could go a long way towards helping so many of our citizens. The area could look a bit like Battery Point and even reflect elements of Wapping. The whole concept would be something we could all be proud of. I think the decision to support the stadium is irresponsible and selfish. In fact it's a kick in the face for those who have put in years of thought, planning and action to create our present unique clean, green, image in order to preserve what we really love about our island home. ((That is are our "point of difference" and it works.) Remember our clean fresh air, our vast, sparkling harbour, snow covered mountain, our heritage buildings, vibrant art scene, beautiful houses, our beaches, parks and gardens and amazing views. We must concentrate on that goal, don't be persuaded to get diverted and lose the plot. This stadium is not the direction we want to follow! It will wreck our image and reputation. Imagine what damage the press could do if they could report a scandal during an important match! -- Sue Miller