

# PUBLIC

## THE PARLIAMENTARY STANDING COMMITTEE OF PUBLIC ACCOUNTS MET IN COMMITTEE ROOM 2, PARLIAMENT HOUSE, HOBART ON TUESDAY, 28 NOVEMBER 2023

### INQUIRY INTO THE TASMANIAN GOVERNMENT'S PROCESS INTO THE PROPOSED ARTS, ENTERTAINMENT AND SPORTS PRECINCT IN HOBART

**The Committee met at 10:23 am.**

**CHAIR** - Welcome to the Public Accounts Committee hearing. This is a public hearing. It is being transcribed by Hansard and it will be broadcast once they get someone there to do that. All the information you provide to the Committee today is covered by parliamentary privilege but that may not extend outside the meeting so just be cautious of that if you're speaking publicly in relation to the evidence you are giving today. If there is anything of a confidential nature you wish to discuss with the Committee, you can make that request. Otherwise, it's all public and it will form part of our transcript that will be published on the website and inform our report in the future.

Members of the Committee from my left are: Meg Webb, Member for Nelson; Simon Behrakis, Member for Clark; Ruth Forrest, Member for Murchison; Josh Willie, Member for Elwick; on the screen we have Shane Broad, Member for Braddon; and Lara Alexander, Member for Bass; so, three from each House.

I invite you to take the statutory declaration. The broadcast is on. We can start your opening statement.

Thank you for coming.

**Mr CHARLES TOUBER**, DIRECTOR, CHARLES TOUBER PRODUCTIONS PTY LTD  
WAS CALLED, MADE THE STATUTORY DECLARATION AND WAS EXAMINED.

**Mr TOUBER** - I will introduce myself to people who mightn't know much about me. My name's Charles Touber and for about 25 years I was a prominent and prolific promoter of popular music events in Tasmania. I've done many shows with international acts like the Foo Fighters, the Ramones, the White Stripes, Midnight Oil, Violent Femmes, Silverchair, Iggy Pop, the Pixies, the Beastie Boys, Billy Bragg, and Gurrumul, and larger-scale concerts outside with the likes of Elton John.

I also set up shows at the former DEC for acts like Elton John, Tina Turner, Status Quo, Bryan Adams, the Cranberries, John Farnham and Joe Cocker. I probably brought back the music festival, as we started doing music festivals in Tasmania with the Gone South Festival, which was early in the century and also experimented with and pioneered the concept of doing outdoor destination shows in different settings other than concert halls.

I was also involved in arranging and setting up the show of the largest attendance that I am aware of in Tasmania for popular music events - which was AC/DC at the TCA Ground on the Domain in 2001.

Having read a bit about it, including the Department of State Growth projections and their documents, it has been my view from the beginning that there is not the money nor the

## PUBLIC

population to sustain a stadium at Macquarie Point. Having read the document I don't think there has been any analysis to determine demand or any proper statistical work done to establish that they are going to get anything like the estimated annual attendances.

According to the Department of State Growth document and the estimates of annual attendance, the new stadium will attract 44 events a year. That's 44 very big events a year, nearly one a week. Twenty-eight of those are meant to be new to Tasmania and 16 re-homed or brought back into the stadium. If anyone can think of any current events in Tasmania which would get around 16,000 or so people which could come into the stadium, not including Symmons Plains Racing, then they are a better person than me.

When that got really interesting reading for me, and when I thought the work of fiction reached truly Olympic proportions, is when they went into the breakdown of the estimated attendance. They have said, per annum, 417,000 people - in the preamble it suggested 587,000 people per annum - I guess that 41,000 is a stress-factor number which is not predicated on a full house. Looking at it, as I read the document, the AFL accounts for only 112,000 of those, so the heavy lifting has got to be done somewhere else. AFL is only coming up with 25 per cent, so where are you going to get the rest? How are you going to get close to that attendance? It really is an exercise of reverse-engineering where people had to fill in boxes to try to make this work.

The report very helpfully suggests that you would get, possibly, six A-League soccer games per year or maybe a Matildas' or a Socceroos' game for a total of 69,000 people; an international rugby game, 18,400 people; seven NFL games, 104,000 people; and an international cricket game, 16,000 people.

My question would be whether there is a commitment from these sporting bodies for anything like this amount of contact. It is a gigantic amount of contact. Even if it was a spare sporting feature like an international rugby game, the bidding from other centres, which would be geographically and strategically better places than Hobart - I would have thought, would be considerable.

It also overlooks the ironclad rule of public events and that is that the more you stage, the greater the yield is going to go down. The more that you saturate a market, the less that you take out the discretionary spending and you make events less special. I could imagine if you had one A-League soccer game that might attract some interest, but if you have six of them plus rugby games, demand is just going to plummet.

I'd like to turn to my area of expertise, which is concerts. The projection there is a very, very rosy: 96,000 people over six concerts. They say they have conferred with experts. I don't know who they've conferred with. As I said, I think I have probably been involved in more concerts than anyone else and we didn't get any contact from them. I don't know what data they've got about ticket sales. I don't think they have any data. They should have all the data from the MyState and DEC ticket sales, and that would tell them the story.

They are talking about wanting to get concerts of 25,000 people. I can tell you now that the biggest attended concert in Tasmania this century was AC/DC at the Domain and that got 16,000 people, which I think is about the limit of what this population base can supply.

**CHAIR** - So, it wasn't sold out?

## PUBLIC

**Mr TOUBER** - No, it was not sold out. Absolutely not. To give this some context, they are suggesting that you would get six of these AC/DC concerts, which has happened once this century. I don't know what happened in the last century. It probably did not happen - and that's got to happen every year.

The next problem is just the availability of these shows. To even attract one of them, I think, is next to impossible. To give you some context about that issue, you might be aware that Taylor Swift is about to tour the country. She was slated to play a venue in Brisbane with a capacity of 50,000 people. When I say she declined, of course she did not decline - it is a business. Her money crunchers declined because they decided they could more efficiently generate a good bottom line by playing two venues, which was Melbourne and Sydney, and doing multiple shows there. There is a big advantage in doing multiple shows. You don't have to break down your gear and take it to another city.

People don't understand how few dates these rolled-gold acts have in Australia. Australia is a good market but it is a very small part of an international market. They are not on the road for many days a year anyway. They might go on a touring cycle every five years. Typically, they do five or six shows in Australia and that's it. It's not as if they have an endless capacity. So, they might be in Australia for 10 days.

To add to that complicating factor is the fact that these big shows, a stadium show, requires really specialised high-end gear, like huge staging requirements, really high-tech lighting, high-tech sound. That equipment, for good reason, because there is no demand, doesn't exist in Tasmania. If you had just one of those shows, all that equipment would have to be brought in on semi-trailers. It probably can't be flown in. I read a rumour once that MONA was saying that they had some interest from Coldplay. I don't know if that is true or not. But they couldn't land their plane here anyway, so they could not even get their gear into the State.

**CHAIR** - How many semi-trailers are we talking to stage something like that?

**Mr TOUBER** - I don't know. You might be talking about six. You are talking about a lot of equipment. I can't remember how many AC/DC brought with them. It was a lot. And since then, these shows have scaled up. It's not like the generic stage. They are really tailored to the act. Often, they might bring the stuff into the country to begin with. It certainly doesn't exist here. The hiring capacity to be able to supply much from Tasmania, probably you wouldn't. It would have to be brought in.

Not only does that add a big problem because it makes the concert much more costly to put on, but also there is the consideration, are you going to Tasmania, which is on the road to nowhere? It's the loop. It is not like jumping from Sydney to Brisbane. I have told you about how few days these acts are in the country. To do a Tasmanian date effectively blows out two days, so that makes it still more unlikely that one of these acts, on a financial basis, would be able to play here.

People misunderstand the size of the market here. That is why I really urge these people to get information about ticket sales and where those tickets are sold. People say, 'oh, we've got a captive market of 500,000', but we haven't in Hobart. I've always looked at it as a captive market of 250,000 and I base that assessment on where I've sold the tickets. They were very

## PUBLIC

hard to sell in the north of the state. I don't know why, but they were hard. This is mainly the international acts. It's not as if these were sort of meaningless acts, they were good acts. Not stadium acts but high-end international acts.

**CHAIR** - They would have also been performing in Melbourne at the same time.

**Mr TOUBER** - Yes, that's a good point. I'll get to that.

I probably sold 10 per cent to 15 per cent of the tickets in Launceston. On the north-west coast it was really hard, probably 5 per cent to 8 per cent of the tickets. You ask yourself why. I didn't really have data on that but there is a lot of anecdotal evidence to suggest that people would go to a Melbourne show. People understand if you've got a Hobart show, you're in effective competition with Melbourne because Melbourne, for a lot of people in this State, is easier to go to and more attractive to go to than travelling down to Hobart. So, in terms of the amount of people you've got to draw from, it's much less than people give credit for.

I've also been asked by a lot of people, the State Growth document suggests things like scaling up certain amounts of shows - like shows which are pre-existing now with a lesser capacity can go into a stadium. I'll tell you why I don't think that can happen. At the moment, I think MyState is a good maximum-capacity venue for this state. It could probably sustain a few shows at maximum capacity per annum. But if you get a maximum capacity show out there, it can't, as an ABC interviewer suggested to me, extrapolate to a 15,000 to 20,000-people crowd at another venue - an outside venue of a larger capacity.

Say we mention Midnight Oil as an example. Australian managers and promoters are very astute. They work on very tight margins: the tightest in the world probably. When they sold out that show, there might have been a bit of excess capacity. They might have had another 1,500 tickets in them, but that's it. Another venue won't, by virtue of being another venue, sell tickets for you. To scale up to go outside, which I suggested that some of these concerts which did go to the DEC, really, when you looked at the numbers, the amount of money that you had to spend to scale up a show to go outside just wasn't worth it. Then there are other factors involved making it difficult.

People have really got to get out of their head that just because it's a sell-out at 6,000, you could magically inflate that by three or four times, because it can't happen. You might get a few thousand extra.

Then there are the other sorts of concerts which I started to do in the Botanical Gardens. It's a different beast. It's a combination of the music and the destination, that's what you're selling. You're selling a package. People go to that because, obviously, they like the music. They like the experience of sitting outside being able to drink wine, sit on a blanket, have their specialty cheeses, be very comfortable and move around. Those people who you are selling that experience to are not after a stadium experience, which is sitting in a bucket seat. You would actually make the event less attractive by doing that.

The other concert-type events I thought of that attract significant numbers are festivals. You'll be aware that we had the Falls Festival here for many years. Those festivals might attract 10,000 or so people. But, once again, it is entirely different. What is drawing that is that, once again, it is about the festival. It's about kids, about some loose behaviour, about having fun, about camping, multiple stages, multiple acts.

## PUBLIC

It's been tried a few times in Australia, many years ago, when people have tried to turn a festival into a concert, into an arena. They were drastic failures, almighty failures, because it's a different thing. It's all about the destination. That's why they're getting more aggressive with destinations. You'll see concerts at Hanging Rock, for example. These are all about experiences. It's experience which is driving the ticket sales. It's a special experience. If you take that away, you are taking away a lot of the appeal of that concert.

The general public in Tasmania is particularly astute. One thing that I have found difficult is you have to get the venue size right. If they think a venue's too large, it seems there's a collective osmosis that no-one wants to go to a venue where they feel they're going to be rattling around. They want to be in something where there's a good atmosphere. That's why it's always dangerous to go into large venues. You want to get the fear of missing-out element when you're selling your tickets. The larger you get, the less of that you get. I'd suggest for a stadium, that's gone. Tasmania has a reputation for very late buying of tickets at the best of times. I would suggest that things like a big capacity really is a recipe for people just to hold on and wait.

I think we can draw some good lessons about what's happened in other places when they've done what's being proposed here for the Hobart Macquarie Point stadium. A good example I can think of, and an obvious example, is the stadium in Townsville, a northern Queensland stadium. I say it's a good comparison because Townsville has a population similar to our captive market of about 200 000. It's also regarded as a gateway or capital of northern Queensland so it has other places it can feed from, other cities. It's a good comparison to Hobart.

That stadium opened in 2020 with very high expectations. They wanted entertainment. They've had the grand total in four years of one show. That show was for the opening of the stadium, which was Elton John. I'd suggest it was probably financially incentivised so it's not a commercial deal. I don't think Elton John would go to Townsville on a normal tour. They made that work because they had to open the stadium. It would be instructive to listen to the very sage words of the mayor, Jenny Hill, who was reported to have said that:

The lack of shows has been a source of bitter disappointment.

She goes on to say:

You can't build stadiums and only have sports events.

That's her assessment. Her constituency was wanting a lot more than just the NFL games. They haven't got them, and I bet they don't have anything like the content which is in the Department of State Growth document, like the six soccer games, the international rugby game, the international cricket game. I think you should look at the content of what that stadium is going to be able to get because it is a very good comparison. Like Tasmania it's geographically isolated so the same things happen - a day wasted in the touring schedule just to do a show there.

I understand why people would like a stadium. I have heard for many years people say, 'Why can't we get the good acts down here? Why can't we get Taylor Swift, Harry Styles, Ed Sheeran, Rolling Stones, Adele, Bruce Springsteen? Why am I going to Melbourne to see

## PUBLIC

this?'. It doesn't take them very long to walk through why it is just logistically and mathematically - it's an exercise in maths and statistics - to say it's not possible. It's not viable, unless we inflate our population by 2 million people. It's a supply-and-demand curve. We just haven't got enough supply of people to go to the shows.

This project is kind of like a pack of cards. It rests on the foundations of its estimated demand or estimated attendances to generate the income that is needed. You take away the pillars, or take away a card, and it falls. The foundations are rotten to the core and it completely falls apart. As a business case, it's a basket case.

Not only do I fear that this State is going to have to shell out a lot of money for this stadium - it's not my area of expertise to talk about the costings of it, they've been questioned by a lot of people - the ongoing costs of running a stadium are massive. This stadium, they are suggesting, maybe \$6 million. Just to look after the turf is \$250,000 a year. I'm suggesting what will happen here is like what happened to the DEC but on a larger scale - the State will be tipping in money year in, year out.

There's a rule about stadiums, and it seems to be ironclad, that they need a re-fit every eight or so years. When I say a re-fit, it's not a lick of paint. They need substantial renovation to be comparable with an international standard. That might not be the same as the cost of the construction, but it would be substantial.

When people are looking at this project, they don't only need to talk about the economic case, which I think is completely unsustainable to build a stadium, but you've also got to think about the economics of what is going to happen in the years after that and what sort of drain that is going to be. I'll leave it at that.

**Mr WILLIE** - Thank you for your efforts bringing all these acts to Tasmania. Many Tasmanians have enjoyed those, including me. Your experience speaks for itself. On 12 May [2023] you wrote an opinion piece in the *Mercury* newspaper. In that opinion piece, you said that nobody from the Government had contacted you about running major events. I'm interested in whether they have since.

**Mr TOUBER** - No. And no-one seems to be interested in statistics. I think this is a mathematical exercise. Does it add up? Does it make sense? I think the whole project has been reverse-engineered from a concept to making a rationale for it. I think the rationale has been kicked down the stairs to some juniors to try to fill in some box to ask how are we going to get this number of people? Well, you can't.

I think it's astonishing that they haven't asked. I've been involved in more concerts than anyone else in this State [for] over 25 years. They haven't come and asked, 'Well, how many people do you actually get at these concerts? How many people buy tickets? Do you have any information about where you sell tickets?' I don't think they have done that. The anti-stadium lobby hasn't done it either.

Everyone seems to be arguing this on the basis of emotion. I can understand why there is emotion involved, but it really should be about what makes sense for this State financially, about the financial legacy. I think the statistics from the Derwent Entertainment Centre would be very useful. I don't believe they have ever been sourced. That would tell you a story. That

## PUBLIC

centre with a capacity of about 5,000 to 6,000 people hit a sweet spot when it first opened, but it fell away fairly quickly.

**Mr WILLIE** - The yield dropped, like you said earlier.

**Mr TOUBER** - The yield dropped - exactly what I was talking about - as these events became less special. Well, we do get a few of these acts here. I remember sitting in there with the tour promoter of the Eurythmics. He had just come backstage and was getting a ticking off from Dave Stewart. There were 3,000 people there and he said, 'Don't you think I'd be better employed spending my time on my career in New York than being here?'

How hard it is to sell tickets in Tasmania is really underestimated: 16,000 is good, but I have been involved with some real car crashes, and it shows you how hard it is to sell tickets, because it is such a fragile, temperamental, small market down here.

I had a bill which was an offshoot of the Bluesfest, which is a very successful event held every year in Byron Bay. We had headliners there with Keith Urban, John Fogerty, Ray Davies - a whole heap of really good international artists, plus a very deep bill of other international artists, really high-cred acts which we could not get to Tasmania before. We struggled to get to 4,000 people. In retrospect, it was probably because it was Easter, which is a shack season here. But it shows you how you just need something small to upset the apple cart here. You can't say to any tour promoter, or someone sitting overseas, 'Oh well, that date in Tasmania is in summer, people go to their shacks then'. It does not compute. They want a good concert but, obviously, it's the finances. That's why they do it.

**Mr WILLIE** - Talking the raw numbers, you have mentioned the six events at 16,100 attendees on average: How much will the Government have to underwrite those events to give promoters such as yourself confidence to even consider it?

**Mr TOUBER** - I don't know. I don't see how you are going to attract any of these acts, because they have too few dates in Australia, too short a time in Australia, and they are playing at venues with capacities of 50,000 people. You can do your sums yourself. These acts have a lot of people working for them, they are researching. If there was something suggested by a promoter in Tasmania which looked a bit different for them, they would have to really back that argument up with something. It wouldn't be, 'Oh look, I have a bit of money from the state Government to go down there', because it is all about the artist for them.

**Mr WILLIE** - So, no realistic amount of money from the State Government will attract the sorts of events they are talking about?

**Mr TOUBER** - The State Government was in partnership with the Southern Roots Festival, which is the one I was talking about with Keith Urban and John Fogerty.

**CHAIR** - The New South Wales Government?

**Mr TOUBER** - No, the Tasmanian Government. It was a generous amount but it was not enough because you are talking about many millions of dollars.

**Mr WILLIE** - For each event?

## PUBLIC

**Mr TOUBER** - Yes. That is exactly right. You know how much ticket prices are. That does not all go to the act, obviously, but it shows you -

**Mr BEHRAKIS** - How long ago was that?

**Mr TOUBER** - That was 2007.

**Mr WILLIE** - Will any acts come here because Tasmania is a destination and they can put it on their tour as a bit of a holiday in the tour? Do you ever see that happening?

**Mr TOUBER** - You are suggesting it is a sentimental business. It is about as sentimental as Bunnings. They employ a phalanx of people who are very good lawyers, very good accountants to look after their interests. It's not inconceivable that that could happen, that someone has a special, and someone says, 'Would you think about a date in Tasmania?'. But it would still probably get blown out for the reasons I have talked about.

AC/DC is a good case in point. People say, 'How did AC/DC get to Tasmania?' because that was unusual. It takes a special circumstance, and in that circumstance is the fact that AC/DC being an Australian act, their Australian touring cycles are faster than other international acts because they come back to the country. They had a policy which is pretty much that when they tour every five years, they do the capitals plus one regional. But if it wasn't AC/DC, if AC/DC hadn't been an Australian act, we wouldn't have got AC/DC. It's just because they had that little peculiarity which gave them that scope to include a Hobart date.

**Mr WILLIE** - In terms of the economic modelling, you talked about that in your opinion piece as well. You talked about ticket sales and that the DEC history might be useful.

**Mr TOUBER** - They need to put some numbers on this. They need realistic numbers about how many tickets have been sold, what the yield is going to be and how much it costs to put on these concerts. I can't tell you off the top of my head. That was a good question you asked: how much would it cost to incentivise the acts? But would a state government want to get into that business on an ongoing basis?

**Mr WILLIE** - That's what they have signed up to, really, haven't they?

**Mr TOUBER** - But you can't afford to. I bet you, if this stadium got built, that they'd pull a headliner from somewhere and that would be pumped up with public money. But you can't do that for - they're saying we get - six of those a year. You can't keep shelling out public money. It's not ancient Rome, it's not all bread and circuses.

**Mr WILLIE** - From memory, they've committed about \$5 million a year to attract the sporting events, let alone -

**Ms WEBB** - Actually, sorry to interrupt there, but in this MI Global Partners report from before, talking about for the whole 44 events per year, they're saying that this could be achieved with an additional acquisition budget of \$5.5 million, plus access to a risk pool for music content. What do you think of that suggestion?

**Mr TOUBER** - It just sounds like gobbledegook. It's acknowledging that it's financially unsustainable. It doesn't stack up as an idea financially to begin with. So, to say how much



## PUBLIC

you'd have to shell out on an annual basis, it would just be complete guesswork. It might be \$5 million, it might be \$20 million. You want to be in a position where you can't even do the vaguest standard of financial estimates? I mean, that's not a business model, that's just wishful thinking.

**CHAIR** - We're also seeing a lot of funding cuts to arts generally, at the moment.

**Dr BROAD** - The Government is claiming four events, 16,000, a year. What do you think is a more realistic? Do you think that one every four or five years, or the Townsville experience, is more realistic?

**Mr TOUBER** - I think that is realistic in the experience of Hobart, because we have the capacity to do outdoor shows like we did here with AC/DC. It happens maybe once every 20 years. I think there was a concert a bit before my time, with Dire Straits when they were at the peak of their powers, which would have been in the 1980s or something. They are the only two standalone concerts I can think of that would have got attendances which would be considered the equivalent of what you need at the Macquarie stadium. But even there, that's 16,000 people. They're talking about concerts where they're hoping for 25,000 to 30,000. Why would you think that's going to happen if it has never, ever happened in the history of Tasmania? It could have happened. We could have got an extra 5,000 or 6,000 people for AC/DC in 2001, but we exhausted demand at 16,000. And in 2001 -

**Mr WILLIE** - And you lost money on the concert?

**Mr TOUBER** - AC/DC did. It was a loss. It was by far the wipeout of their tour. They really couldn't be playing 16,000 people compared -

**Mr WILLIE** - With all the gear they had to bring and everything.

**Mr TOUBER** - Yes, but, anyway, they set it in the context of a full tour. We've never got close to those crowds. And the ticket prices for these concerts are enormous.

**CHAIR** - What's the average ticket price now?

**Mr TOUBER** - I've lost track a bit but I imagine it would start at \$250, or something like that, and go up.

**CHAIR** - Anyone line up for Taylor Swift tickets? How much were they? Do we know?

**Mr TOUBER** - A bit less.

**Dr Broad** - They were expensive. Depends on where you sat.

**Ms Webb** - You've got no hope of getting one anyway.

**Mr TOUBER** - Tasmania isn't a particularly wealthy community. It's not Qatar down here. To pull out that much discretionary spending for events - AC/DC in 2001 was a different beast to what they are now. They are still one of the rolled gold acts of the world, but in 2001 they might have been the rolled gold act. They were a massive concert attraction. That's what

## PUBLIC

we got in Tasmania. The Australian tour promoter was disappointed with it. I guess for AC/DC it's just another day in an endless tour.

**Mr BEHRAKIS** - I've got two questions. First of all, you said something in your initial comments about the freight and Josh said something a minute ago about the freightage. Compared to 2001 - or even 2007 - I would have thought that technologies change so dramatically where your speakers and lighting are twice as powerful with half the size. Is it the same mentality that it is impossible to air-freight this equipment, appreciating that it is quite substantial equipment. In this day and age, compared to when you were putting on events, is that still an impracticality?

**Mr TOUBER** - When I was putting on events is not really ancient history: it's only like five years ago. In sound, the bulk of sound equipment might have reduced a bit because I do remember in the old days it was very bulky. Light shows have exploded out of the roof. Looking at a light show from 2020, just the amount of equipment and the staging, the moving parts of the stage -

**CHAIR** - The set itself.

**Mr TOUBER** - Yes, the set itself has completely changed. It used to be that they were happy to stand on a standard stage, but you don't see any of these rolled gold acts on a standard stage anymore. They've got all sorts of -

**Mr BEHRAKIS** - Secondly, on the topic of the practicality of putting on events with a certain number of people. Back in 2001, an event like Dark Mofo would've been completely impossible. You wouldn't have got a tenth of the amount of people. Last I checked, it was something like 30,000 interstate visitors for Dark Mofo and that gets put on quite regularly. Compared to 2001 or 2007, with the advent of things like Dark Mofo - I remember a time where, in winter, just having people out and about was not a thing - do you think that the demographics - I know the population has changed somewhat - but the demographics and people's propensity to take part in events like these that wouldn't have happened 20 years ago. MONA and Dark Mofo aspire to something that was previously impossible and they pulled it off. Should we not aspire to something just because it would've been impossible in 2001?

**Mr TOUBER** - It's not possible for the same reasons though. That is because of population.

**Mr BEHRAKIS** - But the same could be said about Dark Mofo.

**Mr TOUBER** - No, I don't think it can. Dark Mofo is a niche event which is particular to Tasmania. They've done it very well and built up an image and spent a fortune on the museum, on the festival - which is a great festival. But if there was a Dark Mofo festival in every city around Australia, we wouldn't bring in those people. It is because we have the one of them. I think you are trying to compare apples with bananas. I think the Dark Mofo event is a great thing, but it is peculiar to Tasmania. It doesn't mean that with these touring acts or sporting events the attendance is going to rise.

**CHAIR** - And Dark Mofo is a number of events rather than just one.

## PUBLIC

**Mr TOUBER** - It's hugely marketed, but it's a special event and Tasmania is being used as the attraction of it. It's all part of the marketing and the allure of the festival. For a sporting or concert event, that is totally irrelevant, because the only thing relevant then is the act and the act is all around Australia.

**Ms WEBB** - To dig into that a bit more, I agree on the Dark Mofo thing because that is a series of events. It is an experience across a number of days and a couple of weeks even, and for a lot of it, it is free to go to, so it is very accessible for people.

In terms of the assumptions that are here around that attendance at events: they have three Tier 1 concerts per year pegged at 30,000 people each time, projecting that 5 per cent of those, 1,500 people, would come from interstate. Again, do we have any basis on which to expect that for a large concert event we would actually have, not for a festival, for example, but for a single concert event that would also be replicated interstate, that we would get that interstate visitation?

**Mr TOUBER** - I would like whoever wrote that to nominate one act that they thought was going to get 30,000. Whoever wrote that, I don't know who it was, and it was probably kicked down the stairs to someone who had the job of trying to make this add up mathematically, but it is nonsense. Why would you say that you are going to get three 30,000 events? Whoever wrote it wouldn't have known what the maximum attendance would be to date anyway. They wouldn't have had a clue, so they're totally guessing. Would people travel from interstate? It's possible if there was a concert sellout somewhere else. Tasmania as a whole would be losing people, either to a Melbourne or even to a Sydney show.

**Ms WEBB** - Especially from the north of the state.

**Mr TOUBER** - Definitely from the north of the state, which we do. I told you how hard it is to sell tickets to the north of the state from Hobart. There is no reason to believe that you would have people come. I've heard it said, 'Oh people come from interstate to do summer shows'. You are talking about a handful of people. You are not talking about hundreds or thousands. I don't believe that you would get anything like that amount of people to come and see a major concert down here.

**Ms WEBB** - On top of that three projected Tier 1 concerts at 30,000 each, they have also got Tier 1-minus concerts so I presume the next level down in terms of an attraction. They have got five of those at 15,000 each.

**Mr TOUBER** - That is five AC/DCs.

**CHAIR** - They would be at Tier 1, wouldn't they?

**Mr TOUBER** - In my mind that is Tier 1 but their Tier 1 is double what the historical benchmark has been. Their Tier 1 is so blue sky that it's a meaningless number to me because it has never been achieved and never will be achieved.

**Mr WILLIE** - There has been a lot of talk about how this will help grow the economy and increase economic activity. It was interesting to hear you before saying there was only so much disposable income in the community. I have seen some research where stadiums might change people's behaviour. For example, in my electorate in Glenorchy, you might have a

## PUBLIC

family and instead of taking their kids to the movies one week, they might go to the football or to a concert. It is the same money in the economy, it is just being spent somewhere else.

**Mr TOUBER** - That is why 44 major events per year is not going to work.

**Mr WILLIE** - You don't agree that it is going to be this huge economic stimulus and grow the economy?

**Mr TOUBER** - I am completely uneducated to make any assessment about if it can grow the economy in the construction phase or what sort of bonus that is. Beyond that, I can't see how it can grow the economy at all. In fact, I think it is only going to be a continual drain on State resources.

If you looked at the history of the DEC, which someone should, I would think you would find that over the years a fair bit of money had to be tipped into that and it was sold on to the Glenorchy City Council for \$1 or something. That was not exactly an economic proposition but it still made some sense having a decent indoor venue for Tasmania.

This makes no sense at all because we cannot attract those sorts of acts. We are not in the position. We have not got the size of market down here to get those acts here. As I said they are in Australia for so few dates, how are we going to leapfrog Adelaide or Brisbane or the second show in Melbourne?

**Mr WILLIE** - How off-putting is Bass Strait in terms of shipping equipment across?

**Mr TOUBER** - Psychologically, it's been very off-putting. A lot of people from elsewhere think, 'Oh, I've got to go across the water'. That psychological barrier has knocked people out from touring Tasmania plenty of times. That's not -

**Mr WILLIE** - Insurmountable?

**Mr TOUBER** - Yes, that's not insurmountable. What is of relevance is the cost that involves. Every time you strip down concert equipment and put it up somewhere else, think about the labour and everything involved in doing that. To transport that to a city which is geographically isolated adds a level not only of cost but complication that you don't really want if you're a tour promoter. The more bits like that you have and extra touring dates, the more things that can go wrong.

As I said, the number of dates the acts have available in Australia is determined. Taylor Swift would have said, 'This is the number of dates we have. This is our window'. The tour promoter in Australia doesn't come back and ask, 'Can you stay an extra couple of days?'. No, this is what we have.

**CHAIR** - Are there any other questions from members? Shane, do you have something?

**Dr BROAD** - Regarding Bass Strait, the time delays. You'd have to put all the trucks on the ship, whichever one you take, then you say you lose a day there and you lose a day on the way back. Is that a factor as well?

## PUBLIC

**Mr TOUBER** - The way I used to see it is it would take about a day out of the touring itinerary. For Australian bands, that wasn't too bad. We'd often pick up a Saturday date, which was good, and they'd use Sunday for travelling. For international acts, to lose a day in moving your bits and pieces around is all dead money. They're trying to maximise their yield for the amount of days they're in Australia. That's what it's about. It doesn't matter what the artist says, 'I wouldn't mind going to this place and that place', at the end of the day, it's the people who are driving the money machine. It's as ruthless and well-run as any good business that you'd find that lasts. 'How can we come to this country and get our maximum yield?' As I said, for Taylor Swift even 50,000 people is not good enough.

**CHAIR** - In spite of the challenges that you've outlined very clearly, Tasmanians broadly want a Tasmanian football team, their own team. There's been an agreement signed by the Government that the AFL will issue the 19th licence if we build them a stadium plus a whole lot of other stuff.

**Mr TOUBER** - It's a funny deal, but anyway.

**CHAIR** - Despite what we think about that agreement, do you think there's any way a stadium can stack up financially in terms of meeting the ongoing operating costs without it costing the taxpayers of Tasmania a heap of money over years?

**Mr TOUBER** - Mathematically, unless someone can show me on a spreadsheet how you do it - I am giving you a bunch of figures and reasons to suggest why that can't be done - I say no. If people are desperate for a stadium, you start looking at options which don't put the State Government in a vulnerable position.

**CHAIR** - To look at ongoing costs of maintaining the stadium, do you have any ideas about that or is that way outside your ballpark?

**Mr TOUBER** - It is outside my expertise but I did read the MI Global document -

**CHAIR** - Yes, the MI Global.

**Mr TOUBER** - which suggested it was about \$6 million a year. Turf maintenance is a quarter of a million dollars a year.

That's another thing: nothing's been said about the cost of hiring the thing. If you're rehoming events in Tasmania, it's not going to be a peppercorn rent to get into the place. They're expensive to run. To incentivise any existing event - and I can't think of large existing events which could possibly go in there, but if there were any - the costs would be a lot for a local producer.

**CHAIR** - Say some of the events for Dark Mofo moved to there because it's a large venue, and we've heard from David Walsh and others, that we don't have that sized venue that they would like to have access to, would they have to be heavily subsidised to make that viable for them?

**Mr TOUBER** - Yes. They are heavily subsidised. It's a good thing, but I bet if they do use the stadium for anything, they wouldn't be using it for 30,000-people shows. They would

## PUBLIC

get that as part of the deal with the State Government. It's not indicative of the ongoing commercial realities of running a stadium.

**CHAIR** - That would be part of the funding agreement, you say?

**Mr TOUBER** - Yes. They might have to boost the funding agreement. We used to get some in-kind sponsorship. Sometimes it's not even on paper, media deals.

**CHAIR** - What about things like the Taste of Tasmania? Could you put that on there?

**Mr TOUBER** - Until you knew the cost of hiring, but I would think the cost would be prohibitive. I think there would be a gigantic difference in the cost of staging it where they do at the moment as opposed to the stadium. If I were them, it would be a lot like trying to shoehorn a concert from the Botanical Gardens into the stadium. Would you rather be in the stadium or would you rather be sitting on the waterfront, eating, watching the show? Once again, it's about how many people. People would think, 'I'm going to be rattling in that, it's going to feel a bit silly'. They can go down to the waterfront and it's a nice comfortable crowd at 3,000 people. It's about choosing the right option for as many people as you're going to attract. Obviously, the costs have to stack up. The cost of hiring the stadium would be prohibitive, I would imagine, for those types of events. I would be almost positive about that.

**CHAIR** - Have you had any interaction with the other big promoters like Frontier and people like that?

**Mr TOUBER** - I used to, yes. A lot of the shows I've talked about, I would essentially be the Frontier person for Tasmania, for Michael Chugg, or for Frontier or for -

**CHAIR** - Was Frontier, Michael Chugg or anyone like that spoken to by the Government that you know of?

**Mr TOUBER** - I did see that the *Mercury* claimed that Michael Chugg was supportive of the concept and said it was a great idea. In the next sentence when he said it's going to be 25,000 people, he then said, 'Be good if you can make it 35,000'. It's just something said off the top of the head. When he's thinking about it, 25,000 people isn't going to cut it for a stadium act, we're going to have to give them more.

**Mr WILLIE** - You raised your concerns today, Charles. Where would you like to see the Government go from here? Would you like to see them re-negotiate the arrangement with the AFL?

**Mr TOUBER** - In my time, and a fair bit of my time was spent in politics, this would have to be one of the most bewildering and unworthy major projects I've seen the Tasmanian Government ever embark on. I thought it was a joke when it first came out. Someone called me - a radio station. I thought it was like the *Utopia* show about the stadium. I thought someone was having a laugh, because it's ludicrous. It's ludicrous to anyone who knows anything about the detail.

I can understand the concept is appealing. People used to say to me, 'It would be great to see those acts'. It doesn't take much, if they're told a lot of bullshit that says it's possible, of course they're going to say, 'Yes, I'll put my hand up'. But it's not possible.

## PUBLIC

I would be looking seriously at the options. I have not looked at all of the option that Dean Coleman and Paul Lennon are fronting. Dean is an ex-Tasmanian, a smart guy. Prima facie, it would seem to make more sense as a proposition which would be able to underpin the activities of a stadium, because it is more about the commercial activity in there, I think.

**Mr WILLIE** - Offsetting the stadium costs?

**Mr TOUBER** - That is right. That makes total sense. These stadium costs are not being offset by anything in this proposal. You can't meet the income projections, you can't meet these attendance projections because they are meaningless.

I'm talking from a position of no knowledge but that proposal, I suppose it might delay, but anything that would get the State Government off the hook would be fantastic, to get the people of Tasmania free from a potential millstone which will go on for decades. I can see, if it ever got built, you would be wanting to pull it down in 10- or 20-years' time. It would just be an empty eyesore down there. The Regatta Point one, prima facie, that did make sense. I thought it was a much better location, too.

**CHAIR** - We might need to wrap it up. We have another witness to come in. Thank you, Charles, for coming in and providing your expertise in the area of events management. That understanding of that is really helpful to the Committee.

**Mr TOUBER** - If anyone else privately wants some more information, Josh, your interest in this area, I am happy to sit down and talk to you about that.

**CHAIR** - Sure, great. Thanks very much, Charles.

**Mr TOUBER** - Sorry that I was running late. Thanks for inviting me.

**THE WITNESS WITHDREW.**

**The Committee suspended from 11:22 am to 11:27 am.**

## PUBLIC

### The Committee recommenced at 11.27 a.m.

**CHAIR** - Welcome, Anne and Brian, to the hearing. We are focusing on the revised terms of reference with regard to the development. We understand the progress of matters that have occurred. We are happy for you to speak about all those matters as you see fit. I will ask you to take the statutory declaration. As you are aware, this is a public hearing. It is being streamed and it will form part of our record. Everything you say is covered by parliamentary privilege before the Committee but that may not extend outside the hearing. If there is anything of a confidential nature you wish to share with the Committee, you can make that request and the Committee will consider that. Otherwise, it is all public.

**Mr BRIAN SCULLIN**, CHAIR, and **Ms ANNE BEACH**, CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER, MACQUARIE POINT DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION, WERE CALLED, MADE THE STATUTORY DECLARATION AND WERE EXAMINED.

**CHAIR** - Do you wish to make an opening statement?

**Mr SCULLIN** - Yes, Chair. Thanks for the invitation. We are attending at the request of the Committee to support the inquiry through your questions. Last time we appeared, I noted that we had not made a submission. However, following the update of the terms of reference, we did make a submission last week. The submission responds to two of the new items listed in the revised terms of reference, namely the suitability of Mac Point as the site for a proposed arts, entertainment and sports precinct and, secondly, matters related to the financing and delivery of the entire proposed arts, entertainment and sports precinct.

In relation to the suitability of the site, I note there have been some concerns and suggestions that the site is unstable and not suitable for development. Mac Point is largely a reclaimed site, as is much of Sullivans Cove. The reclamation occurred over a number of years as part of the early European settlement of Hobart. This has not been an impediment for the development of the cove. Across the road from Mac Point are five- and six-storey buildings, including the IXL apartments and IXL jam factory, and further across the curve, large buildings such as the Marine Board building, which is 11 storeys. An awareness and understanding of the geotech of the site is a useful resource to inform design but it's not a barrier to development.

The work that has been done by the corporation over recent years adds to the information that is available to inform development. This includes collecting over 2,000 soil samples, removal of redundant infrastructure, remediation and soil preparation, and archaeological digs to inform development.

In terms of the financing and delivery of the broader precinct, the development of parcels across the site are the corporation's core business, which was the case prior to the proposed multi-purpose stadium.

As I noted, the corporation has had an important role in preparing the site for redevelopment and making it safe for use. The investment to date has provided for the remediation of the site, the removal of redundant infrastructure and plans to install infrastructure to support the development.

The individual projects and development areas will be managed on a case-by-case basis, with the majority of these anticipated to be taken to market for private sector development



## PUBLIC

informed by the site and its own requirements set by the corporation. We have already allocated funding for the development of the Aboriginal culturally informed zone. Should other instances be identified where there is a community requirement or need that is outside of what could feasibly be delivered as part of a privately funded development, we would apply for funding through the normal budget process that would be subject to normal internal and external budget processes and scrutiny.

As I noted, we are happy to work through any questions the Committee may have and anything we can't answer today we will take on notice and come back to you as quickly as we can.

**CHAIR** - I might just open up, if that's okay. Regarding the budget process you've talked about, we know that the state Government has significant other pressures at the moment, particularly with regard to the commission of inquiry recommendations and the work that's being done around that. That's a pressure on the state budget. You made the point that a number of the components of the site will be seeking private investment. Have you undertaken any work to see how much private-sector appetite there is for this sort of investment in this area, bearing in mind that there might be a heavy reliance on that with the current budgetary pressures on the state?

**Mr SCULLIN** - Yes, some market testing, but because of the COVID-19 period it wasn't possible to take the site - I'm talking about pre the stadium proposal - but broadly those same blocks were envisaged to be developed. With the assistance of real estate advisers, we did seek expressions of interest and there were some discussions between the advisers and the parties that responded to that. They advised the corporation that at that time they thought there was significant interest but that nothing could be done in a COVID-19 environment, because if people couldn't come to the site, they weren't willing to make firm proposals.

The one that did go to market was The Escarpment. That was a competitive process. There were several parties interested. One party was chosen and they agreed to make a fairly significant contribution for that. That also heartened us to think that we could take other bits to market and there would be significant private interest in them.

**CHAIR** - I'll come back to that one in a minute. This was all done leading to and around the main restriction part of COVID-19? What work has been done since to assess the private-sector interest, particularly as it seems it's going to rely on that heavily?

**Mr SCULLIN** - I don't think we've done anything recently. Anne?

**Ms BEACH** - No. The precinct plan sets out the development areas. The next piece of work we'll do is to work through what type of developments we want to activate in those spaces, and do some market testing as part of that. We haven't progressed that piece of work yet.

**Ms WEBB** - Can I follow up on that, Chair?

**CHAIR** - Yes, on that bit. I want to come back to The Escarpment -

## PUBLIC

**Ms WEBB** - In terms of exploring opportunities for private development in those parcels, is that something that needs to occur around the same time that the PoSS<sup>1</sup> process integrated assessment is occurring, so that it can be factored into economic assessments and estimations? Or is that something that you see happening separate to or after the PoSS process plays out?

**Ms BEACH** - I think there's a few elements there. We will be working through each of the key parcels to articulate the development we'd like to see activated. That will allow us to estimate the economic impact. In terms of taking it to market, we would need to do that after the planning scheme has been updated so there is some certainty about what would be available. We will work through each of the individual development zones to enable us to estimate the economic contribution that would make and how that integration will work.

**Ms WEBB** - That's what I was interested to hear. In terms of the project that is put forward for the integrated assessment, once the guidelines are finalised, that will include more specific projections about the private investment in those parcels that would sit around the stadium itself?

**Ms BEACH** - Yes.

**Ms WEBB** - There will be clarity then -

**CHAIR** - It is a formal process.

**Ms WEBB** - Yes, so it can be assessed as part of the integrated assessment?

**Ms BEACH** - That wouldn't be going to a point where we would be market testing because it wouldn't yet be ready to take to market.

**Ms WEBB** - No, but you would have modelled what likely private interest and investment there might be in those?

**Ms BEACH** - Yes, that's right. That will be part of the work we will be doing in parallel to the stadium users scoping. That is part of the package that will go through the PoSS process.

**Mr SCULLIN** - It is very difficult to get firm expressions from private developers in an uncertain environment. You can get some indicative work and you can provide some analysis to the people running the process but people will not give you a firm quote without certainty.

**Ms WEBB** - It is difficult, isn't it, because the PoSS process is supposed to be an economic assessment among other things. Presumably there has to be some fairly realistic and clear figures put forward into that?

**Ms BEACH** - That's why we will seek expert advice to help us do that economic investment. We will set the parameters as the landowner about what we would expect to see in our requirements. From that we will get expert advice to help estimate what a realistic economic outcome would be.

---

<sup>1</sup> Project of State Significance

## PUBLIC

**Mr WILLIE** - In terms of activating that commercial development, there's no time constraints on any of that so I am interested in the resources of the development corporation. Clearly, you have to get a stadium out of the ground very quickly as part of the Government's commitment. Potentially, the focus will be off those commercial developments?

**Ms BEACH** - We will be progressing a number of things. The team is working on a number of things at the moment, pre-stadium as well. We will resource-up to focus on supporting the stadium development and developing a PoSS application in parallel to the work we would normally do.

**CHAIR** - With regard to the proceeds of the private investment that went to tender on The Escarpment, what is the status of that now? Where is that?

**Ms BEACH** - Milieu was identified as the preferred proponent but no project development agreement or contract for sale was signed so that arrangement has ceased. It has no status.

**CHAIR** - Were there any financial implications of that?

**Ms BEACH** - Yes and we talked through that during Budget Estimates, so there was -

**CHAIR** - This is not Budget Estimates and we didn't hear that so if you could go through it now.

**Ms BEACH** - Yes, there were two elements. One is there was agreement in relation to the timing around delivery and there was another one. So, one about getting to DA stage and another around developing a project development agreement. There was a total of - I will double check the number - apologies, Chair. I will get that number and provide it to you, the exact number that was paid -

**CHAIR** - That you had to pay to the proponents?

**Ms BEACH** - Yes, that's right.

**Mr WILLIE** - I have some questions about the stadium specifically.

**CHAIR** - Before we move onto that - in terms of the team you talked about doing the work that sits around the private investment that Meg was asking you about - how many staff do you currently have?

**Ms BEACH** - Thirteen.

**CHAIR** - How many are you likely to need as things increase in that work that has to be done to inform the PoSS process?

**Ms BEACH** - We will need a project director who will lead our stadium-scoping work. We would anticipate that given the specialist nature of stadium development that we would outsource the project management and have an external project management firm that can scale throughout that process. We would likely have a project director, executive support and senior contract administration advice, so that would be around three people.

## PUBLIC

**CHAIR** - What is the projected cost of that?

**Ms BEACH** - It will depend on the ranking of those. We currently have a proposal with the State Service management office to create a position for the project director role which was proposed as an equivalent of an SES 3. The two other roles we would have to rank based on the banding system to confirm the cost.

**CHAIR** - What sort of level of funding are we looking at in addition to this current staffing requirement?

**Ms BEACH** - It wouldn't be in addition. We would use the funding associated with the project budget to support the project team. The stadium project budget includes consultancies and project management costs.

**CHAIR** - What is the current budget?

**Ms BEACH** - That's \$715 million for the stadium.

**CHAIR** - That includes all those costs?

**Ms BEACH** - It does.

**CHAIR** - Including the construction?

**Ms BEACH** - Yes.

**Mr WILLIE** - In your submission, you have outlined some of the issues with the site but also pointed to structures around the site. I am interested in the contingencies for the stadium. Are they based on just normal risk assessments or are they site-specific?

**Ms BEACH** - The cost estimates, as I understand, include both the site considerations and a build. Both include contingencies in those. The Aurecon report made the assumption of needing 20-metre columns for the foundations, for example. Our understanding of the geotech is that it ranges from between 4 metres and 19 metres for the different depths. There has been a number of assumptions in there and they have included contingencies in their costing as well.

**Mr WILLIE** - Can we have the figures for the contingencies?

**Ms BEACH** - I don't have those. We can seek the costings that went into the \$715 million.

**Mr WILLIE** - I am interested in those specific site contingency costs. If you could take that on notice.

**Ms BEACH** - Yes.

**Mr WILLIE** - In terms of the goods shed, I think there is an application to the Tasmanian Heritage Council for heritage listing. Can you tell us how that will progress? Will that be

## PUBLIC

moved to a different site or will it be demolished? I am also interested in what is under the goods shed in terms of contamination.

**Ms BEACH** - There is an assessment currently under way. The goods shed was included on the priority list for this financial year for the heritage council. Heritage Tasmania has been undertaking an assessment and they have been engaging with us on that. The assessment is based on the criteria that are set out in the act. There are eight different factors there. They will assess the goods shed and the elements that make up the heritage. It may or may not be the structure itself. It may be some key elements about the structure. It can relate to the location.

**Mr WILLIE** - The facade.

**Ms BEACH** - Yes, exactly. What we need to do is work through that process and understand exactly what the significant values that need to be protected are. Then we work through that with the heritage council around the best way to conserve that and what some options might be. It depends on what it is specifically nominated for. That then infers how it is managed. That information hasn't yet been reviewed by the heritage council. We will work through that when it occurs.

**Mr WILLIE** - Potentially, it is possible to move it to a different location or elements of it to another location under the law?

**Ms BEACH** - The heritage council has working guidelines that, once you have a nomination, then help guide how you manage that and what some options might be. That could include a relocation. What we have looked to understand are what are the significant values that need to be protected; and are there opportunities in this case, for example, if we were to relocate it, how could we enhance those? For example, there is currently a concrete base within a paved floor. Originally, the platforms would have been timber. Is there an opportunity to reflect the original heritage values and enhance those as part of looking at a future use of that site?

**Mr WILLIE** - What about the contamination under the goods shed? It is my understanding, I don't know whether it is 100 per cent accurate, that there is significant contamination under the goods shed.

**Ms BEACH** - We have done around 688 samples across the site, including bore samples. That includes working around the goods shed. We don't anticipate there to be a significant body of work to remediate that area but something we would explore further to make sure we have a clear scope of works, working with our remediation consultant. But all the data and the work we have at this point suggests there is not a material challenge to manage.

**CHAIR** - Regarding the possible removal of the goods shed, because the precinct plan shows it is not there, has all the work that will be required around that been costed, in terms of removing it, rebuilding it, whatever? Has there been a budget allocated for that?

**Ms BEACH** - In the budget for the stadium, it does include some demolition allocation. We also have funding around part of our general site preparation. We would look at what the cost of that might be and the funding we have available. I don't know that we would necessarily

## PUBLIC

need additional funds to achieve that. It depends, again, about what we're trying to achieve and how it would be managed, where it would be located and costing that at the time.

**CHAIR** - You expect this is all going to be included in the \$715 million, all the necessary work with regard to the goods shed including the remediation under it, the relocation in one way or another and the demolition?

**Ms BEACH** - A combination of that has some demolition allocation in it and we also have funding for the remediation of the site. That includes remediating the site, removing redundant infrastructure. There will be a number of structures that will need to be demolished as part of that. We will work through the budget that we have and anticipate that we would be able to cover most of that. We'll need to work that through once we have a better understanding of exactly the scope of works.

**CHAIR** - The remediation budget you talk about, that's the budget you've had to do the remediation to date -

**Ms BEACH** - Yes.

**CHAIR** - How much of that budget is left?

**Ms BEACH** - At the end of June 2023 we had \$53.5 million in cash and investments at bank.

**CHAIR** - That's not all for remediation, though. That would be for operations and stuff, isn't it?

**Ms BEACH** - That is for a combination of capital works that we need to do, installation of infrastructure. There's some allocation in there for the development of the Aboriginal culturally informed zone. That's our total funding.

**CHAIR** - Can you give us a full breakdown of that \$55 million in terms of what it's allocated to?

**Ms BEACH** - I can do that. I would need to take that on notice but I can provide that.

**Ms WEBB** - To follow up on the heritage assessment that's currently under way that you referred to, which was planned for this year: is it your expectation that is completed by the end of this calendar year? What is the time line you understand that to have now?

**Ms BEACH** - Yes, I think at least the initial discussion around that will happen this year. Whether or not the council makes a decision on that this year, I don't know, but I think they will certainly consider it.

**Ms WEBB** - Where does that line up to your preparation for the PoSS process and providing the project through into the integrated assessment? Presumably, it needs to be completed and you need to have factored it in to the planning and putting together the project plan to go for assessment?

## PUBLIC

**Ms BEACH** - Yes. We would need to consider a proposal about how we would manage that piece of infrastructure in that site as part of the proposal to inform the PoSS assessment. We would not necessarily have undertaken any works because it would be informed on the outcome of the PoSS assessment.

**Ms WEBB** - Sure, but I'm just clarifying, you can't put the project into the integrated assessment until you've got an understanding on the heritage arrangement that needs to be in place for the goods shed or any other relevant area?

**Ms BEACH** - It will certainly be one of the factors we would cover.

**Mr WILLIE** - What if the heritage council says you can't move the goods shed and it has to stay in place as a heritage-listed building?

**Ms BEACH** - That's a process we need to work through with the heritage council. This is assuming that it is listed on the state heritage register. There are a number of things in the working guidelines around how we manage it and that will be a matter of working through how we best reflect those heritage values. That would be a process we'll need to work through with the council.

**Mr WILLIE** - Could it stop the stadium at Macquarie Point, though, if you've got a heritage-listed building that can't be moved?

**Ms BEACH** - It's a risk to how we manage that space but I don't think there's a precedent for the council to not have a conversation around what some options might be. I think the onus will be on us to identify how we can manage those heritage values and, particularly, potentially enhance them.

**Ms WEBB** - Can I clarify something on that? As we know, the PoSS process stands aside every other piece of legislation that relates to planning normally. The heritage laws, for example, aren't in play during a PoSS process. It would depend on the guidelines that are put in place for the integrated assessment. To some extent, how heritage matters are treated in the PoSS integrated assessment is going to be determined by the guidelines created, correct? Therefore, the question of the degree to which a heritage matter around the goods shed could impede this process proceeding is actually going to be determined by the guidelines put in place for the integrated assessment.

**Ms BEACH** - In a major project assessment, the TPC<sup>2</sup> process becomes the primary regulator. With a project of state significance, it's a planning integrated assessment. It doesn't necessarily supersede other statutory approvals. That is my understanding.

**Ms WEBB** - I think you will find in this legislation it does explicitly exclude other legislation.

**Ms BEACH** - As part of the normal process of preparing integrated guidelines and then going through the consultation, it would be normal for the TPC to engage with other potential regulators so -

---

<sup>2</sup> Tasmanian Planning Commission

## PUBLIC

**Ms WEBB** - Absolutely, so the guidelines become what stands in the stead of the usual set of legislation that sits around planning.

**CHAIR** - Informed by them.

**Ms WEBB** - Sure, informed by them but the way it's weighted or the way it's treated is determined by the guidelines that the TPC puts in place.

**Ms BEACH** - It is certainly part of preparing those guidelines.

**Mr BEHRAKIS** - There has been a lot of talk about the consultation around this whole project. Can you walk us through the process of developing the plan in the first place and how you've gone about that?

**Ms BEACH** - Consultation was the first key thing that we started to allow as much time as possible. We ran a public consultation process. That ran for just over 10 weeks. It was available through our website. Meetings were available to people. They could make a submission directly to us in writing or through meetings, either through a survey or free form. We offered for people to provide images and drawings. We didn't get a lot of that. We also had a look at a few other stadia to understand how they integrate with the space around them and how they inform that integrated nature, and where they've been successful and unsuccessful. We met with stakeholders - anyone who was interested in having a meeting with us. We also approach our key neighbours.

We also had our delivery partners - the Department of State Growth, including Infrastructure Tasmania (ITas), TasPorts, Stadiums Tasmania, the Australian Government. They were a key part of our consultation, including creating a project steering Committee.

We also asked Incom Projects to do some dedicated consultation with the creative sector as we didn't have great contacts in that space and it was an important part of our understanding of the project. They were the key bits that informed that as well as consultant advice that moving all those inputs together helped shaped the priorities in the precinct plan.

Obviously, the ministerial direction that we received set out some key considerations.

**Mr BEHRAKIS** - As a follow up to that, with regard to the sequencing of the work to date and going forward, there hasn't been detailed plans or drawings of the precinct or the stadium and that's led to, some might say, speculative renderings. How come that work hasn't been done yet?

**Ms BEACH** - We've looked at an understanding of the site and what we need to achieve. That will inform design. We could have started with design and then altered it to try to fit the site. What we needed to understand was what capacity do we have to accommodate it on site? What were the other things that needed to be there? How did they need to integrate? How will people access the site? What existing heritage factors do we need to consider as part of that management? What are the user requirements? For example, Stadiums Tasmania is identified as the future owner and operator of this facility, if its developed. Understanding its needs was critical as well. It's understanding what we can deliver working with the site that we have and the specific outputs that the design needs to accommodate?



## PUBLIC

**Ms WEBB** - You mentioned earlier in one of your answers that you're undertaking stadium-user modelling. Can you explain what that process is?

**Ms BEACH** - Understanding user requirements. A key input into the design and functional brief is the user requirements brief. That's a process of understanding exactly the types of activities that will need to happen in a space and specific requirements for different types of users.

We've done some initial work. It was part of the consultation we did as part of the precinct where, as you'd anticipate, some of the people we spoke to had some important things that would be significant for us to consider in design. That's part of the user requirements that will feed into the process. Working through the detailed requirements, individual sporting codes have quite detailed guidelines that they've provided to us. There'll be different types of event promoters that Stadiums Tasmania will engage with to understand their needs. It's mapping out who are the key different types of users and what specifically do they need in the facility for it to operate. That would inform a user-requirements brief, which will be led by Stadiums Tasmania.

**Ms WEBB** - So it is Stadiums Tasmania that is undertaking that work currently, not Macquarie Point Development Corporation?

**Ms BEACH** - They will be leading it, working with us. As the site owner, we have requirements. Also, to make sure it is an integrated development, we have requirements around that as well.

**Ms WEBB** - Do you know if they are including in that event promoters and those who put on those -

**Ms BEACH** - Yes. That is one of the key stakeholder groups that were not as engaged in the precinct planning process but are pretty critical for a stadium design.

**Ms WEBB** - Have they been engaged at all to date either by you or, to your knowledge, by Stadiums Tasmania?

**Ms BEACH** - I am not aware they've been specifically targeted. I'm not sure if Stadiums Tasmania has started those discussions yet. It is certainly on their stakeholder mapping to include them.

**Ms WEBB** - Regarding transport to the site, you did some transport modelling, mapping and planning to go along with the precinct plan, which is available on your website. What is the degree to which non-car transport is factored in, particularly walking and cycling. I am looking at the little summary, rather than the full version of the transport study; the little bar chart in that summary showing the different forms of transport. It looks like there is an expectation that fairly significant numbers of people, for example, would be cycling to the significant events there. If you have 23,000 people coming to an event, it looks like we are talking about 1,000 people cycling. Can you clarify the extent to which, for example, you expect people to be cycling to events as a proportion of the audience?

**Ms BEACH** - This is work that we commissioned WSP to do to inform how people would get to the site so we would have a better understanding of the different modes and how

## PUBLIC

people would get there, to inform infrastructure design and delivery. Forty per cent of people are anticipated to access the site through some sort of car-based access, whether that is parking, drop-offs, or similar. Sixty per cent would be non-car. That includes cycling and passenger day event buses, existing bus services, ferries, and coach. In terms of the exact percentage, I would need to refer to the report and come back, but I can identify that for you.

**Ms WEBB** - I thought you might have the full report and be able to refer to it. The 40 per cent that are car-based, does that include, for example, people who might park in the CBD and then walk to the site? Or are they in the walking crowd?

**Ms BEACH** - That is part of the car use. It includes drop-off, parking in the CBD area, and the like.

**Mr WILLIE** - But no parking onsite?

**Ms BEACH** - Not for the public.

**Ms WEBB** - The walking component does not include people who have parked in the CBD and walked across. Where are they walking from?

**Ms BEACH** - I think the assumptions around car parking looked at a radius around the space and then other people looking to walk would be from the local areas. I think it is set out in the report. I can come back with the specifics around those. It included identifying where people are travelling from - from the north, south, and east - identifying how they would get to those points, then the supplementary access to the site. For example, event day buses would be coming directly to the site so they wouldn't be included in that walking assumption, but it would include people who live in that area or who may have accessed into the city and then walked to the site.

**Ms WEBB** - Bused into the city and then walked to the site? So they are counted in the walking, but not those who have driven into the city, parked, and then walked to the site.

**Ms BEACH** - No, because we need to look at the traffic impact of those.

**Ms WEBB** - In terms of event buses, which is quite a sizable proportion of the bar chart, is the assumption that event buses are public transport buses or private transport buses or a mix of both?

**Ms BEACH** - It would depend. There are a number of buses in the network. Usually, the peak, as I understand, in our general access and school bus services are around school buses, because that is when there is the greatest need. There are a number of different bus operators that have contracts with the Government and have these services available. The availability of buses would depend on - we would be looking at the different service providers and the buses they have available. It wouldn't be necessarily relying on a particular operator; it would be looking at the capacity in that network.

**Ms WEBB** - The network being the private bus network that currently services schools and potentially the public bus network that services schools?

**Ms BEACH** - That would inform how we achieve that event-day service.

## PUBLIC

**Ms WEBB** - Who does the coordination of, for example, the event bus service, and planning and delivery?

**Ms BEACH** - We will need to do some pretty detailed traffic modelling and work as part of the application for the Project of State Significance. We'll work with the Department of State Growth on that, both their ITas area and their passenger transport areas that look after all road user services that are available for passenger transport. That includes contracted bus services, general-access school bus. They have a good feel for the fleet that is available.

**Ms WEBB** - Sure, that's in the planning part. But let's fast-forward to this all being up and running, and there needs to be this event bus network and system operating. Who is responsible for the management of that?

**Ms BEACH** - It would depend how it's contracted. It would likely be coordinated through the Department of State Growth, but that would be a matter for Stadiums Tas as the owner of that facility to coordinate with them. For example -

**Ms WEBB** - Stadiums Tas management of the facility would incorporate the planning of the event bus system that goes around it?

**Ms BEACH** - As part of a whole-of-government approach, yes, that would be my assumption. For example, there's different models of doing this for different stadia across the country. Some include, as part of the ticket price, funding to provide those bus services. There are different models to achieve it to make sure that they can be delivered.

**Ms WEBB** - And in terms of the -

**Dr BROAD** - I've got a question on car parking as well.

**Ms WEBB** - Okay, I'm just going to ask about bicycle parking that's allocated there on the map. It looks like there's a significant bicycle parking arrangement on the paved area near the escarpment, sort of next to the Cenotaph, and potentially over on the other side. What is the capacity for bicycle parking that you've factored in there?

**Ms BEACH** - This is a principle-based approach and that will be part of the integrated transport assessment work that we'll do.

**Ms WEBB** - Okay, but you've told me already that I could go to the full report to try to find the number of bikes that are factored into this bar chart as people cycling to events. I presume we're factoring in that they have to park their bike at the event. So, is it one and the same number, that the number of bicycles we're anticipating being used as transport to events, we also need to accommodate that same number of bicycles parking there?

**Ms BEACH** - Yes, it would certainly inform it. But we'll also look at what other facilities there are for bicycles to park in and around the space. They would be interrelated and it would be part of that planning process.

**Ms WEBB** - Okay. So, it's just yet to come, yet to come.

## PUBLIC

**Dr BROAD** - In your annual report from 2020 to 2021, there's a statement that feasibility work is also completed for the remediation of the former railyard roundhouse, which will eventually become the site's underground car park. What happened to that project for an underground car park?

**Ms BEACH** - The master plan did include an underground car park. We are looking at car-parking options, particularly for tenants, so looking at an underground car park, looking in the Antarctic facilities zone. There will be a similar-sized car park available. It's just that we anticipate that will be required to service tenants, rather than being a public car park.

**Dr BROAD** - No, I specifically asked about that project. What happened to that project?

**Ms BEACH** - The development of a car park?

**Dr BROAD** - Yes.

**CHAIR** - In the 2020-21 annual report.

**Dr BROAD** - My understanding is that a consultant's report was prepared. What was the outcome of that consultant's report?

**Ms BEACH** - The area was remediated to provide for a car park as part of that master planning. We're looking to replicate equivalent car parking on site in the Antarctic facilities zone.

**Dr BROAD** - Again, that is not the question I asked, sorry. What happened to that specific project? It's my understanding that there was a consultant's report done on an underground car park on the Macquarie Point site. What was the outcome of that consultant's report?

**Ms BEACH** - That looked at the size of the car park in terms of feasibility and car-park numbers. It was not specific to the economics of that.

**Dr BROAD** - I am not talking about the economics. I have the report and it states:

*Howard Fisher does not recommend proceeding with the construction of an underground car park in this location.*

Can you please outline the reasons why?

**Ms BEACH** - I do not have a copy of that report in front of me, Chair. Let me just check with my team.

The original thinking included going quite deep and having a multi-level underground car park. The farther you go down, the more expensive those works become. The second tier down, I think, is what that comment is referring to -

**Dr BROAD** - No, it doesn't refer to a particular level not going ahead. It says:

## PUBLIC

*Howard Fisher does not recommend proceeding with the construction of an underground car park at this location.*

That is not one level; that is the entire car park at the location that was proposed.

**Ms BEACH** - That location includes some of the original shoreline and dolerite, and it would be an expensive area to extract. That was part of the previous master plan and is not part of our current precinct plan. That project is, effectively, no longer proceeding.

**Dr BROAD** - It also references contaminated water ingress, piled footings on a close-grid system, disposal costs for contaminated excavated materials, and groundwater. Those sorts of things are relevant to any project, aren't they?

**Ms BEACH** - We have remediated that section of land to the extent that some of that land needs to be further excavated. We manage that based on the contamination requirements, so it depends on how far down we need to go. The team is highly experienced in managing remediation. We have had a remediation consultation working with us since 2015 consistently throughout that process. It is a case-by-case basis of the extent, if we need to manage the extraction of soil, how we then carefully manage and safely do that. That would be relevant for any project that needs to dig into the site.

**Dr BROAD** - It also said:

*The findings of the investigation has revealed that the geology of the location may present a bigger cost implication than may have already been assessed.*

**Ms BEACH** - Yes, that is because it covers an area of dolerite. That is difficult to extract.

**CHAIR** - Can I follow up there, Shane? You said you were looking at doing some underground parking in the Antarctic facilities zone, is that correct?

**Ms BEACH** - Yes.

**CHAIR** - How is that different in terms of the geotechnical issues relating to those areas, I'm not sure exactly where, as opposed to where the former proposed underground car parking was?

**Ms BEACH** - Because it is a reclaimed area so it doesn't include bedrock at the levels that we would intercept for an underground car park. Also, that location is an area where we are looking to do some feasibility work for a car park because of the related site levels. The level that the road is likely to be, based on the initial work that Burbury has done for the northern access, will be slightly elevated. That creates an opportunity to have, effectively, an underground car park to a point without having to do significant excavations. It will depend on the feasibility how deep we go.

**CHAIR** - How many car parks are you thinking about here? Actual spaces, I mean.

**Ms BEACH** - It will depend on the feasibility work that we need to progress.

## PUBLIC

**CHAIR** - How many do you believe you would need to create adequate parking for residential or other tenants, including your Antarctic zone and any other tenants that are in that area?

**Ms BEACH** - We currently have planning approval for around 350 car parks, I believe. We are looking to increase to around 500. We would need 250 car parks, as an example, for the Antarctic facilities zone, based on previous business-case work working with the Australian Antarctic Division. We would probably be looking at similar numbers. Some of that is informed based on tenant need but also what the road network capacity can tolerate. The current maximum car parking is informed by the load operator and what they allow us to have on site.

**Mr WILLIE** - What about in terms of the operations of the stadium? I can imagine you would need parking for people who are working at the stadium, potentially the teams, all of the support staff?

**Ms BEACH** - Yes. So, that's why working through those requirements is important. As part of the design of the stadium, there are minimum car parks that are listed in the AFL and Tasmanian Government licence agreement. I think there are around 40 car parks and my understanding is Stadiums Tasmania would like to see a few more. So, that informs the design of the stadium itself. The way stadiums are designed, the playing field is slightly sunk compared to the seats and that creates a natural space where there can be back-of-house and car-parking facilities, so specific car parking for the stadium's requirements would be included in that design.

**Mr WILLIE** - What about people with mobility issues accessing the site? It seems to me like a lot of the modes of transport are you either park in the CBD and walk or you cycle, or there's obviously some bus access, but there would potentially be a number of people with mobility issues wanting to access the site?

**Ms BEACH** - Yes. Absolutely. We have listed in the precinct plan that one of the accessibility considerations is there will be accessible parking and drop-off facilities.

**Ms WEBB** - How many parking spaces are factored-in for that?

**CHAIR** - Accessible parking you mean, Meg?

**Ms WEBB** - Yes, accessible parking and accessible drop-off are two separate things. Is there a nominated number or a space allocated for the parking part of that?

**Ms BEACH** - The number of accessible car parks will be informed by the further work we'll do on-site. There are models for the minimum number of accessible parks that need to be available based on the size of facilities. There will be two access roads for the site. The northern access would be targeted for passenger transport drop-off for those event-day services. Then Evans Street, we're anticipating, would be able to support stadium-specific traffic and that's where we could support drop-off and facilities for people who might have accessibility challenges.

**Ms WEBB** - Evans Street would have stadium-specific traffic on event days? Is that what you're saying?

## PUBLIC

**Ms BEACH** - We direct the passenger transport services to the north to allow for spreading of that load across the two roads. Local traffic would obviously need to continue because that's an important access point for a number of businesses in the area; people who are working and need access into the stadium itself and also those people that may need specific drop-off.

**CHAIR** - I want to look at the northern access road. It visually blocks off the foreshore area from the Domain, the Cenotaph, around that area. What planning is there to enable access to the foreshore in that?

**Ms BEACH** - On the website, we have the early concept drawing that Burbury Engineering has prepared working with us and for ITas. The northern access road was identified as a Tasmanian Government commitment in 2019 and what we've been working on. Working with ITas and Burbury is how that we get those good passenger transport connections. That includes cycling and active transport as well as walking - so underpasses, safe crossing spaces and getting that separation of users. We have shown in the engineering drawings that are on our website, at a concept level, where those underpasses and connection points are.

**Dr BROAD** - I had questions around ammonia. I've heard that there is some ammonia contamination in the site. Could you outline what is the level of contamination and where it is on the site?

**Ms BEACH** - We can take that on notice, Chair, to provide some exact information on that. It's one of a number of contaminants we've needed to manage across the site and most of the site is remediated at this point. We have a large parcel to complete that will start works early next year, but specifically on ammonia levels, I can provide some advice on that.

**CHAIR** - Which sites are left in the area that need to be remediated, just so we can be clear about which areas we're talking about?

**Ms BEACH** - Yes. In the south-east corner of the site, a couple of weeks ago we just finished removing the last soil extracted from that area which completes the original site as it was transferred when the corporation was established in 2012. The parcel that is remaining is in the south-west corner, where Evans Street and Tasman Highway meet. That is where the old gasworks and cold store were and that's where there is tar-contaminated material. We are currently assessing a tender to complete those works, which will start early in the new year.

**CHAIR** - That's why the breakdown of your \$55 million is important.

**Dr BROAD** - In light of the previous proposal to construct a car park, do you believe that means it would be very difficult to build anything below ground level given the issues that were raised with contamination or rock-breaking, but I think it also mentions hovels and fill? Could you give a bit more of a response about that?

**Ms BEACH** - No, I don't think that means we can't develop that area of the site.

**Dr BROAD** - I mean the difficulties in digging down. The challenges there.

## PUBLIC

**Ms BEACH** - There's a mixture of different topography and geological information in there. On the western side is where the original shoreline is and where there is some dolerite deposit from the bedrock, then it moves into the reclaimed areas of the site. I don't have concerns about our ability to develop that. With a car park, it comes down to the commercial return you can generate from car parks and that informs some of whether or not that process makes sense in that location. I don't think that impedes other development that could occur in that space.

**CHAIR** - On revenues from the carpark, if it's for tenants as part of their deal, can you still charge additional lease payment even if that's a requirement to build it?

**Ms BEACH** - I was referring to the previous car park proposal, which I understood to be available for public use.

**CHAIR** - In the case where there is no public parking, is there a revenue stream from that?

**Mr SCULLIN** - Probably not. Maybe, but more likely a proponent for building the particular building and the car park would probably come forward with a proposal and it would probably be a one-off payment for their contribution, but it could be that they pay an ongoing stream. I would think it more likely that they say, 'This is what we'll pay you to take the land and design, construct, build and own the facility'.

**CHAIR** - This is one of the areas you are having to get private investment in.

**Mrs ALEXANDER** - My question is for Mr Scullin. I notice that in your first annual report in 2012-13 there was a reference to the fact that the corporation had a risk management strategy. However, going through the subsequent years including the latest report there is no reference to the risk management strategy. Instead, you have opted to only talk about the credit risk, liquidity risk and market risk. Is your risk management strategy available for public reading? That is question number one.

Question number two: at the end of the financial year 2022-23, considering that in May 2023 you received the official notification for a complete change of direction from the minister basically saying that a stadium will be developed on the site, have you updated your risk management strategy and what are the implications on the overall risk to the corporation from such a drastic change from the initial scope?

**Mr SCULLIN** - Yes, the corporation has a comprehensive risk management plan. We have a Committee of the board – the Audit and Risk Committee - and a significant part of their deliberations is around the risk register, where each risk is assessed in terms of the possibility of it occurring and the consequences if it did occur. That is updated at least annually, more often if the Committee feels there is a need. It is pretty comprehensive.

The review of it is conducted in conjunction with our external-internal auditor, which is KPMG. They also work with the Board to make sure that we've thought about all the risks and how we can manage and mitigate them. I don't know whether that's ever been made public. Do you have a view, Anne? It's an internal paper to the Board, but I think we can do it at least confidentially.



## PUBLIC

**CHAIR** - I'll put it on a list of questions to provide that. If you wish the Committee to receive it in camera, you need to make that request. The Committee will consider that.

**Mr SCULLIN** - Okay. But just to assure you, risk management is taken very seriously. Obviously on a big site like this, one of the risks on a day-to-day basis is hazard risks around the site. There are hazard walks twice a week around the site involving rotating groups of employees, so that you have fresh eyes looking for trip hazards and all those other sorts of things. That's at an operational level, but we do look at all the risks at a higher level, as well.

**Mrs ALEXANDER** - Thank you for that. My interest was more around the actual risk to the corporation following such a major drastic change of direction, not as much around the workers comp - work risk of health and safety risks. It's whether you have, as a board, formalised the risk impact on the corporation following a major change of direction in what initially you were planning to do, you set yourself to do? Has that body of work been completed, accomplished? Have you sought advice on the risk implications of the change of direction?

**Mr SCULLIN** - Yes, that is included in the risk register, the change in direction. The corporation has faced two. There was one significant change when the then-minister gave us an instruction to introduce what was called the MONA vision, or as much of it as we could. That led to a master plan. That was a significant shift at the time. There's been a new shift with the decision to have a multipurpose stadium there. Each time we've thought about what that means for the corporation's risks. We'll share that with you.

**CHAIR** - I'll just follow up with a question on that, Lara. With regard to the risks you've identified, how many of those have been costed?

**Mr SCULLIN** - I'm not sure that they're quantified on that basis. When you see the register, you'll see that the risk is identified, the probability of it occurring is identified, the way that you can manage it, and then the residual risk, and is that high or low. I don't know there's a dollar figure attached to each of the risks. Some of them might be quite difficult to quantify. We'll share it with you.

**CHAIR** - We can have a look at it, okay. Meg, then I'll come to you, Simon.

**Ms WEBB** - Thank you. Just to skip back for a moment and clarify, looking at the larger transport plan document on the website, it is 1,000 bicycles to each event that it's looked at. From what I can read, the parking available onsite is going to be 20 class one bicycle spaces, 120 class three bicycle spaces. So, there are 850 bikes or thereabouts being parked, presumably, in surrounding areas?

**Ms BEACH** - This is our first piece of work that identified the principles and different modes of travel. It's not the end product. That will all inform the transport modelling we do. That's initial advice we've got from WSP as event transport experts. That's further things we need to interrogate about how that will work and be modelled, and the space that we need to make sure is available. It may be a case of not just places to park bikes, but it may be appropriate for us to provide charging stations and the similar for different types of bikes. They're the specifics that we'll work through as part of the site planning.

## PUBLIC

**Ms WEBB** - But you're taking what they've presented to you on face value, that potentially 1,000 people will be cycling to a major event at the site?

**Ms BEACH** - Yes.

**Ms WEBB** - Did they take any local statistics and figures into account for that? Do you know?

**Ms BEACH** - Yes, the (inaudible) are guided by guiding principles, ABS statistics, looking at the network capabilities and the infrastructure that was likely to be available on day one. They factored in to how they anticipated people would access the site.

**Ms WEBB** - I can't imagine having 1,000 Tasmanians cycling to any event before, let alone numerous ones during the year.

**CHAIR** - They will be coming down from the north-west on their bikes.

**Ms WEBB** - Exactly.

I also want to ask a question around the Aboriginal culturally informed zone and where planning for that is up to? What specific consultation or process is under way now in relation to that area?

**Ms BEACH** - As part of investigations on site, we are currently in stage three of an archaeological dig. Across those investigations we have found a number of Aboriginal artefacts. We're working with the Aboriginal heritage officers who have been involved in that work to put together a package of information to take out to community and working with a consultancy firm to help us get around the different organisations.

It's probably a three-part process we're looking at where, firstly, we make sure we share what we have learnt about the site with the Aboriginal community; we have the offer for people to come on site and have a look at the location and understand where the original shoreline is and walk them through all the information that we understand. From that we'll seek their guidance on how that space should be developed, informed by their feedback. We need to make sure we're sharing with them what we've learnt as custodians of the site to inform how they then want to advise us how they would like to see that area developed.

**Ms WEBB** - At the moment, those excavations and those archaeological investigations are happening but that consultation process is in the future? That's not occurring yet?

**Ms BEACH** - That's right. We have spoken to some Aboriginal people but we certainly haven't undertaken a detailed, comprehensive engagement with community. That's what we'll seek to do informed by what we've learnt about the site. Every time we seek an Aboriginal heritage permit, wherever we think there may be a possibility of discovery of items and before we approach those, we engage with the Aboriginal Heritage Council. Whenever anything is discovered, part of that process is notifying the community to see if they'd like to make any comments to inform how it's managed.

## PUBLIC

Throughout that process there's been constant engagement. What's really important now is that we package all that up and make sure the community has a full picture of what we've learnt about the site and share that with them directly so they can then inform what we do next.

**Ms WEBB** - To be clear, how Aboriginal heritage matters are undertaken and dealt with is one thing and the interactions you have with the Aboriginal community around that is fine, but having something that's designated an Aboriginal culturally informed zone is a whole different aspect to this plan. Has there been any initial discussion with the Aboriginal community as to whether the Aboriginal community wants an Aboriginal culturally informed zone next to the stadium where you have it in the plans now?

**Ms BEACH** - I have spoken to Aboriginal people throughout this process but I wouldn't class that as comprehensive engagement with community. We've spoken to individuals who have provided guidance to us. This is the area that was the original shoreline which informed some of the thinking about this being a suitable location for such a site on the broader site. The conversation we need to have with community is what is important about this site? How should that inform the development, not only of this area but the broader site?

**Ms WEBB** - One last thing to be clarified on that matter. A culturally informed zone which is related to the Aboriginal heritage features is different to an Aboriginal reconciliation park or what had previously been proposed as the central character of the previous master plan. These are not things we should think about as being similar in intent?

**Ms BEACH** - The reason we haven't called it a Truth and Reconciliation Park, and it would have been easier for us to do that, is because the feedback I got from Aboriginal people was to not call it that. We need to have a conversation with community and ask them what they want it to be. That is why we have called it a culturally informed zone. That was the feedback I heard from Aboriginal people.

**Ms WEBB** - That's what I'm talking about - whether there have been discussions even about the initial appetite and interest in having something that is specifically focused on Aboriginal Tasmanians there as part of this plan. That's limited.

**Ms BEACH** - Yes. There is a mixture of views on that and that's why it's important we go to community to get the collective view.

**Mr BEHRAKIS** - On the alternative proposal, have the proponents of that reached out to you guys at all? Have you had any discussions with them?

**Ms BEACH** - None.

**Mr BEHRAKIS** - I think that is curious. That is the only question I had.

**Mr WILLIE** - Mine flows on from that. You have had a number of stakeholders within the vicinity, including the RSL, support an unsolicited proposal. I am interested in whether you have been able to answer those questions for the RSL. I think they are concerned about the height, the size and how long. Have you been able to answer those questions for the RSL and give them any sort of comfort?

## PUBLIC

**Ms BEACH** - Yes. The precinct plan itself identifies the key development parcels and how the site will be developed. It was not intended to be a first pass at 'this is what the stadium will be'. Each of the individual projects we will need to do some further work on.

We have been able to answer some of those questions. We can answer for location. We have a footprint that is 232 metres by 236 metres, and we are specific about where that is in the site.

In terms of timing, we have identified the stadium as part of the staging of the precinct that is included in the plan - that we would see the northern access road and the stadium as stage one. That work would start first.

There are some time lines set out in the agreement between the Tasmanian Government and the AFL about the anticipated time line for that delivery. We can answer where and about how long. The height? I haven't pretended that we have an answer for that yet. That needs to be informed by the design of the stadium, which is informed by the requirements of the site, the feedback we have had and the user requirements.

**Mr WILLIE** - You have significant stakeholder groups that are supporting an unsolicited proposal now. How will that impact your consultation with them moving forward, given that they do not support the proposal at Macquarie Point?

**Ms BEACH** - The RSL was one of a number of ex-service organisations that represent people in Tasmania. We have spoken to others. I continue to offer to meet with the RSL and we will continue to do that throughout this whole process. I think it is important that they help inform the design, work that needs to happen both on that and some of the other parcels of the site. All I can do is keep that door open.

**Mr WILLIE** - Are you having engagement with any other adjacent interests? I know the Federal Group own the Henry Jones Art Hotel. They have expressed some concerns about what will happen to those historic buildings.

**Ms BEACH** - We have met with the Federal Group and have another meeting with them, which was scheduled a while ago, later this week as well.<sup>3</sup> We have met with each of the different key businesses around the site. We have worked closely with TasPorts, we have spoken to other neighbouring sites such as the Friends of the Soldiers Memorial Walk and the Vietnam Vets. I can provide a list of the stakeholders that we have engaged with throughout this process and met with.

**CHAIR** - Throughout which process? They were not spoken to earlier, so which process are we talking about now?

**Ms BEACH** - Through the development of the precinct plan.

**CHAIR** - That would be good to get the business stakeholders consultation.

**Mr WILLIE** - Put that on notice, perhaps?

---

<sup>3</sup> Ms Beach subsequently advised the Committee Secretary and corrected the record: the meeting was scheduled for Thursday, 7 December 2023.

## PUBLIC

**Ms BEACH** - Yes.

**Mr WILLIE** - When will these adjacent interests and other stakeholders get an answer on the height? I know you have to submit to the PoSS, but have you got a time frame in mind in terms of next year?

**Ms BEACH** - The integrated guidelines, I think, need to be completed by mid-February. That will be one of the important inputs into the design of the stadium and what will go to the TPC or their panel to be assessed. We would anticipate having a concept design to inform that around mid-next year.

**Mr WILLIE** - So mid-next year they will get an answer on the height and how that might impact the Cenotaph or the historic buildings on Evans Street?

**Ms BEACH** - Yes, that would be our concept design and would be further finessed as that work progresses.

**Ms WEBB** - There must be some understanding of a minimum height for a roofed stadium?

**Ms BEACH** - We have not been progressing specific work on stadium design.

**CHAIR** - And where ground zero is, too. Where it starts from?

**Ms BEACH** - Not necessarily, Chair. It depends on how that approach and the design of the stadium will actually determine some of the height factors. How it is integrated into the site is important to its ultimate height.

**CHAIR** - That's what I'm saying: You have to know what ground zero is for you to start building from.

Going back to your stakeholders, when you provide the list, can you also provide details of when you met the stakeholders and any feedback they provided?

**Ms BEACH** - Yes, we have file notes for each of those meetings.

**Ms WEBB** - On the location issue, can I get a quick clarification? In terms of proximity to Evans Street, when we look at the precinct plan it is very close. Literally how many metres is the edge of the stadium concourse to Evans Street?

**Ms BEACH** - I would need to check that. The building envelope does not go onto Evans Street and there is a buffer of part of the concourse there. I can get the exact measurements for that estimated footprint.

**CHAIR** - This little notch that you can see there, following on from Meg's question -

**Ms WEBB** - I presume that's the drop-off zone or something?

**CHAIR** - It notches in rather than out.

## PUBLIC

**Ms BEACH** - That's actually the footprint of the site. There is another parcel of land in front there.

**Ms WEBB** - On Evans Street, that little tiny notch?

**Ms BEACH** - That is currently service infrastructure.

**Ms WEBB** - I am interested in the proximity in metres of the edge of the concourse to Evans Street there.

**CHAIR** - There's that area there that's obviously not part of the site.

**Ms WEBB** - That's the edge of the site.

**CHAIR** - Along the whole length of Evans Street would be helpful to have, assuming it is the same all the way?

**Ms WEBB** - No, I mean you've got a closest point. The closest point of the concourse to Evans Street is what I am interested in.

**Mr WILLIE** - In terms of the concept design, will we get a costing in July [2024] as well?

**Ms BEACH** - We have a budget to work to, which is \$715 million.

**Mr WILLIE** - Okay, but that's pretty rigid in the current construction environment. If you do some detailed design work and it appears that it's going to cost a lot more, which a lot of experts are saying in commentary, will we get an updated costing at that time?

**Ms BEACH** - If there's a need. As with all projects, they are given a budget. It has been informed by some cost estimates and we would be expected to work within those. If we are unable to, we can then look at that. But that would be the starting base that we would be expected to work to.

**Mr WILLIE** - So, potentially, we will get a budget stadium because that's the funding envelope, rather than what's fit for purpose?

**Ms BEACH** - It refers back to your question before around contingencies. The budget does include contingencies in there.

**CHAIR** - Can I ask how you interpret the need for easements, given the site has a lot of areas of construction and various builds on it. How do you cater for the easements?

**Ms BEACH** - What sort of easements?

**CHAIR** - There are many easements that will need to be on that site, I imagine. I am talking in broad terms.

## PUBLIC

**Ms BEACH** - Part of that will be looking at how we manage the site infrastructure and where those access points are. Throughout all our thinking, we've included public open space and connection points so they can provide those connections of where infrastructure can go.

**CHAIR** - What easements currently exist on the site?

**Ms BEACH** - There is currently a transport corridor identified on the title and we have a myriad of infrastructure that runs through the site that we have either relocated or are working on relocating. For example, there is a high-voltage cable that currently runs thorough the south-west corner of the site. The works happening onsite at the moment are in the process of removing that. What we will try to do is keep critical service infrastructure around the boundary or, otherwise, in those public shared spaces.

**CHAIR** - If there are easements required for some of those services, one would assume they can't go along Evans Street because there doesn't seem to be enough room. That is part of the perimeter. The perimeter seems pretty tight in some spots. I am interested in where all the easements are going to go for this critical infrastructure. Obviously, the road, the transport corridor, disappears in that because it would have gone through parts of the stadium.

**Ms BEACH** - There is a lot of service infrastructure already in Evans Street: water, power, sewer. Those things can be in those corridors.

**CHAIR** - Including with the construction that is going on?

**Ms BEACH** - Yes.

**CHAIR** - Where are the services that are in Evans Street now? Are they on the Macquarie Point side or are they under the footpath?

**Ms BEACH** - We have one critical piece of infrastructure on our side. That is the sewer main that we are working to redirect around the site. Evans Street is not our space and we are not responsible for those pieces of infrastructure. We would look to use the road corridor for access to infrastructure that services the different built form.

**CHAIR** - The Evans Street road, you mean?

**Ms BEACH** - There is the Evans Street road and there is also the paved transport connection in the north as well.

**CHAIR** - It is not built yet?

**Ms BEACH** - No.

**CHAIR** - I think you might have covered this. How much of the site is development-ready? Where this proposed stadium is, does that need any more work to remediate it? I assume that the sewer line still there hasn't been moved yet. How much of it is actually ready, could progress site-ready?

**Ms BEACH** - Most of the site is prepared. The sewer main there is over 100 years old. We're working on diverting that around our border with TasPorts and then working with

## PUBLIC

TasWater and TasPorts on the design for that. That work needs to be progressed. The south-west corner still needs to be remediated. Those works are anticipated to start early next year.

**CHAIR** - What is the time line for the replacement of the sewer line?

**Ms BEACH** - We hope that work can start early next year. We just need to finalise some agreements and revise some of the contract arrangements.

**CHAIR** - We have contractors onsite. We talked about this at a previous hearing here, that you have people onsite who were ready to go and staff at work - but on the previous plan not the new plan. What has happened with those workers? Obviously it's not ready to start yet; there's still work to do.

**Ms BEACH** - Yes. We've been working on a design for that pathway, working with TasWater and TasPorts. Some of that needs to feed into TasWater's thinking around their pump station location and the emergency storage, because that determines where the pipe needs to connect. Those designs are getting close and from that we'll be able to progress. The contractors that we had commissioned to start that work, we have had work through a number of other projects that needed to progress onsite. I think I provided a breakdown or provided some costs on that in a previous request for further information, but I can run through some of the other works they've been doing, if you would like.

**CHAIR** - Will the old sewer line remain in situ or is that going to be removed?

**Ms BEACH** - It would need to be removed. It's quite shallow, so it does impede development, cutting the site in half.

**CHAIR** - So, it's not ready yet because you've got to move that.

**Ms BEACH** - Yes. That work is happening next year. Some of the work that BlackCap, who was commissioned to do the sewer relocation, has progressed for us was the demolition of the SeaRoad shed, which happened last year; bulk earthworks in the middle of the site to complete some previous works there; internal road sealing to support our tenants; and they undertook their remediation of audit area three, the south-east corner, the area underneath the SeaRoad shed. That was the last major area of the original site that required remediation.

**CHAIR** - So, they haven't completed all that work yet? They're still engaged in doing that?

**Ms BEACH** - All that work is complete.

**CHAIR** - Has that contract now ended?

**Ms BEACH** - The contract was suspended, because the task didn't change. It was specifics around the detailed design. The intended scope of the primary function of the contract remains. We will then need to progress some contract negotiations to progress the works.

**CHAIR** - How much have you already paid BlackCap for the work they have done?



## PUBLIC

**Ms BEACH** - The demolition of the SeaRoad shed was \$326,000. The bulk earthworks and road sealing was \$475,000 and the remediation works came to \$996,000.

**CHAIR** - You've suspended the contract to re-engage them. Were they contracted for a specific amount to do the task of dealing with the sewer line, which is what I believe they were there to do originally?

**Ms BEACH** - Yes.

**CHAIR** - So was it a fixed-price contract?

**Ms BEACH** - Yes.

**CHAIR** - So, you're going to have to re-negotiate it?

**Ms BEACH** - Yes, based on the change in the length of the pipe that will be required.

**CHAIR** - What was the contract price?

**Ms BEACH** - \$4 million.

**CHAIR** - \$4 million? So, that's not all expended, then, yet?

**Ms BEACH** - No.

**CHAIR** - No. Okay. When is the renegotiation occurring? Can you do that prior to getting a finalised design?

**Ms BEACH** - No. We will need to do the work that the infrastructure will be handed over to TasWater. We need to make sure we have an agreed design.

**CHAIR** - And you have to fund that through the funding here?

**Ms BEACH** - Yes.

**Ms WEBB** - Can I clarify, the area where there's proposed to be housing around on the Regatta Point side-

**CHAIR** - Regatta Grounds, not Regatta Point. Regatta Point is in Strahan.

**Ms WEBB** - Regatta Grounds. Well, actually, in the precinct plan, it refers to Regatta Point.

**CHAIR** - That's wrong, because that's in Strahan, Regatta Point.

**Ms WEBB** - I'm just clarifying the ownership of that land. Is that currently Crown land, or to enable those developments do you have to encroach into land that's a different tenure?

## PUBLIC

**Ms BEACH** - No, it would be fully contained in Crown-owned land. Regatta Point is an activity area identified in the Sullivans Cove Planning Scheme, which sets out that space. I think it's Activity Area 4.2. It is an identified statutory space.

**Ms WEBB** - And that's Crown land?

**Ms BEACH** - Yes.

**Ms WEBB** - Has Macquarie Point precinct been officially expanded to cover that area? I don't think it was officially covered by Macquarie Point, by your precinct, previously, was it?

**Ms BEACH** - Has the transfer been complete? No, not yet.

**Ms WEBB** - When is the expected time line for that?

**Ms BEACH** - There's a process set out in our act that requires a series of approvals and then they can settle. My understanding is that it's in process.

**Ms WEBB** - Right. In terms of the criticisms of the Stadium 2.0 proposal, and the fact that that covers areas that aren't just Crown land but are owned differently, is that because some of the area that is closer to the Cenotaph is incorporated in that 2.0 plan?

**Ms BEACH** - My understanding from the drawings is that concept involves a number of parcels of land. It looks like it would require TasWater land, Hobart City Council land, Crown land, and corporation land. There are a number of parcels there's not an individual section. It also requires reclamations, so there's a large amount of land tenure work to be done there.

**Ms WEBB** - Yes, sure. I understand that. I was just trying to clarify how the footprint of it was different from what is proposed now that you're wrapping around to that area as well.

**Ms BEACH** - The precinct planning is constrained there to Crown-owned land only.

**Ms WEBB** - Okay. It doesn't encroach into the TasWater space, and obviously not into the port space?

**Ms BEACH** - The area that's currently the location of the Macquarie Point sewage treatment plan is owned by TasWater. Once it's decommissioned and removed that would be a connection point for the port. There'd be a small parcel of that land that we would use for plant equipment, and the majority would otherwise transfer to TasPorts.

**Ms WEBB** - Okay. So this proposal does encroach into that similar mix of land?

**Ms BEACH** - The access to the port has been on the basis of that land transfer. To construct the pump station, TasWater need to do that in advance of decommissioning the waste water treatment plants. They'll build the pump station, build the pipeline, have it all working, and then turn everything off. That requires additional land, so it's effectively a land swap with TasPorts.

**CHAIR** - Is it Mac Point's responsibility to build the northern access road?

## PUBLIC

**Ms BEACH** - No, that would be a State road.

**CHAIR** - So that's not part of the \$715 million budget?

**Ms BEACH** - I don't think so.

**CHAIR** - You don't think so?

**Ms BEACH** - Well, I don't have the numbers in front of me. I believe that it is a separate project. It was committed in advance of the stadium, so I would assume it would be funded separately.

**Mr SCULLIN** - The northern access road was part of the City Deal.

**CHAIR** - The one on the website here and the link to Evans Street that'll tail off to the port and tail down to the waterfront is completely separate to the development of the stadium, the precinct?

**Ms BEACH** - It was precommitted in 2019 by the Tasmanian Government as part of facilitating Antarctic logistics on the port and the requirement for a secondary access. It would be developed separately to us, but we would expect to be part of that process to make sure it interlinks with our site.

**Ms WEBB** - You've designated it stage one. It's the other part of stage one with the stadium, is it not?

**Ms BEACH** - Yes, but so is the redevelopment of the wharf. Our intent was not to develop the space as an island, but do it informed by the other developments that would be happening around us. The northern access road is a key existing project. We worked with ITas to make sure, as part of the precinct planning work, that it was informed by how that would likely be developed.

**CHAIR** - Do you believe it is fully funded by the state under separate funding? None of the \$715 million budget will need to go toward any of this construction?

**Ms BEACH** - That would be my assumption because it predates the stadium work.

**CHAIR** - You say you assume that. You are not entirely sure? Do we need to clarify that?

**Ms BEACH** - I assume it is part of the road program. It is identified in the Keeping Hobart Moving Strategy. It is identified in phase 1 in the first three years of that project. How that's funded as part of the road program would be coordinated by State Growth.

**Ms WEBB** - Will it need to be part of the PoSS integrated assessment - the arrangements around the construction of that road, the economics of it, the funding of it?

**Ms BEACH** - Understanding of it will be important because it will be a key part of the transport modelling and work but the delivery of it would be separate, that would be delivered

## **PUBLIC**

by State Growth. Certainly, an understanding of how it would work in the time line, I would have thought, would be important.

**CHAIR** - Particularly in terms of traffic management.

**Ms WEBB** - It will be interesting to find out about the funding.

**CHAIR** - We have gone a bit later than what we said but we did start a bit later. We appreciate you having some flexibility around that. If there are no other burning questions, I thank you both for coming. We will write to you with a series of questions and thank you for your appearance. There is nothing you wanted to add before we finish?

**Mr SCULLIN** - What is the likely timetable now for your Committee? When do you think there will be a report or what is the process from here?

**CHAIR** - That is a matter for the Committee to consider. As Christmas is coming, we will need to have further hearings based on the revised terms of reference. We can't fit all of those in before Christmas so it will be after Christmas.

**THE WITNESSES WITHDREW**

**The Committee suspended from 12:52 pm to 2:30 pm.**

## PUBLIC

**The Committee resumed at 2:30 pm.**

**CHAIR** - Welcome to both of you, Paul - and Stuart, in person here. We appreciate you providing a submission to our revised terms of reference, focussing on matters related to proposed design and costs of the proposed stadium at Macquarie Point. We appreciate that you have provided that for us and we have read that. We will have questions after that. In the interim, I would like you to take the statutory declaration. Paul's outside the State, aren't you?

**Mr STUART TANNER**, NATIONAL PRESIDENT, AUSTRALIAN INSTITUTE OF ARCHITECTS, WAS CALLED, MADE THE STATUTORY DECLARATION AND WAS EXAMINED and **Mr PAUL ZANATTA** WAS CALLED VIA WEBEX

**CHAIR** - Thank you. This is a public hearing and it is being streamed on the website. It will form part of our record and be transcribed and published on our website. Everything you say is covered by parliamentary privilege while you are before the Committee. That may not extend beyond the hearing. If there is anything of a confidential nature you wish to share with the Committee, you can make that request and the Committee would consider it. Otherwise, it is all public. Do you have any questions before we start?

**Mr TANNER** - No.

**CHAIR** - I assume you will be the main spokesperson in this?

**Mr TANNER** - Yes, I think it is probably best if, on occasion, I refer to Paul and he will be able to augment what I am saying quite well.

**CHAIR** - Okay. I invite you to make further opening comment to support your submission if you wish. We can then go to questions.

**Mr TANNER** - Thank you very much. I am the national president of the Australian Institute of Architects. In introduction, thank you to the Chair, and for the opportunity to respond to the Tasmanian Government's process into the proposed arts, entertainment, and sports precinct in Hobart. The Australian Institute of Architects recognises the unceded sovereign lands and rights of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples as the first peoples of these lands and waters.

In terms of the proposed arts, entertainment and sports precinct, the institute supports the development of this important location to these purposes subject to a range of conditions:

- Development must not only uphold the highest design standards but also maximise benefits to all Tasmanians through improving public infrastructure, civic amenities and economic opportunities.
- Development at this scale should be responsive to climate change, carbon mitigation, adaptation, settlement patterns, cultural impact, sustainability, liveability and longevity.
- With respect to truth and reconciliation, the institute advocates for the ideas and the values associated with the original Truth and Reconciliation Park to be meaningfully incorporated into the precinct through a process of co-design with First Nation people, cultural advisers and representatives.

## PUBLIC

- With respect to the public realm, a sports stadium is only part of the picture. As with former master plans, of which there have been a few, there needs to be a strong emphasis on the public realm through design decisions that reflect on local heritage and context, and integration with the surrounding urban fabric of Sullivans Cove.
- In terms of economic sustainability, Tasmanians in the building consultancy and construction sectors, including graduates and apprentices, should benefit from business growth, upskilling, and career-entry opportunities.

A rapidly executed development of the precinct would require capacity to be imported from mainland states and territories and this would place an additional pressure on already strained housing. In contrast, a carefully and well-staged development would permit Tasmania's building consultancy and construction sectors to deliver the major part of the required services and works as a sustained effort. A sustained effort delivered by local capacity would, in turn, deliver long-term economic and social benefits to Tasmania.

As an institute, we have expectations for the planning for the city. A broader city-shaping and urban-planning brief should be addressed by any large-scale developments in this location. There should be ongoing consultation with the First Peoples of lutruwita to ensure care for country through a design for country approach. Public transport networks and nodes, pedestrian walkways and the intercity cycleway and other cycle routes should be developed or upgraded and become well connected.

Housing should be appropriately leveraged by the precinct development. Since our submission, a major alternate proposal has indicated that worker housing would later be recommissioned as social and affordable housing. This housing should be built as long-term permanent housing and not potentially later sold off as a development opportunity. The people living in this housing would then have access to nearby employment at the new facilities, so the development must respect and enhance the scale and the settings of the Cenotaph headland, the grounds, the Bridge of Remembrance and the Queen's Domain so there needs to be further stages of consultation with the Tasmanian architectural and design professionals and the community.

I thank you for the opportunity to make this submission on this important stage in the evolution of Hobart as both a port and a capital city.

**CHAIR** - Thank you. I appreciate the comments you've made and the importance of community engagement and buy-in and whatever happens on this whole area. In terms of any consultation that's been undertaken by Macquarie Point Development Corporation or the Government in proposing this, has that happened with the Institute of Architects at all?

**Mr TANNER** - We have seen some involvement. There have been members involved but as national president I won't comment on other members' work. The point needs to be made that the relevant and critical design professionals - urban design professionals and planning professionals - must be included in this process to give the project real rigour and density that it requires because this is a major move for the whole city, not just one site.

**CHAIR** - How do you see that happening because, obviously, I'm not sure how much you understand about the Project of State Significance process but it's been referred. The

## PUBLIC

Tasmanian Planning Commission (TPC) has developed guidelines under which the project is assessed. Is that something that the Institute of Architects would have a role to play in raising some of these matters in terms of the importance of engagement with First Nations people and engagement with those neighbours and existing public infrastructure and the like? The look and feel of it as well. Is that something that you would participate in?

**Mr TANNER** - The short answer to that is yes and we would welcome that involvement. It needs to be said that as an institute we are pro-development and pro-development of a precinct such as this but it's important that the caveat to that is that we are pro-design excellence and pro-high quality development and that is absolutely key. High-quality development and design excellence comes from a very carefully understood and carefully analysed process and there is an enormous amount of expertise within the institute that could be provided to the TPC.

**CHAIR** - That is more a proactive requirement from the Institute of Architects in many respects.

**Ms WEBB** - My understanding is that the TPC has until 16 February [2024] to put forward the guidelines. There has to be public consultation as part of that which, presumably, has to happen before Christmas, so we could all expect any minute for there to be an invitation for public input into the guidelines and development process so is that something that the institute can be on the front foot to be a participant in?

**Mr TANNER** - The answer to that would be yes and, Paul, you may have some comments to make on that.

**CHAIR** - I don't think you get an invitation, I think it has to be proactive, the way I understand it.

**Mr ZANATA** - That's an interesting question. First of all, to further answer your earlier question, we did make a submission in August to the development corporation. I would like to get some clarification for your comment about proactive participation on our behalf. Do you mean you want us to assertively reach out to the planning commission or are you more talking about the perspective of having people who would participate in the process on our behalf? Can you please give us a little bit more detail of what you mean by us 'reaching out or actively participating' as against being invited to participate? I am a little unclear.

**CHAIR** - As I understand the process, the TPC will put out a call for public input into the development of the guidelines that will guide the assessment of the project. There is a four-month period there but the public consultation has to fit into that. It will be more at the front end of it and then they would develop the guidelines. I do not know how the TPC operates in this regard. We don't have many projects of state significance. We do not have a lot to go back on and see how they did it. Whether they particularly go out and contact people, I am not sure.

The question I have for you, the institute, is that something you might see advertised in the paper or be aware of and then, once that call is made, put your thoughts forward into the development of the guidelines to ensure that the matter is of high-quality design and a part of the picture.

## PUBLIC

**Mr ZANATTA** - Yes, we would make a submission on the development of the guidelines. By all means, we would definitely participate in that. There is an economy to processes around our own workflows in the organisation if someone can tap us on the shoulder and say, 'Hey, by the way, these have been released'. We do pay attention to various media feeds. We are not sitting down reading the newspapers every day. I genuinely mean that. It is not like we are sitting down there every day reading through the Public Notices part of the paper. We do actually have a media monitor service that we use; if we picked that up in our daily media monitor feeds.

Sometimes it is good from the TPC's point of view, a little bit of proactive stakeholder engagement in terms of having a grid of whom they would see as groups in the community that most likely would be wanting to respond. That would even include organisations such as the Planning Institute of Australia Tasmania and maybe the Master Builders Association Tasmania. I think that if they had a communication, a simple email list or mail list, that would probably be a useful thing, just to make sure that we are aware as soon as it goes out. I certainly can say from the point of view of being a national advocacy and policy manager, working with our different chapters, and also nationally, the earlier we get started on a submission, always the better. The sooner that we know, the better.

**Ms WEBB** - I would say keep a very close eye out any minute. The public consultation has to happen before Christmas; that's my understanding from discussions with the TPC. It is, therefore, only going to be a short period of time to put submissions in. It could be any moment.

**Mr ZANATTA** - Okay, we will definitely keep an eye out on their website and they will have a media releases page, I would hope. I will also give them a ring and see if I can make sure they let us know. Thank you for raising that.

**CHAIR** - Going back to your comments around the importance of high-quality design, with appropriate impact on the location, in the expectation for planning for the city, you've noted in one of your dot points there: 'Development that respects and enhances the scale and setting of the Cenotaph headland and grounds, Bridge of Remembrance and the Queens Domain.' Knowing that the specifications have been dictated to the State by the AFL - that it is a 23 000-seat fixed-roof stadium - do you believe that can be constructed on that site and not interfere with the important sightlines from the Cenotaph?

**Mr TANNER** - I think the important thing to bear in mind is that this really must be a design-led process. You really only begin to realise how your question will be answered once there is more density in the proposal. As with any proposal that requires design stewardship, as this one definitely does, the opportunities and the limitations and restraints of any one site become more evident the deeper you go through that process. What we would need to see is more progression and density with whichever scheme has been proposed before we really begin to understand those impacts that you refer to on the broader context.

Nonetheless, I believe that through, again, design excellence - and I would refer to a lot of the incredibly high-quality developments in close proximity to other things that I've seen in my travels and so forth as national president - that with high-level thinking and careful process, one would hope that those other aspects of the site can be managed and the site becomes something that benefits, most critically, the whole city, not just the site itself.



## PUBLIC

**CHAIR** - You said here it should maximise benefits to the Tasmanian community. That's not Hobart. The Tasmanian community includes the north-west coast and King Island, Flinders Island.

**Mr TANNER** - It does, of course. All places I've been. What I would say to that is I would point to the importance for not having a, shall we say, targeted, truncated process, particularly during construction. It needs to have a staged and carefully planned process such that we can maximise the engagement, employment of all professionals and construction trades so that it does benefit in that way the community.

We all understand. I'm not just talking about the actual site itself or the stadium itself. I'm talking about the associated infrastructure that is absolutely critical to this development. Again, some of the best cities you can see around the world have extremely well-integrated public infrastructure. They have used development opportunities to uplift a city, to generate and engender civic pride. I think the opportunity for Hobart and the opportunity for Tasmania, when we are faced with any development of this kind of scale, is that there needs to be an uplifting and improvement of city betterment and city infrastructure and civic benefits in amenity.

**CHAIR** - You made the point earlier and just repeated it then around the need to almost stage the development to enable particularly local workforce benefits in terms of apprentices and others. There is a pretty tight time frame inherent in the agreement. From what you know about building, which is more than me by quite a margin, I imagine, do you think it's even possible to build such a facility, engage in the way you suggest with the workforce, but still meet the time lines? Considering you've still got a long way to go in the planning for the process of PoSS.

**Mr TANNER** - I would pick up on your last point. There's a very long way to go in this so I really would not be willing to comment on that at this stage because this project is, essentially, still in its embryonic stages. It is a very large project and it has a lot of sophisticated aspects to it. I think there are going to be so many things that are not just project-related but also outside of the project's scope - that are going to impact it in terms of bettering, linking and integrating with the city - that time frames would be difficult to pin down. I think that's why the more work that is done, in a real granular level of understanding, to the master planning and the urban design of the whole site, and how it integrates with the city, is going to bring about a better understanding of time frame.

**Mr ZANATTA** - Stuart and I were reflecting yesterday on this. If the careful work is not done upfront, in terms of that thorough site analysis, the two comparative locations - we're very aware of the highly public Dean Coleman proposal - while we have lovely 3D renders with video flyovers, et cetera, that is not the required detail to make sure, to really attend to such matters as the sightlines, shadowing.

I'm not an architect. I want to make that very clear, but Stuart was even drawing my attention to the way sunlight, for example, would come into the stadium, given the latitude that Hobart sits at. It's all that required detail work that needs to be done upfront. If the detail design work and analysis is not done upfront, then the risk is that there are errors that then get built in. They are then very expensive errors to remediate.

**CHAIR** - The grass won't grow.

**Ms WEBB** - Can I ask a question?

**Mr WILLIE** - I have to go in a second.

**CHAIR** - Okay, sure. Then I'll come to you.

**Mr WILLIE** - It is great to hear you talk about design excellence, Stuart, but are we going to get design excellence for a budget of \$715 million? In the previous hearing, we heard that we are not going to get an updated cost probably in July when the concept designs are done. We've had \$240 million from the federal government contributed for the precinct, but there's no funding for housing, there's no funding for transport, there's no funding for the wharf upgrades. Are we going to get design excellence in that environment?

**Mr TANNER** - I would hope we are going to get design excellence in that environment. That would be the objective of the Institute. In terms of budget, once again, like any project, it is absolutely critical to the proper management and stewardship of a project and setting of expectations that the knowledge around both time frame and cost is known - the sharpest assertion of time frame and cost - because it is always something that is in flux until you sign a contract. The objectives should be to understand as much as possible the most realistic assertion of both time and cost at the earliest possible stages. That will only come from a concerted effort to put the density into the design at the earliest possible stages.

We all understand that it is a long process, but I think it's important for not only the Government and everyone involved, and also the Tasmanian public, to have a sound understanding of what the likely and probable true cost of the project is - not just the stadia itself, but the associated infrastructure. If we only focus on one aspect of this, then other aspects of the city may not be optimum. In fact, they may generate further problems.

It should be a holistic approach to this. That means a very detailed and sophisticated analysis at the earliest possible stage of where the true scope and therefore cost of such a large investment will be.

Paul, did you want to add to that?

**Mr ZANATTA** - I will add a point. I suppose what could be useful for the Government to consider is what is the current construction cost for projects at similar scale?

I said to Stuart yesterday, I was noting that in October 2020 the Victorian government, as part of its COVID-19 stimulus, made an announcement for the National Gallery Modern in Melbourne. If I'm recalling correctly - I should have pulled up the media release - I think that's a project at scale that sits behind the National Gallery of Victoria, of some \$1.6 billion.

I don't know how the cost compares to constructing a museum, sorry, a gallery, with all its required temperature and atmosphere controls, versus a stadium which has to hold a large number of people at any one time safely. I think it would be rather useful for the Government to even try to undertake some sort of benchmarking based on comparable projects in the last five years, and weight those costings for the location, et cetera.

## PUBLIC

**Mr WILLIE** - Stuart, it's my understanding that the costings have been based off Metricon Stadium in Queensland, which is a pretty standard sort of stadium. You probably wouldn't say design excellence. It's a pretty standard design of a stadium. If that was to be placed at Macquarie Point in a pretty similar design, is that design excellence?

**Mr TANNER** - It depends when it was built. We have seen significant uplift in the last few years alone in building costs, supply constraints and all these things which are driving costs up. I would say again, and this is really to answer your question, Josh, or illuminate it more and in an advisory sense to the Committee which is really important. Like any project, it is critical in terms of good, sound housekeeping and stewardship to set a client's expectations around time and cost. If you don't do that and regardless of what project it is, then trust can be lost in that process.

It is critical to engender confidence in this process that the required work, going back to our earlier comments, is about getting good master planning and detail and understanding of what the true sophistication of the project is and what is truly required in terms of the full scope of the entire project.

You can't necessarily wave a magic wand and have a full set of documents in front of you. It takes many months and a lot of processes and a lot of consultants. Those processes can be embarked upon. There needs to be a number of stages where those costs are put under a microscope so that they can be staged and upgraded as you go in terms of the full scope of the project that is required to make this a really workable site.

**Mr WILLIE** - What I am hearing is, if you are going to do this properly potentially there will be cost updates required along the way, which may be more than the \$715 million.

**Mr TANNER** - That is correct.

**Mr ZANATTA** - We've made a distinct point in our proposal that a project that is carefully staged, that maximises the employment and economic development opportunities for Tasmanians as against a very rapidly executed project that requires lots of importing of skilled work and expertise from interstate, that rapid approach and the importing of skills will have its own set of collateral costs. One of those will be about housing that workforce in and around the area to enable the job to be done. One really needs to go in with all eyes open.

**Mr TANNER** - It is reasonable to say there is a direct correlation between haste and risk.

**Ms WEBB** - I wanted to pick up on your comments that the public needs to know, time frames and costs for the whole precinct at the earliest possible stage. When you say that, do you mean at a stage prior to a final decision or final approval being given for go-ahead for the project?

**Mr TANNER** - I am not sure in the background where things are at in terms of the progress of either option that is proposed for Macquarie Point. In an ideal sense that would be a positive thing.

**Ms WEBB** - Currently, the Government's proposal has been put into the PoSS process and that process has begun. That produces a recommendation from the Planning Commission, which then has to come back to Parliament for a final vote. That's an absolute go-no-go point

## PUBLIC

when Parliament gets that final vote. Is it your expectation that we should expect to see very clear and transparent information about the time frame and cost of the whole precinct, not just the stadium component but the whole precinct, at that time when we are looking at that decision-making point?

**Mr TANNER** - I think it is important, as any client, that you need to have the maximum amount of knowledge when you are making a significant decision about whether a project should proceed or not, given the level of public funding associated with such an investment.

**Ms WEBB** - What risks do you see if we go ahead and we're just focused on what the Government's proposal calls Stage 1, which is the stadium build and the road from the north coming into the area? If we are just making decisions on that stage without full awareness and design and understanding of the cost and time frame for the subsequent stages, what are the risks involved there?

**Mr TANNER** - The requirement for more funding and variation. It is like any project. If you look at just a house project, you can focus on the house and you can focus on the driveway. But if there are civil aspects to the site that reveal themselves once you've excavated, they may put upward pressure on the overall cost of the project.

Whilst there are some things, it is fair to say, difficult to identify - you can't necessarily always identify everything on a project - you need to understand the full ramifications and scope of the project in order to make it work with its context. No more so than a site like Macquarie Point. Regardless of what goes on Macquarie Point, any investment of this scale on a site so proximate to the city and the CBD has to be considered holistically in terms of how it functions and how it circulates for the health of the city. That will only have a reciprocal benefit to the development itself.

**Mr ZANATTA** - One of the things I have also discussed with Stuart - in terms of the idea that it is in fact very much a multi-modal site in terms of what is being provided for the benefit of Tasmanians and tourists and visitors to Hobart, in terms of a much broader sports entertainment and cultural precinct - is there is an army of workers that actually operate these sites.

One only has to go to a sporting event at a large stadium - or have attended, as I have in my career, many conferences at various similar venues, the three racecourses here in Melbourne, at the MCG, at the Etihad Stadium - to realise that there is quite an army of people who operate these sites. They are the front-of-house people, the people on ticketing, bar staff, people in catering, in security services, in cleaning and in maintenance. This is actually the huge opportunity that is presented by this site for the people of Hobart and Tasmania - that ongoing opportunity for jobs.

I noticed that this Mac Point development plan subjugates itself to the Hobart 30-year plan that was launched last year. That particular plan makes a point under its recommendations, in 12, for example, around identifying additional employment opportunities as the City's population increases and to provide employment opportunities across greater Hobart so that more people can live closer to where they work.

Understanding fully, once this precinct has been developed and is fully operational - and I notice there have been some transport studies or proposed transport models. There are three

## PUBLIC

vertical bar graphs in the document that show, at various stages, what the modes of transport they predict might be. Really to factor in here, how do the armies of workers who are required to be onsite every day to make this site activated and enable it to provide its benefit - it's not just the buildings, it's actually the people who work in them - how will all that actually work? Where will they park? How will they get to work? What transport will they be using, as well as the visitors coming to the site? It is an example of one of the complex things that need to be properly understood before proceeding.

**Ms WEBB** - Can I follow up on that. Did you look at the detailed transport work that was done for Macquarie Point Development Corporation to feed into this latest iteration of this plan and make an assessment of its value or accuracy?

**Mr ZANATTA** - No, I haven't.

**Ms WEBB** - In a previous hearing I had some questions for them around it because I note, for example, it expects 1,000 people to ride their bikes to the major events that are going to be held there. That seems fairly unprecedented for Hobart. But that question you have raised about not just people attending events there but the considerable number of people who are going there to work each day, how they are getting there and how their transport is being accommodated is a whole other question. I am not sure that that study incorporates that. I had wondered if you had seen it.

**Mr ZANATTA** - No, I haven't.

**CHAIR** - It will be interesting to see whether it does contemplate just the people who are going to be there on game day or event day, in terms of facilitating the event. There is obviously a smaller number that are there all the time.

If I can go back to that. I have family that live over the road from, not Etihad, Marvel Stadium now. They live on the 22<sup>nd</sup> floor of one of the apartment buildings, so you look right down on Marvel and it is a complete dead zone around there. It is just a concrete jungle around it 99 per cent of the time. It is lovely when there are all the people around for a game. It is a great place to teach little kids to ride bikes because there's concrete forever and you see no-one. You can ride right around that whole stadium on a little bike and not see a soul. All the cafes around that area are closed. There are not that many but there are a few.

In terms of having a workforce in that area all the time, you may have people at the Antarctic division, or somewhere else, but if you want an enlivened zone, do we get it from putting an events, function or multi-purpose arts centre there that is certainly not used every day and not used more than once a week, potentially?

**Mr TANNER** - I think that is the crux of the issue here because we have to treat it as a potential. The positive potential of a development of this scale on that site is to treat the entire site and the city as one. What you are talking about is sporadic activation. We have activation at some points in a month and at other points. What you would be wanting to avoid is no activation.

**CHAIR** - The dead zone.

## PUBLIC

**Mr TANNER** - The way to do that is to diversify how that site is working so that you get, without wanting to sound too complex, a multivalent way that the site works, so it is layered, it is integrated, it has variables in terms of its functionality.

**CHAIR** - Can you do that in such a size-constrained area, acknowledging all the other competing interests like the Cenotaph, the port and the heritage-listed buildings on Evans Street?

**Mr TANNER** - The true density and analysis of the site will reveal that and will answer your question, I believe. There needs to be some seriously detailed analysis, if it's not already happening, in terms of scale, proximity, even just the suitability and practicality of remaining space on the site. Those sorts of things need to be analysed, given the comments that Paul referred to earlier about the orientation of the stadium for maximum sunlight, because our sunlight in June is at 24 degrees, so it is pretty low. Those sorts of things are going to influence site planning.

I have no doubt that the teams working on this at the moment are aware of those things, but we need to understand it properly. It is like anything. When you have a big decision to make, you need the maximum amount of information, and that information needs to be done up-front so that you are making realistic decisions. That is not to say it is not possible. It may be. But we need to understand it properly.

I would further that by saying, in terms of your reference to activation, it goes back to the huge potential of any development of this type to create civic betterment, civic pride and uplift in the way Hobart works. Earlier this year, to use a quick anecdote, I was in Denmark. In Copenhagen, 49 per cent of all people ride a bike instead of using a car. Now, there's 630,000 in Copenhagen -

**CHAIR** - So, 1,000 would ride their bike to the game in that case -

**Ms WEBB** - Well, they would.

**Mr TANNER** - They would, but that is because there's been a concerted understanding, impetus and determination to create a shift in the way people move around. Now, it's a flat city, granted, so that is to their advantage, but then farther north there is the city of Aarhus, which is not much bigger than Hobart and it's a port city. That has a very sophisticated and multi-layered public transport network. It also has sports facilities, cultural facilities and so forth. The general feeling of that city being a similar scale to Hobart is that people move around freely. It's very easy to get everywhere. That not only creates a nicer city - I'm not suggesting Hobart isn't, it's one of the most beautiful cities in the world - but Aarhus is a good example of a city that has capitalised on a sophisticated approach to the way people move around to make it a beautifully easy city to live in. That flows through to the general feeling of the city. That is the opportunity Hobart has.

We have one of the deepest ports in the world and a 4,500 foot/1,200 metre mountain behind us. The setting is incredible and so if we focus on the whole city and use any development of this type as an opportunity to better the city, then we're treating the city holistically and giving it the right approach.

## PUBLIC

**Ms WEBB** - How will we measure whether we have bettered the city and how would we then also assess various proposals in terms of how they achieve that goal compared to each other?

**Mr TANNER** - Design excellence and urban design excellence and if people are able to not use their car as much, if they're able to walk to a game comfortably and safely and not feel threatened by vehicles. Those are the types of things that are a strong measure of a city working very well.

**Mr ZANATTA** - If I may also, Chair and also Stuart, add to that, my background is in public health and people services so I'm very enamoured with the United Nations' Sustainable Development Goals. I'm very aware of this because Hobart has a Cities' Deal. We actually had a set of indicators. In fact, I made a submission on this about 18 months ago. We have a set of national indicators for cities as well which were withdrawn from use prior to the federal election as part of a review process. I think we need to get back to some recognised, authoritative metrics about how we measure the performance and the functioning of our cities.

The UN's Sustainable Development Goals have also been translated by the International Union of Architects, known as the UIA which is the acronym for the French name L'Union Internationale des Architectes, which has produced a couple of guideline documents for architects. Architects don't just design buildings; they also do a lot of precinct and urban design and master planning. They've produced some guideline documents for the profession worldwide about translating those UN Sustainable Development Goals into design guidelines for our city, urban and suburban landscapes. I think going to those authoritative sources and using established and authoritative benchmarks is one important way that you can answer the question, 'what does this deliver'.

I think the other thing is to go back to the 30-Year Greater Hobart Plan. I think they've produced an implementation plan. If this project is actually subjugated to the 30-Year Greater Hobart Plan, then you have to look at the goals, the objectives that have been set within that plan and how does this actually deliver on those goals and objectives within that local plan for this city? Go back to what's already there and use those things also as your benchmarks.

I have a long background in outcomes evaluation of programs and services so I'm rather passionate about this particular topic.

**Ms WEBB** - I love that you are. I'm particularly interested in the sustainable development goals translated into principles that can apply to architecture and place shaping. If you can send us a link to that, that would be great.

The thing that concerns me is where in this process does such assessment take place? Will it be part of the integrated assessment that's done under the PoSS process by the TPC, I wonder? I'm not confident that it is.

**CHAIR** - According to the guidelines it will.

**Ms WEBB** - Or does it happen at a later stage when we're assessing it at parliament, which is probably a little late and we're not necessarily equipped to do that ourselves. I'm concerned that we'll just barrel on and not have an opportunity or not have prioritised an

## PUBLIC

opportunity to make these sorts of value assessments here. That's a comment rather than a question, sorry.

**CHAIR** - One thing that's been identified in the submissions we have to the revised terms of reference that hasn't been referred to is the impact of noise on the surrounding tenants of this area. You have the TSO; there is the Henry Jones Art Hotel. I've been at the Theatre Royal at the Hedberg when a helicopter's landed at the Royal and fair dinkum it sounds like it's coming into the theatre during a performance. It's not very pleasant. In fact, it's quite disconcerting.

The noise has been raised as a real concern, because a lot of these events are at night; that's when they also hold their events. How could a facility like this have the noise attenuated to the level that might be required?

**Mr TANNER** - Any project of this scale has a raft of consultants on it. One of those would be a sound engineer. It's going to be challenging to mitigate noise when you have an open stadium. This is the only comment I can make in response at this stage. The surrounding tenancies would probably have reasonable sound attenuation but not, perhaps, at the level if you'd built those same tenancies this year or next year.

**CHAIR** - They're also not dealing with concerts with massive speakers.

**Mr TANNER** - No.

**Ms WEBB** - There are not going to be many of those by the sound of it, anyway.

**CHAIR** - No, but even if there were, the odd one that comes -

**Mr TANNER** - Yes.

**CHAIR** - Even a football siren, we don't want the failure of the siren like we had at York Park once. It caused all sorts of chaos for AFL because it was near the end of the game, but you can't not blow the siren.

**Mr TANNER** - Everyone would be aware of the proximity of such a development. It wouldn't matter really whether it was a rock concert or a footy game or the Wallabies, or whatever. It's going to have a noise impact.

**CHAIR** - The Matildas will have a noise.

**Mr TANNER** - I'm sure they will. I think that it is going to be challenging to mitigate that with existing sound attenuation quality in those tenancies. It is the only thing I can say at this point because we really don't have that level of detail. Using the words 'density' and 'detail' and 'sophistication' in the documentation of the stadium at this stage, that will all evolve along with the raft of consultants who will be associated with such a complex project.

**CHAIR** - On another point that you spoke of earlier and you noted the Macquarie Point 2.0 proposal, in a slightly different location but still on Macquarie Point but around the corner. Part of their proposal, which is still early days, was to build worker accommodation to a standard that could then be converted to public housing, social housing, disability-access housing and affordable housing, a mix of housing. We had them in front of the Public Accounts



## PUBLIC

Committee a few weeks ago. They recognised that to build something like that, you need a significant workforce.

The current proposal that'll be assessed through the Project of State Significance process doesn't appear to have room much for that, and there's no real provision for that.

What concerns does that raise for you in terms of longer-term planning, particularly in those comments you made about the need to have - I think you said something along the lines of, 'There's already strained housing for building, and you need to create some permanent housing out of the arrangement if you're going to support the building workforce'?

**Mr TANNER** - I certainly wouldn't want to cast any presumptions on the authenticity or genuine willingness of the 2.0 team as to that proposal, other than to say that it is critical that if that is part of that proposal, that there is some real design leadership around what those houses are and what that accommodation is, so that they become something that is of integrity, that can remain, so they're not removed and it becomes just a capital asset.

To the second part of your question, it is critical that the Government is able to understand the true influence of the first proposal, if you want to put it that way, on the site, and the proximity for worker accommodation. Paul and I talked about this yesterday, so I might get Paul to make a few comments about the proximity for employment and ongoing employment.

**Mr ZANATTA** - We were saying that if, for example, you instead located something like an arts and cultural precinct and a conference venue for Hobart in this precinct, but you located a stadium up near Wilkinsons Point, where you have the racecourse and the basketball and netball stadia, you've probably got a ready workforce of people who are in close proximity to their future place of employment. Whether or not the thoughts are that you develop a sports precinct in total with training facilities separately, that's one consideration. Does separating the functions out to different locations serve a better purpose?

We noted that the Mac 2.0 proposal includes that housing. We thought if it's done as social and affordable housing, then oftentimes these positions around hospitality and cleaning are lower wage level jobs. For people living in affordable housing, it may be that this provides them with those employment opportunities. It's either that the employment is suited to what they are looking for or the fact that they're actually working at the stadia may qualify them, for example, for the affordable and social housing. There could be a reciprocity between the provisioning of that longer-term housing.

We come back to the idea that if it's built as worker housing to start with, and we want it to go on to become social and affordable housing, then there has to be a fairly reasonable robustness of the build-quality itself. It has to be durable. You have to set your sights on it being long-term. If it's done simply as demountable accommodation, then is it going to last the distance?

**CHAIR** - That's not what they indicated. They indicated more substantial construction.

**Mr ZANATTA** - We haven't seen the detail of that in the documents we have viewed, so we don't have that level of detail. We were second-guessing. What normally happens in locations such as mining towns is the style of accommodation done to rapidly put housing in place that's required for a workforce.

## PUBLIC

If the pressure is on here to deliver rapidly, how quickly can this housing be delivered for the required numbers of workers? How are they actually going to rapidly establish that housing, in the very first instance, for the workers? That does raise the question of will this be quality, durable housing for the long haul? Will it be readily adaptable for accessibility? Will it be built to a seven-star energy efficiency standard, which is now the current standard for the National Construction Code? Will it deal adequately with condensation conditions in the Hobart area? There are a lot of boxes that it has to tick to be authentic to the aspiration that is being put forward.

As Stuart says, we don't doubt the intent. I notice they actually have some expert directors for the social and affordable housing component on the material we have seen. We don't doubt their authenticity or commitment to delivery.

**CHAIR** - Acknowledging all that, the point I was making was that the Government's proposal, Macquarie Point Development Corporation's proposal, doesn't contemplate any worker accommodation in the vicinity. You mentioned a workforce perhaps out around Wilkinsons Point area. Is that a problem here?

**Mr TANNER** - The challenge of the site is getting people in and getting people out, whether that is during construction or when it is an up-and-running facility. I would answer your query by saying that is the challenge. The attention needs to be focused on the functioning and integration of accessibility and circulation to ensure that both the development and construction process and the functioning of the site post-occupancy is really well thought through. At this stage, looking at the documents we have seen and the master plan proposal, there is certainly the intent and thinking around that, but we need to see really accurate site planning and master planning that is dimensioned.

**Mr ZANATTA** - On Stuart's point, the very point is that if there isn't housing provided for workers, let's say that additional workers come to Tasmania or from other cities and locations in Tasmania, to Hobart, where are they going to live?

**CHAIR** - That is regardless of which project.

**Mr ZANATTA** - Correct.

**Ms WEBB** - Even if they are relatively local, where are they going to park? Not many tradies come in on the bus, do they?

**Mr TANNER** - They need the proximity of their gear.

**CHAIR** - Coming back to transport and getting people to and from the facility, I think it was you, Paul, who mentioned Wilkinsons Point. The argument has been put by the Government, basically, under the direction of AFL, that the stadium needs to be in walking distance from the CBD, which makes Wilkinsons Point a fairly long walk if you have to walk that. In many respects, a lot of people who come to a game or other event will have to come in from those suburbs. Is it a non-argument, in some respects, that you can put in good transport from the city out and the surrounds toward that facility to then enable all the requirements you've talked about to be better met? Or do you think that there is some real value in having it within walking distance for the average person from the CBD to the ground?

## PUBLIC

**Mr TANNER** - Walking distance is the ideal. Cycling distance is also a positive. But, inevitably, there are going to be people coming from greater distances. This is the key factor. I keep going back to treating this site holistically and thinking critically about this site as a holistic, integrated element of the city. I just can't stress that enough. It's not just about the isolated site itself, it's how it functions more broadly. Yes, in an ideal sense, if people can walk that is perfect. The more walking the better. But we know that people are going to be coming from Launceston and Burnie and everywhere to see a game because it is a project of state significance now.

**Mr ZANATTA** - For people who live in Hobart itself, my observation from Melbourne is that, when something is on at the 'G' or at Marvel Stadium, Etihad Stadium, at the round ball centre, 80 per cent to 90 per cent of people are not driving there. Some people are travelling up to 30 kilometres, if we look at the Burwood line, on tram. They are coming by train. Melbourne, in its sports precinct, for people in the city of greater Melbourne, even coming from the regions, relies very much on the mass transport afforded by rail, light rail and tram. That is a distinct advantage.

This begs the question, possibly, for Hobart about rethinking whether it needs to reactivate the reserve that is there for the rail that once existed. I think it was operational in freight mode up until 2014, from some research I was doing. Whether or not it presents there an opportunity to reactivate a light rail infrastructure that heads out to the north of the city, and with that -

**Ms WEBB** - Goodness, that is a can of worms you are opening up there.

**Mr ZANATTA** - It may be a can of worms but looking at what other benefits would that deliver over the long term too.

**Ms WEBB** - The intention is to open up that corridor. It's not intended to be light rail under this Government. They are intending it to be rapid bus that uses that transport corridor.

**Mr TANNER** - We understand that too.

**Ms WEBB** - What you are describing with those other cities, what you just described with Melbourne, is the utilisation of existing public transport infrastructure. In the transport modelling done for this most recent precinct plan, when they look at mode share, what they are mapping out is a fairly high proportion - one in five, maybe more than one in five people coming through what they have called event-bus transport. This is not the routes that normally run and the timetables that normally run; it is special event-day buses put in place. Do you see that there is advantage or disadvantage to that? They are recognising we don't have the public transport system to bring people to the right spot at the right time. We have to put a special bus system in place for event days.

**Mr TANNER** - We have to be realistic. Hobart is topographically challenged. It is not a flat city. Going back to Copenhagen, beautiful. There is an incredible public transport network there. It is quite mind-blowing. But it is dead flat. That is an advantage. We are topographically challenged. But in that, I would say that the potential is for innovation. We need to think around acute transport options that feed on those days.

## PUBLIC

I also would say that it is not limited to post-occupancy. We have to be thinking about that during the construction. And where people are going to stay while they are building the precinct - not just the stadium but the precinct.

We need to understand the correlation between the potency of design excellence in public infrastructure, not just buildings. We can see that in cities like Bilbao, for example, where public infrastructure becomes part of the joy of being in the city. This is the potential. Not only that, there is a direct correlation between design excellence in public infrastructure and also it's got to be built. You get a dual benefit in that not only does design excellence lift a city and provide innovative options to the question that you have put to me, Meg, but also it has an economic benefit and flow-on benefit through its construction and procurement of construction.

**Ms WEBB** - When I look at the report that was done in August 2022, just over a year ago now, by PwC around the estimated economic impacts of the new arts, entertainment and sports precinct in Hobart, it talks about the construction phase and economic activity. It points to 4,200 jobs in Tasmania, estimated across the three-year time frame for construction. Then it breaks down the sectors of those 4,200 jobs. I am trying to understand why the largest cohort of jobs would be in the arts, sport, and recreation sector during construction, 1,600 jobs. Whereas the civil engineering and construction sector has just over 1,500 jobs, slightly less. Is that what you expect to see in a jobs profile for a construction phase, that jobs in the arts, sport, and recreation sector outnumber the civil engineering and construction jobs provided?

**Mr TANNER** - I am not privy to their metrics but that does sound confusing.

**Ms WEBB** - It does sound confusing.

**CHAIR** - Maybe the construction workers are all going to go out on the town every night.

**Mr TANNER** - I will take you back to the point reiterating what I have said, that the greatest outcomes come from critical design excellence and critical design thinking. It's proven right around the world that this has a civic benefit and an uplifting of the wellbeing of people. We want a happy city. We want a city where it feels like people can really get around easily, and enjoy every day and not be frustrated by being late for work because there is no public transport. The opportunity of such a large investment is to tackle that.

I think it's really critical that whatever goes on Macquarie Point is an opportunity to look holistically at the way the city can be improved. Excellence in design and public infrastructure is a very big way of doing that. It will have economic flow-on effects through construction and procurement. Pointing to PWO report, the other component is the consultancy component of urban designers, architects, engineers and other professional input.

**Ms WEBB** - If only we had started at the endpoint of excellent design and an uplift of civic pride and engagement, rather than the starting point of a football field for \$715 million. Again, comment not a question.

**CHAIR** - Any other pressing questions, members? Thank you very much for your time today and for your submission, and further information provided. Is there anything that you wish to say that you haven't? Thanks very much for your time.

**PUBLIC**

**THE WITNESSES WITHDREW**

**The Committee adjourned at 3:38 pm.**