

From: [Sally Curry](#)
To: [PAC](#)
Subject: My PAC submission
Date: Wednesday, 22 November 2023 5:17:23 AM

I love my city of Hobart; the waterfront is part of the city's character . The stadium robs Tasmanians of all opportunities provided by a prime waterfront site in their capital city.

This project clearly fails to comply with the Sullivans Cove Planning Scheme. It breaches many of the principles of the scheme, designed to protect the cultural heritage of Hobart's waterfront precinct.

By any standard, the agreement negotiated by the Tasmanian Government has been a sell-out of Tasmanian interests, including giving away access to public land (Macquarie Point) that some describe as our Sydney Opera House site. The Tasmanian Government hasn't just helped out with the establishment of a Tasmanian AFL club, it has entered into a highly risky business venture with the AFL, where the AFL bears no risk and where the anticipated costs of this project will escalate rapidly. Tasmania can't afford the opportunity costs of spending \$700M+ on an underused facility when there are more important budgetary needs in health / housing / education.

We still have no idea of the actual spend, because the Government has, incredibly, avoided costing the entire development with major roadworks off Hobart's busiest arterial road, major public transport infrastructure, redevelopment of Macquarie Wharf, removal of the sewerage works, and mass parking facilities.

All financial assumptions need to be visible and challenged on revenue and cost. The proposal needs to face normal scrutiny of any government infrastructure project. Community values and outcomes need to be included

The Government's own Reports 'base case' assumes that, without a Stadium precinct, nothing will be built on the Macquarie Point site. But the ultimate reason the project is so destructive of social and economic value is that a sportsground better sited elsewhere, and inappropriate for this unique harbourside site adjacent to Hobart's iconic waterfront and the inner city, would prevent this area from being transformed into a visionary and iconic place for Hobart, and for Tasmania – a place that potentially provides for housing, focuses on reconciliation, and celebrates the site's attributes with its proximity to the river, its mountain views and Aboriginal history. This is the alternative option that a properly conducted cost benefit analysis ought to consider. Tasmania doesn't need a costly 3rd stadium.

The AFL should not be making overburdening demands on the community or 'determining' (and 'owning') the fabric of the city. There are other feasible locations that would consolidate existing sporting infrastructure. The AFL has ensured that its venture into Tasmania comes at barely no cost to the AFL and carries absolutely no risk to it at all.

We do not need a new stadium at all, we already have the Blundstone Arena and the UTAS stadium.

Sally Curry

