

Legislative Council
HANSARD
Tuesday, 8 April 2025

MOTION

**Macquarie Point Stadium - Reports by Dr Nicholas Gruen and Tasmanian Planning
Commission- Consideration and Noting**

[excerpt]

[4.33 p.m.]

Ms WEBB (Nelson) - Thank you, Mr President. I rise to speak to motion number 11 on the notice paper tabled in my name.

Originally, I was considering tabling a motion last week to simply note Dr Nicholas Gruen's independent review of the Macquarie Point stadium, which, although released on 1 January this year, has not been formally responded to by the government. However, when we had the Tasmanian Planning Commission's draft Integrated Assessment Report (IAR) of the Macquarie Point Multipurpose Stadium Project of State Significance, released last week on Monday 31 March, I realised it is timely and relevant to note both reports. It is especially timely that we note them during this sitting week at our earliest opportunity, given the Premier's repeated threat that, in response to the draft IAR, he may seek to circumvent the continuation of the POSS process for assessment of the Macquarie Point stadium and bring on enabling legislation to seek parliamentary approval for the project forthwith.

Such a move would clearly be in shockingly bad faith with the Tasmanian people. It is impossible to regard such a threat as anything other than a blatant attempt to discourage public participation in the current community consultation process centred on the draft IAR. Hundreds, if not thousands, of Tasmanians are likely preparing to make submissions to the consultation process open right now through until 8 May. Let us be very clear here, the draft assessment is the first step of the PoSS process, and the draft IAR raises issues of such consequence that to suggest the next crucial steps of that process be abandoned is beyond irresponsible. I think it verges on the criminal.

The next steps of the process provide for responses to be made to the draft IAR, which will no doubt come from not only the broader Tasmanian community, but also from experts in relevant fields, representative professional associations and groups, and from directly affected stakeholders. The proponent of the project will also have further opportunity to provide additional information to address the matters raised in the draft IAR. All these responses and submissions become public. Some will be the subject of public hearings by the TPC assessment panel. This will be a crucial process conducted transparently and appropriately to further examine the serious matters of concern raised in the draft IAR.

If this process is cut-off and blocked by the Rockliff government at this point, it will be a clear message that this government is not interested in solving the problems that are indicated in the PoSS report, that it discounts the relevance or seriousness of those issues, and is prepared to thwart the process designed to seek further and expert information to accountably consider if and how those issues may be addressed. Mr President, make no mistake about it, this would be an outrageous step for the Premier to take.

Having said that, this Premier has demonstrated throughout this whole saga a propensity to act in autocratic, secretive, and unethical ways, in my view. This is the Premier who promised in the other place back in 2022 that the team would not be contingent on a stadium, that they would be separate matters altogether.

Ms O'Connor - That is what he said to us.

Ms WEBB - That is what he said in the other place. The misleading, unaccountable behaviour has only progressed from that point.

The Premier, Jeremy Rockliff, is the one who has, at every step along the way, risked killing our dream for the Tasmanian Devil's team. I am now here suggesting a way forward to keep that dream alive because Jeremy Rockliff has mismanaged this so woefully, we cannot meet what is required in the deal that he signed. Let us remember, Jeremy Rockliff recklessly signed our state up to an agreement with the AFL without even taking it to his cabinet, let alone to parliament or the Tasmanian people. He signed up to that deal without getting Treasury advice and perhaps without getting legal advice on the final aspects of the deal. I am happy to be corrected on that if that is not the case. Its beggar's belief that any serious person with our state's best interest in mind would have signed us up to an agreement that imposes a massive development in the heart of our capital city, which, having been genuinely assessed, has no possibility of being responsibly approved under our planning system. There is simply no universe in which it is okay for the Premier to have legally bound our state to delivering a project that has not, and likely cannot, pass through our planning system successfully. There are no circumstances under which that is acceptable. This is a gross failure on the Premier's part. In it, he has without doubt jeopardised our Tasmania Devil's team.

Even on the basic timelines in the contract, the agreement is now going to be void. The agreement requires that the stadium development obtains all relevant planning and environmental approvals for the stadium construction activities in accordance with relevant laws by 30 June 2025. It also requires that the stadium development obtains approval of the Public Works Committee to proceed with construction by 30 June 2025. That is in Schedule 12 of the signed agreement. Although I note there is a cut-and-paste typo in Schedule 12 table, which is probably an indication of the haste with which that agreement was being put together and being rushed to be signed, it is not possible to meet either of those deadlines. I do not believe it is, certainly not without throwing all good governance in decision making out the window. I presume this means, being already in likely breach of the agreement, we are already negotiating to adjust the agreement. In signing the agreement, it seems clear that the Premier never intended that this project would need to pass a genuine planning assessment. By hook or by crook, it appears he always intended to ram this through regardless of planning scheme and approvals processes, regardless of any economic, social, or safety concerns, and regardless of appropriate parliamentary scrutiny or the wishes of the majority of the Tasmanian people.

I note the comment made recently by Sue Hickey, a previous MP in this place, formerly Lord Mayor of Hobart and now Mayor of Glenorchy. She was reflecting on the government's handling of the Macquarie Point stadium situation, just last Friday, on ABC Radio. She said this:

Everything they are doing by rushing it through is stuffing it up. It risks major failure because they will not adhere to the rules that they have in place for every other major development.

People being opposed to a large project is one thing; a project that contravenes the

planning scheme so wholly that it could not hope to pass any normal standard approvals process is another matter altogether. As Mr Nicholas Gruen says in his report:

Tasmania deserves an AFL team and must have it at the right cost, but not at any cost.

I agree with that statement. The Tasmanian people were certainly never asked if they were prepared to pay any price economically, socially, or environmentally for this Macquarie Point stadium. The Tasmanian people have never agreed to write a blank cheque for this AFL-preferred Macquarie Point stadium. Our AFL team should never have been contingent on a specific piece of infrastructure with specific features in a specific location, all dictated by the AFL. It was an outright mistake for Premier Rockliff to secretly sign us up to such a disadvantageous deal and ever since he has put us in that hole, he has just kept digging, digging, digging.

The Premier and his minority government have no mandate for this stadium and the Opposition certainly has no mandate for the position they have degenerated into, post-state election, as a lap dog of the government.

Ms O'Connor - Exactly, it is pathetic.

Ms WEBB - I am going to move on to point 1 of the motion, which speaks about the Gruen Independent Review of the Macquarie Point Stadium Report. I did note, in preparing for today's debate, that while this report was released on 1 January in a media release from the government with a link to the report, the report is no longer available via that link. It is, in fact, near impossible to find online now, through any other link. I will seek leave to table the Gruen report here in this place, noting the government has not taken any opportunity to table it in this place or the other place. May I -

Seek leave to table to Gruen report

Leave granted; report tabled

Ms WEBB - It says everything that the report has been disappeared by the government, having released it on 1 January 2025, at a time they hoped no-one would notice it. It is now not readily available. Why do they not put that report, which they paid for, back on the internet? Somewhere, on a readily discoverable place on a government website of some sort? I put it that to them now that they should commit to do so.

Point 1 of the motion that we have to consider today, asks that we note the Independent Review of the Macquarie Point Stadium Report by independent assessor Dr Nicholas Gruen dated 1 January 2025, publicly released on 3 January, 2025. What I will acknowledge is also, as per the second point of the motion, the Gruen report's four recommendations and six key findings. We would all remember, that the Gruen report arose from a post-election deal made by the minority Rockliff Government and the three then members of the JLN. It was to accompany another independent report of the state's finances by respected economists, Saul Eslake. The terms of reference for Gruen were to review the existing analysis and assess the overall cost and benefits of the Macquarie Point precinct.

In the report, Gruen examines the proposed development across 11 chapters. They being: the AFL agreement's fitness for purpose; planning, delivery and stakeholders; the site selection report: a flawed foundation; the visual impact of the stadium; transparency in managing

projects; involving the private sector; costs; benefits; net benefits; financial impacts and economic impact assessment. In the interest of time, I will not go into too much detail on the content of those chapters, but rather, primarily look to the findings and recommendations in the report. Although I do note that in the overview section of the report, Gruen makes his overarching views of the stadium project very clear when he says the following:

The central conclusion of this review is that the projected costs associated with the stadium at the Macquarie Point Multipurpose Precinct have been significantly understated. At the same time, the benefits have been overstated. Accordingly, the projected benefit-cost ratio has been significantly overstated. The project is already displaying the hallmarks of mismanagement, with much of that mismanagement stemming from the official's attempts to deliver the project within the Tasmanian Government's commitment to limiting the stadium's impact on state debt to \$375 million. This commitment cannot be met. Substantial costs can be avoided simply by not proceeding with the stadium and seeking to renegotiate the establishment of a Tasmanian AFL team on more reasonable terms in the future.

I emphasise that he points to the opportunity to renegotiate at this point given the unrealistic likelihood that we can deliver on this outcome without detriment to our state. And Gruen does then warn that:

Any renegotiation should not be done without further recourse to the Tasmanian community.

I would certainly agree with that. The author of the report then goes on to point out the central deficiencies of the current process that has been undertaken to date and he points to four things.

First, a hasty process with analysis that is hasty, partial and crafted to support conclusions already made.

The second one is a minimal effective consultation. Community consultation was meagre, which means important non-economic costs of the Mac Point site have not been properly assessed and incorporated in analysis.

The third deficiency he points to is inadequate and over optimistic cost-benefit analysis, including taking little or no account of the opportunity cost of the site.

The fourth deficiency was little joined up planning, noting infrastructure investment on this scale should take place within wider planning frameworks to ensure it catalyses broader economic, social and cultural benefits for the surrounding urban environment.

That noted for context, I think they are all things that we will hear echoed when we talk further about the more recent report released last week.

Now I will move on to the findings of the Gruen report, of which there were six.

The first finding was that the agreement between the AFL and the Tasmanian Government is over-specified and imposes needless costs and restraints on the realisation of a Tasmanian team. These costs and restraints are contributing significantly to the poor cost-benefit ratio of the proposed Macquarie Point Stadium. The AFL has a legitimate interest

in insisting that should it enter the competition, a Tasmanian team is viable and competitive and not an undue burden on other teams. However, he goes on to say:

The AFL's agreement with the Tasmanian Government goes well beyond this. It contains terms that are of marginal significance for the AFL, but which impose substantial costs on all Tasmanians. These include the site on which the stadium is located, the speed with which the stadium is completed, and whether it has a roof or not.

It goes on to say:

Whatever its preferences, the AFL should have no strong interest in these matters and they should be left to the Tasmanian community. The AFL's core interest of ensuring the Tasmanian team is financially viable can be directly protected by the Tasmanian Government committing to ongoing subsidies should agreed financial metrics not be met.

Indeed, we are signed up to ongoing potential financial support anyway.

The second finding from the Gruen report speaks about the agreement setting an unrealistic timeline for the project. He says this:

This is particularly the case for the first two stages of the process, project definition, particularly site selection and full design specification. Yet taking the time to get these two stages right is the ultimate precondition for minimising the risk of cost overruns and efficiently delivering the costly construction stage of the project.

He then goes on to the third finding, which was this:

That the site selection process for the Hobart Stadium was flawed by its failure to prioritise community consultation, properly account for opportunity costs and address critical urban planning trade-offs. This has likely led to the wrong site being selected.

The fourth finding from the Gruen report:

The government's current \$775 million estimate of the stadium's cost, significantly understates the true expected cost. Based on our analysis of the current stadium proposal and project scope, we estimate the total project cost will exceed this amount by \$321 million bringing the total cost to over \$1 billion.

The fifth finding in the Gruen report:

Notwithstanding the details above, the government continues to insist that the fiscal cap of \$375 million can be met. This is already having two adverse effects, which will intensify over time. The official reporting on the progress of the project is not candid. This undermines the community's trust in the process. Various means are being used to disguise the true cost of the project. Their impact is escalating over time.

Then, he speaks to the other adverse effect which will intensify over time:

In addition to impairing the probity of the project, disguising its true cost is also a driver of mismanagement. To meet the \$375 million cap on outlays, certain facilities within the stadium have been carved out for the government's capital budget for the project. These include the carpark, kitchens and food and beverage facilities, CCTV system, LED ribbon board, advertising, and AV and PA systems. Because these facilities will earn revenue, private investors can likely be induced to fund their capital cost in return for some right to that revenue.

While such partnerships should be explored, the motive to do so should always be to optimise the net benefits from the project for Tasmania. Here, the motive is simply to move these costs off the government's books. This lowers capital costs to the government, but it is likely to do so only by lowering the stadium's capacity to generate revenue by a greater amount measured in net present value terms.

This is what he goes on to say:

In other words, this apparent saving is very likely to be penny-wise and pound-foolish, costing the government more than it saves.

Mr President, the sixth finding from the Gruen report is that the involvement of the private sector in the Macquarie Point stadium project falls well short of satisfactory practice. It lacks transparency and seeks to minimise government outlays, even where this compromises getting the best deal for Tasmanians.

Having made those findings, Mr Gruen then notes this:

It is not too late to achieve an AFL-ready stadium at lower cost, with lower technical risk and with less community division.

To do so, he recommends key changes. The first of these key changes is that:

Should a new stadium be built, the time line to do so needs to be extended. The current stadium timetable will drive needless risk to construction costs and is precluding necessary debate about alternative stadium proposals. The government should negotiate with the AFL to extend the deadline to complete the stadium build, with the Tassie Devils playing games at the Ninja Stadium and UTAS Stadium for a longer transition period.

This is about renegotiation. He goes on to say:

Given the circumstances, I think it would be unreasonable for the AFL not to agree to extend the time frame by, say, four years, without penalty. Even in the absence of the appropriate goodwill from the AFL, the existing agreement provides that Tasmania can buy more time by paying a penalty of \$4.5 million per year in the event of its stadium not being ready by the time of the deadline agreed.

Mr President, the second recommendation he makes is this:

Planning for the stadium should be joined up with the broader plan for the future of Hobart. It is insufficient to plan for the Macquarie Point precinct site alone. To realise the full benefits of stadium investment, a plan for Greater Hobart should be developed addressing how the stadium will interact with, and support, the city's future urban environment, including surrounding community and green spaces, historic sites, ports, transport infrastructure, tourism, events and housing.

This should be underpinned by the development of a shared vision for the future economic, social and cultural characteristics of the Greater Hobart area, which today is absent.

Thirdly, he goes on to say:

The government should provide an itemised and candid reanalysis of the amount the stadium will cost the government. This report should be done now and co-signed by the Auditor-General, with the process being repeated regularly.

This is an absolute call for transparency, recognising that there has not been candid transparency to date from the government. A damning finding from an independent analysis of what has occurred thus far.

The fourth recommendation is:

The delivery of the stadium and all its component parts should be driven solely by optimising its value for money for the Tasmanian community. Any commitment to cap the government's capital contribution compromises this goal and could force the adoption of inefficient public-private partnerships. All arrangements for partnerships with the private sector should only proceed consistently with the principles set out in the national PPP policy and guidelines, including the use of a realistic public sector comparator. In addition to this mechanism being self-administered by government officers, it should be overseen by someone independently appointed and reporting to parliament.

This recommendation has micro and macro aspects:

- (a) Decisions to bring in private funding for any capital expenditure on facilities of the stadium should not proceed except according to the safeguards above.
- (b) The government should introduce competitive tension between projects by committing to consider alternative unsolicited stadium proposals.

The Gruen report could not be clearer. The AFL deal runs roughshod over the best interests of the Tasmanian people. Having signed us up to an unnecessarily detrimental deal, the Rockliff government are now having to mislead Tasmanians and mismanage this project in an attempt to try to save face and keep the deception on the viability of this AFL-dictated stadium going as long as possible. Digging, digging, digging that hole, Mr President. It is

categorically clear that the wrong site has been chosen and the cost will inevitably blow out massively. None of these are things that should not be able to be renegotiated.

The Gruen report confirms that the way forward must be through renegotiation and resetting the basis of the AFL deal. He suggests the timeline should be extended. Any stadium development should be underpinned by the development of a shared vision for the future economic, social, and cultural characteristics of the greater Hobart area. The government should tell the truth about the real cost of the stadium development and that should be confirmed independently by our Auditor-General. The delivery of the stadium, and all its component parts, should be driven solely by optimising its value for money to the Tasmanian community.

I am surprised that we have not had the government have the guts to provide a response to the Gruen report after four months.

Ms O'Connor - Are you really surprised, honourable member?

Ms WEBB - I am disappointed, perhaps is a more accurate descriptor, member for Hobart. Actually, I think the whole Tasmanian community would feel such disappointment. If the government believes that the way they are progressing this project is defensible, they would have come out, at some point in the last four months, to provide an open and honest response to this report fully - to explain why, if they are not going to take these suggested courses of action, why not? What are they going to do instead to deliver on the intent of these recommendations - the transparency that they are calling for, the accountability, and the better outcomes for the people of Tasmania?

I am going to move on to part 4 of the motion, which asks us to consider the TPC Panel's findings presented in the Draft IAR. The motion lists a number of matters, A to J. However, Mr President, this is not an exhaustive list of the matters raised in the Draft IAR. I will speak to the findings listed in the motion, and I will also point to some further matters that I find extremely concerning on reading this report.

To begin with, I would note a couple of general matters relating to the Draft IAR. Firstly, the panel considers that the scope of the project includes the stadium itself and also related infrastructure and services necessary to support the operation of the stadium and which are convenient for the implementation of the project. Those include development associated with landscaping and movement of pedestrians and emergency management vehicles, development of transport infrastructure associated with the northern access road and bus plaza, and the use and development of transport infrastructure, including pedestrian active transport, traffic management around Evans Street, Hunter Street, Davey Street, and Franklin Wharf.

Secondly, as members will have noted when reading it, again and again, on topic after topic in the interim assessment report, it has identified that not enough information has been provided by the proponents to allow a proper assessment to be made. This is highly concerning to read in this report. It indicates that either the proponent, the Macquarie Point Development Corporation, on behalf of the government, is deliberately withholding information from the TPC Panel undertaking the integrated assessment or it does not have the relevant information, analysis, data, et cetera, to provide to the panel. And, quite frankly, both of those situations are entirely unacceptable.

This development is not someone knocking up a shed in the backyard. This is the most consequential development in the heart of our capital city that is ever likely to be proposed. To

think that in the formal planning system approval process, there is either active withholding and deception from the proponent or an amateurish dearth of preparatory planning, analysis and design work that has been done to date. It is, quite frankly, scary. To be fair, though, to the Macquarie Point Development Corporation as proponent, they were, to speak colloquially, completely dropped in it by the Rockliff government. They have been burdened from the start with the thankless and nigh well impossible task of retrofitting all planning, analysis and design work to the demanded outcome rather than the location and design of a stadium being arrived at through a credible, evidence-based, appropriately consulted process.

The draft IAR has certainly badly exposed the vulnerabilities of this reverse engineering approach.

On the matter of economic effects, which points A, B, C and D of the motion refer to, the draft IAR highlights a number of key areas of concern. The panel finds that the cost of developing the stadium and the supporting infrastructure and services are understated in the proponent's report. Now that rings a bell because that is what Gruen said too.

The panel also concludes that the estimated benefits of the project are overvalued in the proponent's report. Again, echoes what the other independent report said.

They go on to say:

There are downside risks to the panel's current estimates that are yet to be quantified. And, if all costs and benefits were able to be better quantified, the panel believes the excess of costs over benefits would, in fact, be greater than what they have arrived at in this report.

The panel finds that under its central scenario, construction of the project would require the state to borrow or otherwise finance at the same or greater cost approximately \$992 million. At the end of 10 years of operation, the additional debt directly associated with the project's construction and operation would be approximately \$1.86 billion.

The state's debt servicing costs are estimated to be \$76 million higher per annum over the first 10 years of operation than would be the case if the project was not constructed. Over this period, the state's cash deficit is estimated to be \$87 million per annum higher.

Overall, while the proponent's economic analysis shows the operation of the project would result in between 203 and 238 FTE jobs on an ongoing basis, this is what the panel finds: that that is a relatively small benefit for an investment of this magnitude and would be less than if the same quantum of public funds were invested in a project with a positive benefit-cost ratio.

We could spend the same money on a better project, would deliver more jobs.

And, speaking of benefit-cost ratios, the panel's estimated BCR in the central case that it presents is 0.53 and it stands between the proponent's estimate of 0.69 and Dr Gruen's estimate of 0.44.

That is all three studies show a BCR below the required level of one. In addition to the public financing of its construction, the stadium is projected to operate at a cash loss.

Other things being equal, the resulting higher state deficit would need to be funded at some stage in the future through either increasing revenue or reducing services. That is the impact of this project: increasing revenue through taxation or reducing services.

Construction delays represent a significant risk through potentially higher costs and AFL penalties under the agreement with the State Government. To the extent there are delays, construction costs would be adversely impacted and, potentially, penalties applied.

If all that does not sound bad enough on the economic front, it gets worse. On the assessment of this independent Tasmanian Planning Commission panel - remembering that one of the panel members is former head of Treasury, Martin Wallace - say:

The additional debt the State would take on to build the Project and to fund its operating losses may trigger a credit rating downgrade.

for our state.

The Panel calculates that by the end of 10 years of operation the additional debt due entirely to the Project build would be approximately \$1.86 billion

...

As it is a subjective judgement as to whether the extra Project debt would trigger a credit downgrade - [quotes checked]

the panel is being entirely reasonable here, saying that their assessment of that could be subjective. Other people might think it would not trigger such a downgrade, so they have not included that in the allowance at this stage in their calculations. However, they do say that to the extent that there is a credit downgrade, this would impact on the cost of all state debt over time and the project's BCR would be lower than estimated, even now.

They have not included it in that calculation, but they are saying it is possible, it is a risk, and it would make the scenario even worse. In calculating the BCR, it is noted in the report that the panel has made no allowance for the negative social impacts from building and operating a stadium at Macquarie Point, such as noise, dust, visual disamenity, transport disruption, and traffic congestion. As it says, it has no basis for estimating these at this stage. They recognise there will be negative social impacts across those areas. They cannot calculate it right now, but they do say this:

To the extent [those negative social impacts] are significant, the BCR for the Project would be lower

They also say this, as outlined in the report:

The PoSS Guidelines for the Project required a comparison of the economic impact of the Project with that of an alternative investment utilising a similar value of public funds. The reason for this is that any sizeable public expenditure would have a significant economic impact, and the relevant question is whether and by how much an investment in the Project would

provide an additional economic stimulus compared to an alternative application of these funds.

The report clearly states:

The Panel considers that the construction and operation of the Project would not generate a net economic benefit for Tasmania compared to an alternative public investment of the same financial magnitude.

It does not stack up. If we are going to be spending a billion dollars of Tasmanian taxpayers' money, this does not stack up as the best way to spend it. The report says:

During the operation phase of the stadium the marginal increases in output, employment and income are low for the level of public investment proposed.

... These economic impacts would be higher if the stadium operated profitably and delivered a return on investment, which is not the case.

I will move on to social and community issues in the IAR:

Overall, the Panel finds that the project has some potential positive effects in relation to health, community engagement, and sports diplomacy. However, sustained investment would be required, and it is noted that some benefits may arise independently of the development of the Project. The Project's positive social and cultural effects rely primarily on the establishment of the Devils teams and their entry into the AFL/AFLW, and associated investments into the sport ecosystem, rather than the physical establishment of a stadium. The Panel notes that while there may be some positive social and economic impacts in state/city branding, and tourism and trade, achieving these positive impacts would require ongoing Tasmanian Government funding in order to attract high-quality events, and these benefits are not solely dependent on the stadium.

As noted in part (e) of the motion:

The Panel considers that there is significant potential for a negative impact of the stadium on the existing territorial sense of community for local residents in:

- the surrounding area, due to the significant change to their local area and increased foot and vehicle traffic through the area; and
- Hobart more broadly due to the significant visual change in the landscape.

In terms of health and wellbeing, the proponents report an assessment of positive outcomes and impacts for health and wellbeing articulated in both the cost-benefit analysis and the social cultural analysis reports rely predominantly on the establishment of the Devils' teams, the entry of these teams into the AFL/AFLW and associated investment into the sport ecosystem for AFL participation, rather than the physical infrastructure of the stadium itself or its associated events.

The report says this:

The panel considers that there is little to no empirical evidence that a stadium and the events it hosts lead to increases in sports participation or associated physical and mental health benefits. As noted in Part F of the motion, the panel considers that there is some evidence of a potential positive impact on a sense of community and associated sense of wellbeing due to the establishment of the Tasmanian AFL teams and their associated member and fan engagement and communities. The panel, however, considers that these would be realised regardless of a stadium being built, although the panel notes that the establishment of these teams is contingent on the stadium being built under the terms of the current agreement with the AFL. It says the health benefits presented by the proponent in the above-mentioned report with regard to increased participation in AFL are arguably overstated.

Again, they relate to the team rather than the stadium:

There is very limited evidence -

The report says:

Of a positive trickle down or inspiration effect from watching elite sport at a stadium to greater participation in sports. Multiple research articles from 2002 to 2021 across the globe found that there is no evidence supporting the concept that elite sport increases physical activity or sports participation in the general population. These impacts on social wellbeing are just as likely to occur in other settings, e.g. -

It goes on to say:

Watching the game at the pub with friends and via online fan communities as they are in person in the stadium itself.

Moving on to the area of urban form planning in the report:

Overall, as noted in parts G and H of the motion, the Panel finds that it is unlikely that any stadium development within Sullivans Cove could comply with the established planning principles for the area, regardless of design details. The panel considers that the size of the stadium is disproportionate to Hobart's small scale and would be contrary to Hobart's visual values, which consist of natural topography, established built form and urban detail and expression. These visual values are an important aspect to the Tasmanian tourism economy and form an important part of Hobart's visual identity and sense of place. The panel considers that the proposed stadium form contradicts several key strategic planning principles and strategies for Sullivans Cove and central Hobart.

The Panel then notes that:

The strategic urban design principles for Sullivans Cove are well-established and specific and remain relevant as guidance to the continued development of the area.

These urban design principles are what every proponent of any other development in the Sullivans Cove area have to comply with to preserve the valued character of our capital city. Strategic planning principles for the development of Hobart and in particular, the Sullivans Cove area have been developed over an extended period for specific reasons relating to the unique qualities of the landscape and historical pattern of development. These principles derive from people's understanding of the places, their history and their meanings and associations, the report notes that the values these planning principles seek to protect are an important aspect of the Tasmanian tourism economy. They form an important part of our sense of place.

Heritage Tasmania staff provided advice and comments related to the heritage setting of the surrounding area as a part of the consultation process for the preparation of this draft IAR and concluded that the stadium would have significant visual impacts on the setting of some heritage places in the vicinity.

Commenting on the project design, the panel considers that the size and scale of the stadium would have a significant impact on the visual experience and spatial identity of Sullivans Cove.

The Panel finds that the proposed interfaces with the port area, Tim Tamili Mananya, Derwent River, and the Queens Domain are all characterised by a lack of integration or connection.

Relevant to Part J of the motion, the Panel considers the stadium's built form footprint in the context of the size of the....

Ms WEBB - (cont) the panel considers 'the stadium's built form footprint in the context of the size of the site, means that the majority of the site's available spaces is occupied by the stadium structure and its associated elements.'

It goes on to say:

Due to lack of remaining space around the stadium structure, the Panel considers that activation of the public realm around the stadium would be difficult and would contribute to significant issues, including challenges to access and egress, comfortable pedestrian flows, and opportunities for rest and respite. The residual space and its limitations would not allow the creation of an activated, mixed-use precinct, and would minimise the potential to achieve a public realm area for enjoyment out of event mode. It also means there is very little scope to establish soft landscaping to support amenity and biodiversity.

The panel goes on, noting:

... that the open areas at the south, east and north of the stadium structure are spatially constrained and would need to be 52 dedicated to pedestrian circulation. Therefore, there are extremely limited options for other public uses or activities in open spaces which could otherwise contribute as destinations or attractors for people to move through, and thereby socially

activate the site outside of event mode.

The IAR says that These narrow open spaces lack connections to the surrounding areas, have poor visibility and indirect sightlines, and subsequently would have limited scope to provide commercially viable activated interfaces with the public realm.' Here is another comment from the report of particular note on this topic:

The Panel considers that this type of spatial arrangement would create a poor solution from a Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) perspective, meaning the areas are not likely to be, or cause people to feel that they are, safe places. They are not likely to be desirable or attractive places to visit outside of event mode.

This is not an area that will be a vibrant, activated space outside of the major events held there. By definition and design, this panel has found that it cannot be that.

The panel also acknowledges that a stadium, in fact any stadium, would be a new alien form to some extent if it was inserted into an existing city context. That is what they are saying here when they are using that word 'alien', which I know - apparently, from news reporting - the MPDC has gone to seek legal advice and one of the things they have taken offence at is this report's use of the word 'alien' apparently, thinking that they were describing this stadium. In fact, they are making the point that if you plonk a stadium down anywhere, it is probably going to be a bit odd in the context of whatever city you are putting it in. But, they go on to say this, that 'this has the potential to add new character and new layers of history and meaning to a city's life and identity.' There is an opportunity there, even if the stadium in the first instance is 'alien' in that context.

In this case, however, the panel considers there to be -

inadequate space at or around the site to mitigate the city-scale negative effects of visual bulk and homogeneity. In addition, the very limited remaining public space is inadequate to allow for new, positive contributions to history and meaning to evolve through use and enjoyment in and out of event mode, over time, at the pedestrian levels.

It is clear this report says the precinct is likely to be effectively inactive outside event mode.

Overall, the panel finds that the project would have significant negative effects on the values of places, buildings, and activities of historic, cultural heritage significance and of community significance. The panel considers that the scale of the stadium would dwarf historic heritage elements and diminish their presence in our city, the story that they tell of Hobart's historic development and their prominence as physical landmarks in the landscape. These historic places and buildings hold value to the community and are an important aspect of Tasmania's tourism economy.

We know there has been much discussion in relation to the impact of the Mac Point Stadium on the Cenotaph. As noted in Part (i) of the motion, the independent TPC panel considers that the built form of the stadium would have a significantly detrimental effect on the visual amenity of the Cenotaph and the way it is understood and experienced. These are currently informed by its prominent elevated headland position, sense of space, and expansive views to and from its site. The panel considers that the height, form, bulk, and proximity of the

stadium building would cause it to be highly intrusive and physically dominating against the Cenotaph monument and surrounding landscape and would diminish the prominence and primacy of the monument. This would affect how users and how users experience and understand the space, the panel tell us. Further, the panel considers that both the proposed built form and the use of the stadium building would have a significant detrimental effect on the historical, cultural heritage and community values of the Cenotaph.

Another finding, Mr President, that is of crucial importance is that the panel does not consider that these effects on the Cenotaph, arising from the scale, height, form, bulk, use, and proximity of the stadium building could be resolved by design details applied to the proposed stadium building or by the scheduling of stadium events to avoid specific ceremonial activities at the Cenotaph. It could not be clearer in this report that detrimental effects on the Cenotaph will be irreconcilable and permanent.

The panel considers that the built form of the stadium has significant negative effects on the settings of the buildings on Hunter Street, specifically the heritage-listed Henry Jones and Co IXL Jam factory buildings, including those buildings currently used as University of Tasmania's Centre for the Arts. The Hunter Street streetscape is an iconic location in Hobart which defines the waterfront skyline and has significant value to both locals and visitors. The panel considers the social and aesthetic significance of the Hunter Street buildings is adversely impacted by the stadium form. The panel also considers that the built form of the stadium has significant negative effects on the setting and appreciation of the Royal Engineers' building, and some impact on the wider settings of Victoria and Constitution docks due to its dominating presence.

The panel considers that the stadium roof contributes materially to the negative effects on the historic, cultural heritage significance of the listed places and that any changes that increase the height and bulk of the roof would exacerbate the effects. Here is something that needs to be said clearly. The panel considers that the proposed design details are not sufficient to ameliorate the effects of the stadium's built form on the historic, cultural heritage significance of surrounding places. You cannot fix it with design elements on the current design. The panel considers that due to the size, height, and bulk of the building that are required to facilitate its intended use, these effects cannot be satisfactorily resolved.

In the IAR, the panel notes a separate assessment under the *Aboriginal Heritage Act 1975* would be undertaken if a permit is granted for the project through the Project of State Significance process. However, they also note that consideration of Aboriginal heritage is still an important part of the integrated assessment for the project that the panel is undertaking to ensure it is capable of being cited to avoid significant negative effects on Aboriginal heritage and cultural values.

The development of the northern access road for the project would involve works within this registered Aboriginal heritage site that may affect its values, although there is currently insufficient evidence on the potential effects of the northern access road for the panel to make clear findings on that point. The panel acknowledges that only Aboriginal people can truly speak to and understand the Aboriginal cultural and landscape values of the place. Therefore, until feedback is provided through engagement and assessment by the Aboriginal community, the panel is unable to make findings on these issues.

The report is very clear that the size of the stadium will mean that not much else can fit at the Mac Point site. Overall, the panel finds, and I quote:

... that the limited space around the stadium is a major constraint in developing a genuinely active mixed-use precinct. The spaces around the stadium are constrained, visually disconnected, not easily accessible, overshadowed, and potentially subject to uncomfortable wind conditions. During operation, most space around the stadium would be required for access and egress, people moving in and out, with limited or no scope for successful activation through other uses.

The panel considers that during construction and during stadium events, the project has the potential for adverse effects on the operation of the Port of Hobart, Federation Concert Hall, the Queen's Domain and surrounding uses such as hotels and educational facilities, established events and hospitals due primarily to increased traffic and parking demand and noise. Pedestrian movement, the report says, and circulation around the area would also be compromised.

It goes on to say:

The functional and spatial requirements of the stadium resulting in the majority of the Mac Point site being occupied by the stadium building would significantly affect areas within the site that were identified in the 2019-2030 reset plan as being suitable for mixed-use purposes such as commercial, residential and visitor accommodation.

While they have that reset plan, it is actually not possible to give effect to it, given the design elements of the current project proposed. What will instead be needed, simply as space to move people in and out of the stadium.

The panel considers the residual areas of the Macquarie Point site outside of the land required for the stadium and adjoining structures are (I will give you a small list):

- (10) insufficient in area to enable an effective amount and range of other urban and mixed land use activities;
- (11) have the potential to generate land use conflict with current and future port and shipping operations where future activities expect a higher level of amenity;
- (12) include land that is dislocated from urban services and neighbourhoods.

The panel notes:

There is intended to be an opportunity for further separate land uses, such as hospitality or retail, to occur around the stadium. However, due to the overall size and design of the building, the remaining public spaces are inadequate in area and are not conducive to establishing a vibrant and active urban area with viable quantum and mix of commercial tenancies to generate much pedestrian activity outside of event mode.

Given the constrained nature of the limited spaces that remain outside the land area required for the stadium building, the panel considers the creation of a genuinely mixed-use precinct which is well connected and easily accessible, visually connected and intuitively legible, attractive to visit and

of critical mass of complementary tenancies to enable a localised economic ecosystem to thrive, does not appear possible.

The space as indicated for complementary mixed-use in the Mac Point Precinct Plan are insufficient and poorly sited, substantially limiting their ability to achieve this.

I particularly want to mention here the impact of a stadium development on the Tasmanian Symphony Orchestra and Federation Concert Hall. As the IAR notes, the Federation Concert Hall and the ABC Broadcast Centre are used for a combination of broadcasting, recording and performance purposes.

The quality of the acoustic environment within these facilities may, at times, be critically important for their effective operation. The nature of these activities means that there is likely to be a higher potential for impact from special audible characteristics such as tonality, modulation and impulsiveness, as well as from sound during the day or early evening, in comparison to the sensitive uses associated with residential and accommodation activities.

The Tasmanian Symphony Orchestra (TSO) provided comments on the draft guidelines for this project as part of the public exhibition process. As noted in the IAR, the views and comments expressed by the TSO included these:

The TSO rehearses, performs, records, livestreams and sells video-on-demand services at Federation Concert Hall, a hall that was purpose-designed and built for the orchestra in 2000, and enhanced acoustically, and from a professional recording and livestreaming perspective, over the last few years. The operation of the stadium may result in noise radiating from the building that is much higher than the levels the envelope of the Federation Concert Hall is designed to withstand. Noise and vibration from construction of the project disrupting the TSO's existing facilities and operations is of genuine concern.

What is clear is that our purpose-built, state-of-the-art concert hall and world-renowned orchestra will be adversely affected by a stadium development literally on their doorstep.

Members here may not be aware of the technical capability, the value, the esteem, and the local, national and international reach of the work of our TSO, specifically in that concert hall. I wanted to share a little of what I recently heard when I attended an incredible concert there as part of our iconic Ten Days on the Island festival. It is relevant here to what is reflected in the IAR report.

In a pre-concert speech from Caroline Sharpen, CEO of the TSO, we were made aware of the following. In the concert hall, there are 800m² of absorptive acoustic material - woollen drapes - in housings around the walls of the hall. They are like individual electronic blinds, and they are configured to suit the sound world for every piece played in a concert there. With all those banners down, the sound quality of the hall is dried up completely. It is perfect for a speech. With all the banners up, there is a sound reverb of 2.3 seconds - not quite a cathedral, but, perhaps, according to Caroline, a big, boomy bathroom.

There are, in that Federation Concert Hall, 32 ABC microphones positioned around the orchestra and eight 5K cameras dotted around the auditorium, giving more than 300 pre-set shots of the orchestra, the conductor and the soloists. The audio and video capture is run off

new fibre-optic cabling.

All of this was installed during COVID, and this is what we heard: Because of that installation and upgrade during COVID that has made the Federation Concert Hall one of the finest concert halls and cultural export hubs in the world.

Then we heard about the reach, the impact and the esteem in which our TSO is held. For that concert, for example, there were audiences joining us around Tasmania. This included Uniting AgeWell residential care facilities; in the North-West, the UTAS campus in Burnie; in community hall screenings in Deloraine, and Whitemark on Flinders Island. There were households dotted around Australia who were beaming themselves into Tasmania for that concert. In a few months, that night's concert will be available on ABC iview, free to watch for every Australian, and it will be sent to Amsterdam, to the international streaming channel for the world's great orchestras, called Symphony.live.

The TSO is the only Australian orchestra featured in that streaming channel and able to deliver the quality and the scale required to be so. The TSO is the most recorded, broadcast, filmed and streamed orchestra in the country. It is nationally and internationally significant, and the Federation Concert Hall facility and the people in it are what make that possible.

Every month - I want members to hear this - the TSO reach three-quarters-of-a-million listeners and viewers on radio, online and on Spotify. Every month, three-quarters-of-a-million listeners and viewers, creating an international brand and cultural and economic value for our state that is astronomical.

This report notes fairly prosaically in black and white on the page that the panel considers that the operation of the stadium would result in sound, including sound with special characteristics that may affect the Federation Concert Hall - specifically the operation of the Tasmanian Symphony Orchestra that uses those facilities for a wide range of purposes. While the Federation Concert Hall may have soundproofing in place that effectively removes this and other unwanted noise, the panel has no evidence that this is the case.

What we are reading when we see that on the page is the concern that a stadium at Macquarie Point will put our world-class, elite-level, prolific and internationally successful TSO at risk, permanently. I wonder if the stadium progresses, is it the government's intention that our TSO stays where it is and is crippled in its ability to perform the outstanding cultural work that it does for this state, this nation and internationally?

If so, we must quantify that and count it in the benefit cost ratio of this stadium, because it is an internationally significant loss to us, not just our city, but to our state and our nation. Or perhaps it is the intention that our TSO moves to another purpose-built concert hall at some other location. If so, we need to count that in the cost of this stadium. Perhaps the Labor Party would like to explain how they have betrayed Jim Bacon's legacy by supporting the trashing of the functioning and standing of the Federation Concert Hall?

Ms O'Connor - That is a good question.

Ms WEBB - The report talks about impact on a range of other surrounding uses and areas, but I am going to move on now to transport and movement as a key area.

In the draft IAR, the Panel, Independent TPC Panel acknowledges that the background transport network and services in Hobart may already be constrained during construction and

peak operational time periods, especially on key corridors accessing the stadium, including the Tasman Bridge, the Brooker Highway and Davey Street. The panel considers there are synergies between journeys in a transport system and some project journeys that could be reconsidered, retimed and moved to different modes to mitigate travel demand impacts are there.

However, the panel considers there are no adequate public transit service provision. Transport infrastructure and operational agreements have been made, or, are likely to be adequate for the project movements to function safely and conveniently at all times.

The panel considers these project movements would thus exacerbate background movement pressures and create additional transport issues in Hobart.

Pedestrian movement is a key area. Pedestrian movement is of critical importance and the report raises considerable issues on that front, some of which appear unresolvable. As proposed, the vast majority of people accessing the stadium would start or end their use of the stadium as pedestrians. The use and development of the stadium requires that suitable pedestrian infrastructure is in place to accommodate safe, convenient and direct pedestrian movement for the numbers of people projected to be accessing and exiting the stadium.

The provision of suitable pedestrian infrastructure, including any arrangements required for its effective use, is considered to be a necessary element of the operation of the stadium and consequently part of the project.

The report says the panel considers the project creates problematic pedestrian movement issues for event patrons and for the broader community. These include a range of issues with particular concerns relating to safety, capacity and convenience of pedestrian movement pathways and options following high capacity events.

The panel considers the scope of the project proposal should extend to incorporate all necessary pedestrian infrastructure and management arrangements that would enable pedestrians to move to and from the stadium in a safe and convenient manner, including beyond the immediate area of the stadium as appropriate for the stadium to operate.

The panel generally considers the pathways adjacent to roads and signalised street crossings in the area have not been designed for, and lack sufficient space to enable changes to accommodate pedestrian flows associated with the stadium.

The panel considers the pathway and crossings are not adequate in capacity or design to operate safely or effectively with the likely peak pedestrian movements under a range of post event scenarios.

The panel considers the pedestrian access route proposed for the area of Davey Street between Evans and Hunter Streets particularly constrained, and has the highest potential for negative effects on pedestrian safety and convenience.

Of particular note, the panel considers it is essential that plans for the development of a pedestrian infrastructure and management of pedestrian movement enable the Davey Street - Franklin and Wharf routes towards Salamanca in the city to be used in safe and convenient manners for peak, post event movements. They consider the extent to which management actions may be able to adequately modify pedestrian behaviour is not able to be assessed.

Generally, however, the panel does not consider the management actions to provide a feasible alternative to the provision of suitable permanent pedestrian infrastructure.

Just to be clear there, because it can be easy to switch off when we are listening to this long list of issues. What they are saying is the pedestrian issues will be so significant, you cannot just modify it by changing the lights at crossings, by putting in some extra arrangements to shepherd pedestrians through the area, but you need to look at infrastructure solutions, widening footpaths, widening areas of pedestrian movement. But, even then, that may not be enough.

Noting there is very limited spatial scope to increase widths, areas and capacity for pedestrian movements within or around the stadium site. The panel considers these kinds of improvements would not be sufficient to cater for peak pedestrian demand under a range of likely scenarios.

The panel considers that as proposed and even including the opportunities that they list, the project does not include the necessary pedestrian infrastructure and management arrangements to ensure safe and convenient pedestrian movements. Overall, here is the kicker, the panel considers that the planning, development and operation of pedestrian routes that can safely, comfortably and realistically cater for peak pedestrian movement scenarios relating to the operation of the stadium is a necessary element of this project and this is considered to be an issue of critical significance for the project.

An area of particular concern in relation to pedestrian movement is capacity for safe evacuation of the stadium. This is the part of the report that pulled me up short more than any other, and if members have not had the opportunity to read the report in full as yet, I implore you to listen to the key messages from this section, because we are talking about fundamental matters of public safety and ultimately, Tasmanian lives.

As the draft IAR notes, safety is considered to be a critical requirement in the development of any new infrastructure and is of particular significance where the safety of large numbers of people may be at risk due to the nature of the infrastructure.

The safe and effective operation of the stadium requires pathways that enable people to move to safe places within the broader city and waterfront precinct in the event of an evacuation being needed. In an emergency scenario during an event at the stadium, the groups of people that need to be evacuated for the stadium include staff, teams, officials, performers, crew, patrons of various sorts from various areas of the facility and at the same time, access to the stadium may be required by fire, ambulance, police and other critical emergency services.

In the event of an emergency, people need to be able to reach safe evacuation points where they are no longer exposed to the risks associated with the incident, whatever it may be. This should include designated evacuation points, assembly areas or safe zones within the stadium site or the broader city and waterfront precinct.

Adequate space is required so that the pedestrian demand can be met without footpath congestion backing up all the way into the stadium, stopping people from evacuating and without causing road safety issues in the surrounding traffic network, and without emergency services being unable to access the stadium.

International standards for safety at sports venues are outlined in the Guide to Safety at Sports Grounds. The 6th edition is called the Green Guide, published by the UK Sports Ground

Safety Authority. This is detailed in the IAR, with evacuation times for full evacuation of the venue recommended to be a maximum of eight minutes. It is confirmed in this IAR that the proponent has stated that it aims to meet that standard, eight minutes.

The proponent has proposed that in the event of an emergency, general patrons would be directed to evacuate the stadium and disperse away from the immediate stadium site towards the broader city and waterfront precinct, however, the development plans from the proponent do not.

This is what the panel has assessed and determined. The development plans from the proponent do not provide sufficient pedestrian pathway capacity either within the Macquarie Point site or on the main pedestrian paths from the stadium to spaces within the broader city waterfront precinct to safely achieve an eight to 10 minute evacuation for crowds over 24,500. As crowd sizes increase over this level, the risk from pedestrian congestion and longer evacuation time frames increase.

Furthermore, in case anyone is thinking 'Oh well, we won't often have necessarily crowds over 24,500 thousand people at the site', then we say this as is detailed in the report, 'Stadiums Tasmania has identified a need to accommodate crowd sizes of 35,000 to 39,000 at this site and plans for pedestrian evacuation and emergency vehicle access should be based on meeting this peak level of use.'

The TPC Independent Panel in this report considers the broader areas surrounding the stadium would be overcrowded and potentially unsafe for emergency evacuation of the stadium as they include a number of barriers and bottlenecks inherent in the existing physical environment. These barriers and bottlenecks create pinch points that limit pedestrian capacity and flows, conflict with emergency vehicle routes and would result in unsafe levels of congestion and likely unsafe behaviour by evacuating pedestrians and/or conflicts with other vehicular traffic.

Let us be clear here. We have to evacuate in eight to 10 minutes up to 39,000 people out of the stadium, and what this says is there are so many impediments in the way that the flow of people going out would be interrupted and people would start to panic and that would then add to the whole emergency situation and the risk to people's lives.

The report goes on to say for these pedestrian pinch points to be mitigated effectively or avoided, the design of pedestrian and emergency vehicle routes, including the location and width of these routes, would need to cater for a range of peak crowd scenarios, and I make this point: the panel considers the design and provision of suitable routes and pathways cannot be replaced by combination traffic management and evacuation procedures. They cannot manage with the existing facilities there for those routes and pathways. They need to change the physical infrastructure to even start to get the right kind of physical environment for evacuation to be possible.

Within the area immediately surrounding the stadium, the panel considers the development plans from the proponent do not provide sufficient pedestrian pathway capacity within the Mac Point site or from the stadium to spaces within the broader waterfront city precinct to safely achieve an 8 to 10-minute evacuation for crowds over 24,500. They say this

-

Areas surrounding the stadium building and in the broader precinct would be overcrowded and potentially unsafe for emergency evacuation of the stadium

within that 8 to 10 minutes for any event over 24,500 people unless substantially wider pedestrian evacuation paths are provided and there is effective mitigation of pedestrian pinch points through design supplemented by emergency evacuation procedures and traffic management.

This a matter of critical importance. I do not believe any MP could throw their unconditional support behind this stadium project at this site while safety issues of this magnitude hangover it. There should be no way a project of this size and consequence should be approved under our planning system with what appears to be an unresolvable issue with emergency evacuation. That would be an approval that would put Tasmanian lives and in fact visitors lives at risk.

If the government or the proponent are suggesting that this is resolvable, it will have significant impact on the design of the space because it will require opening up much more pedestrian pathway capacity for people to move through the space, which will cut out many other elements that have been suggested for the surrounding areas of the stadium. It would also require substantial redevelopment of footpaths et cetera in the broader precinct and surrounding areas to provide much greater movement of pedestrians there, which is questionable in terms of practicality and cost and certainly adds to the overall costs of the project. If these serious evacuation concerns cannot be resolved to a degree that independent experts certify as appropriate, it should represent a hard no on this project.

There are so many more areas that are covered in this independent TPC panel report that are of critical importance when it comes to the viability of this project. But, in the interest of time, I am not going to go through all of them in detail. I trust that members here will have read this report and made themselves well aware of the breadth of these matters covered. I also trust members have noted the fact that many concerns and issues identified in the report are not readily resolvable and any resolution options generally involve significant further costs, which are not yet factored in to the BCR of the project and the debt profile it presents to our state.

I am going to briefly mention in a quick fashion some of those further areas without going into detail. The panel considers that the event bus concept proposed is not capable of achieving the aspirational mode-share target nor could it be operated as intended. In terms of transport system effects, the panel does not consider that these mode-share targets are achievable that are presented in the project. The panel considers, however, that any increase in traffic volume on the network will make it more difficult for incident response plans to be effective. There is a whole range of traffic issues discussed.

Parking: the panel considered it likely there would be more stadium event patrons completing their journey by private vehicle than they have anticipated, and parking than anticipated by the proponent, which is likely to exacerbate the pedestrian movement issues.

Overall, the panel finds that the limited understanding of the current contamination conditions of the site and the consequent uncertainty on contamination and disposal requirements are likely to affect the cost and time frames of the project. This is under a broader heading of environmental effects. Contamination is one, construction noise is mentioned as adversely affecting the amenity of adjacent land users. Operational noise and lighting is mentioned as impacting on adjacent residential amenities, particularly during night time events. Stormwater released from the site does not achieve water quality targets and the effect of the release on the marine ecology remains unknown. It is not demonstrated. The piped stormwater system does not have the capacity to manage runoff from flood events and the potential contribution of the project to flood events remains unknown. Wind comfort levels for sitting

and strolling at key waiting areas such as the entrances and the bus plaza are expected to be generally poor.

The EPA provided detailed discussion of issues and potential risks consistent with the panel's findings. The EPA considers that the preliminary nature of the proponent's reports invalidated some conclusion statements, assessment findings and the appropriateness of the proposed management measures identified in those reports. So, the EPA has challenged what the proponent has put forward.

There is extensive discussion in the report on each of those environmental matters that I have just run through super quickly, and the report raises concerns and issues throughout.

While the panel has some awareness of the issues and relationship associated with design and delivery elements of the project and other construction projects in the area, it says it does not have the information that enables it to discuss or make findings on these issues. This is in terms of construction programming and sequencing. The panel notes that the uncertainty of the construction program in staging poses significant time and cost risks to the delivery of the project. Another unknown not presented with enough information to make that assessment.

The final matter in the report I want mention is in the section titled Ministerial Direction Matters and relates to the consistency with the Macquarie Point Precinct Plan. The Ministerial Direction, dated 16 October 2024, requires the commission's integrated assessment to include specific consideration of a number of matters, including to specifically consider the extent to which the proposed project is consistent with and supports the urban renewal of Macquarie Point site as defined in the *Macquarie Point Developments Corporation Act 2012*, as provided for in the Macquarie Point Precinct Plan prepared by the Macquarie Point Development Corporation, established under section 5 of that act.

The panel states that based on its consideration of issues in this report, it considers the project would not be consistent with some of the stated urban renewal principles of the precinct plan and it goes on to list those. The panel considers that the project would not support or promote integrated urban renewal of the site. This is categorical. This is not an urban renewal project that is being presented to us here. This is not what the Commonwealth believes it is funding as an urban renewal project. The panel has assessed that we cannot regard it as such.

It says the panel considers that the development of the stadium on the Macquarie Point site would compromise the potential for success of other uses and activities proposed in the precinct plan. The Ministerial Direction asked them to assess it and, boy, did they assess it, and it came out with a big fat fail.

In order to improve the functional and safe operation of the stadium, the panel considers buildings within the Antarctic facility zone and the complementary integrated mixed-use zone would not be able to be constructed. It appears the design of the bus plaza submitted by the proponent already impinges on the area set aside for the Antarctic facilities zone.

While the precinct plan does not propose buildings on the western side of the site, there is an area there set aside for the Aboriginal culturally informed zone. The panel, in this report, considers this area of land would be necessary for pedestrian movement associated with the stadium.

While the panel does not provide comment on the design and treatment of this space, it notes that whatever landscaping treatments are used they would need to be compatible with

free movement of stadium patrons. People have to walk across it. I have referred before in this place to the Aboriginal culturally informed 'nature strip' the government intends to put at the face of this stadium. Now the TPC panel has confirmed that is precisely what it is. It is a nature strip to walk from the street into the stadium. What an absolute insult to our Aboriginal community.

The panel says that the requirement to have to allow for the movement of patrons across this area:

may affect the achievement of the stated aims of the Precinct Plan for the area to be a meaningful space for the Aboriginal community

... Overall, the Panel considers that in order to improve functionality and safety of the proposed stadium design, additional dedicated space around the stadium building would be required. The Panel therefore considers the Project would be incompatible with the achievement of the other objectives of the Precinct Plan.

The stadium kills the precinct plan. That is what the TPC Independent Panel tells us. The precinct plan is a goner.

Finally, here is the kicker:

The Panel notes, however, that the additional space that would be gained by not developing other elements of the Precinct Plan would not be sufficient to resolve all issues with the stadium's operation.

Even when we throw the precinct plan out the window and get rid of all those other uses that were planned for the site, all the urban renewal ideas that were in place for that site, even when we ditch them all to help facilitate the operation of the stadium, it is still not enough to resolve the issues that are there with this stadium's operation on the assessment of this independent TPC panel.

It is utterly gobsmacking that anybody in this place, in this building, could be throwing their thoughtless support behind this without recognising the seriousness of the issues being raised in this report.

The final point of my motion today calls on the Tasmanian government, in order to secure the ongoing future of Tasmania's AFL team, to seek to reopen negotiation with the AFL regarding the location and construction time frame of any associated stadium. As Gruen notes in his overview on page three of his report:

I expect that the Government and the AFL believe they have been acting in good faith to deliver a big project despite the inevitable naysayers. But their haste has undermined the prospects to minimise costs and maximise benefits and for different parties to craft constructive and well-informed compromises. The decision to locate the stadium at Macquarie Point is already dividing some of the AFL's core constituencies: veterans, Indigenous Australians, and heartland football supporters in Tasmania. This is creating needless reputational risk for the AFL.

Dr Gruen explores this reputational risk for the AFL further on page 18 of his report:

Reputationally for the AFL, Tasmania's participation is potentially both high risk and high reward. The potential reward is nothing less than the destiny of Australian rules football as a national game. Despite its proud and passionate history as one of the foundation states of Australian rules football, and despite numerous eventually unsuccessful overtures to the AFL in the past going back at least to 1987 if not before, Tasmania is the only original Australian rules state not to have a team in the AFL.

If that is the prize, the risk is that integrating Tasmania into the AFL is looking like being a reputationally bruising experience for the AFL (for example in relation to military veterans and the impact on the Cenotaph).

As one prominent Tasmanian I consulted - Saul Eslake - observed, a Tasmanian AFL team offered something that might have been even more inspirational and unifying for Tasmanians than the establishment and success of the JackJumpers has been. Instead it risks becoming another futile battle within the community of the kind that have often characterised major policy debates in Tasmania.

Further, on page four of his report, Dr Gruen puts forward an alternative path to secure the team and appropriately consider the prospect of a new stadium. He says this:

Tasmanians and all who wish to see a Tasmanian AFL team succeed, need to take the time to get the stadium right. That can be done by returning to the original timetable for the stadium proposed in Tasmania's 2019 AFL Taskforce report, namely that the "first 5-7 seasons" be played at UTAS and Ninja Stadium at Bellerive while a proper process is put in place to locate, design, cost and build a new stadium.

This is a sensible, responsible, realistic suggestion. It has merit and it should have been an excellent opportunity for the state government to pause and take stock when it was proposed in this report and released in January. It is incredibly sad - tragic even - that the Rockliff government showed absolutely no inclination to be informed by this independent work and expert advice that it had commissioned and paid for.

In addition to the clear message from the Gruen report that a renegotiation is required, we now also have the TPC Draft Integrated Assessment Report (IAR). Quite frankly, I challenge any MP to properly read this report from cover to cover and not be shocked to their core at the seriousness of the issues it raises and the potential consequences of dismissing such serious concerns in a blind rush to insist on this stadium at all costs.

What cannot be denied from those issues raised in the draft IAR is that if we are to be bullied forwards on this pathway to this stadium, what we risk is as serious as the credit rating of our state and the safety of Tasmanian lives. That is the level of irresponsibility that is being demanded by the 'Just build it' government and the 'Me too, me too' Opposition in this state.

I was not elected to bow before bullies, but to stand up for the best interests of Tasmanians and my electorate and to make sound, transparent, and evidence-based decisions. I think that should be true of everyone in this Chamber.

On the matter of my electorate in Nelson, I note a hallmark of a bully is to use strawman arguments rather than engage in the substance of the matter. I put on the record here that I stand

in support of my Nelson electorate and my positive statements on the public record welcoming the decision to locate the Tasmania Devils high-performance centre at the Kingborough Sports Precinct. Specifically, those comments were printed in the *Kingborough Chronicle* on 26 November 2024, for anybody's reference. That was an excellent outcome for the Kingborough community, and may I say the Rosny community. I have noted comments from the Premier just this morning in the other place attempting to cast aspersions on my commitment to the team and the high-performance centre in Kingston. I utterly reject this. It is a desperate strawman argument put forward to try to diminish my stance here today.

Since the Liberals have brought up the high-performance centre, it is a perfect case study for us to refer to when it comes to this stadium debate and what I am proposing in this motion. The location of the high-performance centre was another matter that the AFL had made demands about. The AFL's preferred location for the high-performance centre was Rosny. That is where they wanted it to go. That was what they had demanded.

What we have seen demonstrated by the high-performance centre process is that clearly the demands of the AFL so not always have to win out. Our state and our communities can in fact make decisions for ourselves in our own best interests. After substantial community mobilisation against locating the high-performance centre in Rosny Parklands, the decision changed. The AFL preference was overridden and it was decided to locate the high-performance-centre in a location that makes sense, is thoroughly supported by the local community and the broader Tasmanian community, and is able to be progressed readily through the planning system.

That is exactly what the majority of Tasmanians want to see occur in relation to the stadium. There are mature adult ways forward to resolve matters in the best interest of our state and our local communities

The evidence is telling us that there are serious gaps in the AFL's preferred stadium proposal. It indicates there are serious flaws in putting that stadium on that site. It should be a matter of priority, I think, for the AFL and the state government to invest in securing a social licence not only for the team itself, but also for any associated infrastructure development, like they did, eventually, with the high-performance-centre. It cannot be ignored that in all likelihood there will be serious and unresolvable problems progressing the stadium project at the Mac Point site, including significant public safety concerns.

What is the problem with sitting down at the negotiating table again, in good faith, to have a mature, adult conversation about alternative options that do not impact on the realisation of a Tasmanian team? It should be a reputational risk to the AFL to not do, given what is now explicitly detailed in the public domain. It is time for leadership on this which is not based on bullying and division, but on clear-eyed and honest prioritisation of the Tasmanian people's and our state's best interests.

I commend the motion to the House.

[6.06 p.m. ...]

[10.19 p.m.]

Ms WEBB (Nelson) - Thank you, Mr President. I rise to sum up. I will get myself organised here with all the bits and bobs so that I can make my way through some responses to members. I certainly appreciate members' contributions to this motion. It is really interesting to hear some of the reflections that have been made. I would like to jump straight in and address

the matter that the member for Huon raised right at the end there, suggesting that this motion seeks to pre-empt the PoSS process. I will be very clear that I absolutely support the PoSS process. I am appalled at the idea that it might be pulled up short by the government. That would be entirely inappropriate. I would like to speak a bit more about that during my summing up because others have also raised that. I do not see this motion as pre-empting the PoSS process, just to be really clear. This probably relates to some comments from other members as well.

This is not a motion that is for or against the stadium. It is not a motion that is about whether we stop or keep going with the PoSS process. It is a motion where the final point makes the call very straightforwardly and calls on this Tasmanian government, in order to secure the ongoing future of Tasmania's AFL team, to seek to reopen negotiations with the AFL regarding the location and construction time frame of any associated stadium.

The reason it is that call, as simply as that, is to reflect the fact that what we have now is the independent entity responsible for providing this parliament, ultimately, with a report that we would then, as a parliament, need to consider in terms of saying yes or no to a stadium. That entity, the Tasmanian Planning Commission, via the independent panel in the interim report, has told us quite clearly that the timelines specified in the agreement are not able to be met; that there are issues of such significance at Macquarie Point as a location for that particular proposal that it is unlikely to be able to be supported through that process; and that it is clear from the things that they have flagged as unresolvable that it would be very difficult for them to make a recommendation that we support it.

With that in mind, what is indicated in the draft integrated assessment - and not to pre-empt where they might end up with their final one - it is already clear enough that we are putting this team at risk because we may not, on all good authority there presented, be able to meet the current agreement. It calls on the government to seek to reopen negotiations on those elements of the agreement that what we know so far tell us we probably cannot meet - that relate to location and timeline. It is about preparing the way so that we are not left in a hole, we are not left up against the wall - so that we do not have that sense that we are going to be blackmailed at a certain point, where if we see the TPC come back to us with a final report that categorically says this cannot be recommended to be passed, we are then, as this parliament, faced apparently with only the option of saying yes to something that all experts have told us not to say yes to, or we have suddenly killed the team.

That would be a ridiculous and irresponsible position to find ourselves in. For the government to lead us to being in that position would be ridiculous and irresponsible. That is what this motion is about. It is to provide an avenue for the government to lead us away from that problematic outcome by simply seeking to reopen negotiation on the elements of the agreement - not the whole agreement, not every part of the agreement on every detail - that all indications tell us are going to be very problematic to comply with, and therefore put our team at risk. I hope that clarifies for people what this motion calls for and why.

When we are voting on this motion, we are not voting for or against the stadium, or for or against the team. In fact, we are voting for the team, because we are voting to keep an avenue open that looks to be at risk right now for the team. That is my response to the member for Huon. I appreciate how you had interpreted it, but I hope you can hear me explain that this is not to pre-empt the PoSS process. It is to note what the PoSS process has already been indicating and to look ahead so that we are not up against a wall if and when we come to the end of the PoSS process. It confirms the things being flagged now about timeline and about location. From memory, the member for Murchison was talking about those same elements as

being problematic in the pathway we are on now. I will come to that in a moment.

Before I go any further, because of things that have been raised primarily by the government, in my summing up I do particularly want to recognise the work of the Tasmanian Planning Commission, and in particular the independent panel that have been given this role to play in our PoSS process to do the integrated assessment work on this project.

My goodness - I wonder how they are feeling today, interestingly enough, or how they felt last week when the report came out and the responses started to be triggered. It must have been extraordinary for that group of independent expert people to have the things said about them and their work that have now been said in the public domain, in the media and here in this place today. From the government, in fact.

Ms O'Connor - And last week, the Premier and various ministers slurring the TPC.

Ms WEBB - It is quite disturbing, actually. The TPC is an independent statutory entity. It is an independent umpire in our planning system. We look to it as the place we go where people can take matters for recourse if they have encountered an outcome that they do not agree with, or feel is not right at an earlier stage of the planning process. It can be appealed to the TPC. The TPC can resolve those things. There is a further appeal that can go to the Supreme Court after that, presumably, but they are where we look to resolve matters.

That is the standing that that body has in our planning system. We have set that body up to undertake processes like our PoSS process. We legislate to give them this role in that PoSS process. Part of that is to assign a panel of independent experts to undertake the integrated assessment. The independent experts that were assigned to this process are people who actually need to be recognised for the experience that they bring. It needs to be really clear so that when we hear, just to be clear, the government say that the work of this panel lacks balance, is selectively inclusive of materials, makes findings without receiving representations, has excluded a range of information about benefits, has manifest errors in it, is legally questionable and should be given limited if any weight - when we hear that sort of criticism from the government about this group of people and the work they have done, we really have to give pause here.

We have the members of the panel; Gary Prattley, who has longstanding and extensive involvement in planning and urban and regional development across New Zealand and Australia, including heading up the planning system in Western Australia, Tasmania and the ACT. He has also held senior executive positions in the New South Wales government, including responsibility for major projects, and has been involved in private sector developments in regional Australia. In 2017, Gary was awarded the biannual Sidney Luker Medal[okay] by the Planning Institute of Australia (PIA), for notable contribution to urban and regional planning in Australia. Gary was Deputy Commissioner for Town and Country Planning and Director of Planning in Tasmania between 1988 and 1993.

We have Paul Turner SC. Paul Turner has practised in Tasmania as a litigation lawyer since 1981, retiring this year as Assistant Solicitor-General to this state. Paul was responsible for the conduct of civil litigation involving the state, and regularly appeared as counsel in all Tasmanian courts and tribunals. He has extensive experience and expertise in a number of areas of law including planning, environmental, and public administration law. He was appointed Senior Council in June 2019.

Lynn Mason AM is on this panel. Lynn Mason has over 30 years' experience in local

government as President of the Local Government Association of Tasmania, Senior Vice President of the Australian Local Government Association, member of the Tasmanian Local Government Board, and a member of the Board of Inquiry into the Glenorchy Council. She is a member of the Tasmanian Local Government Code of Conduct Panel. Lynn is a former councillor and mayor of Flinders Council. As a director, she's been chair of Tasmanian Affordable Housing Inc, Metro Tasmania, and the Tasmanian Community Fund, and a director with the Primary Industries Foundation, Crime Stoppers Tasmania, Rural Alive and Well. Lynn is part of a family owned and run agricultural and fishing business and farms on Flinders and in northern Tasmania.

We have Shelley Penn AM. Shelley Penn is an architect, urbanist and non-executive director. She has over 35 years' experience encompassing architectural practise and senior strategic advisory role supporting governments and the private sector to advance outcomes for all people through the quality of public architecture and urban design and built environment. Currently Deputy Chair of the ACT Suburban Land Agency, she's a member of the CIT Woden Project Board, the Victoria and Victoria University's Infrastructure Planning committee. She's a member of several state and city design review panels, Associate Professor at Melbourne University and Adjunct Professor in Architecture Practise at Monash, where she's also University Architect. Past roles include Chair, the National Capital Authority; National President, Australian Institute of Architects; Associate Victorian Government Architect; and Deputy Chair of Heritage Council of Victoria. She is a life fellow of the Australian Institute of Architects.

Finally, Mr. President, Martin Wallace. Former Secretary of the Tasmanian Department of Treasury and Finance, he has extensive experience in public finance, economic analysis, economic and regulatory policy, business development and financial management. He has held executive level roles in the energy and telecommunications industries in health and human services. He is an experienced board member, with present and past roles including the National Competition Council, Tasracing Proprietary Limited, Aurora Energy, Tasmanian Public Finance Corporation, and the governing council of the Tasmanian Health Service.

That is the panel that we are talking about here of independent experts appointed to undertake the integrated assessment by the TPC. These are the people who are being besmirched by the government and, unfortunately, by the Macquarie Point Development Corporation in the types of public language being used about the work that they are doing and the quality of that work. Not only that, there are inaccurate claims being made by the government about that work. For example, to make criticisms of this process and that panel's integrated assessment by saying that they had not taken representations to feed into their work. That is rubbish. The first stage of the integrated assessment, the one that they have done, is against a set of guidelines that were that were produced through a public consultation process and is entirely based on a couple of things. One is the material put forward on the project by the proponent - which they had to drag out of them, by the way, going back numerous times to get more information - and through consulting. It is defined in our legislation who they have to consult with, it is not the general public.

I will tell you who they need to consult with. It requires consultation during that first integrated assessment stage with the council of a municipality in which the project is located and each agency, which in the commission's opinion, has an interest in the project. The section of this report titled Consultation Summary provides an overview of the consultation process undertaken in the preparation of this draft IAR. Anybody can go and read that. Anybody who has read this report would be familiar with what occurred in terms of the material that went into this to be assessed and to have the findings that have been made here. Those findings,

which is made very clear in the report, are put out as an issues report for consultation. That is literally now the phase we are in of this process. They have done their job using the information provided by the proponent and provided by the others that they consulted with that they deemed was necessary under the act and they have come forward with this report and this information, raising particular sorts of issues and concerns.

What happens now is - as long as the process is allowed to continue - is there is a public consultation phase through to 8 May where anybody, including the public, including expert bodies and organisations, including the proponent, including the government if they like, can put forward further information in response to this draft Integrated Assessment Report.

The panel is able to hold hearings. Why did they do that? Why might that be a really important part of this process? One of the things that really disturbed me this morning when the Premier was answering questions in Question Time in the other place is that, when he talked about the possibility of cutting the PoSS process short and instead bringing on enabling legislation pre-emptively, he said, 'Oh, yes, submissions can be made, we will not do anything until after submissions close'. He did not promise that hearings would be held. He did not promise that the expert panel would have the chance to do their expert work in assessing, analysing and interrogating the evidence provided through the public consultation process, which would then inform their final report to us as a parliament by the minister.

He did not promise that that would happen. That is incredibly disturbing. If we have the public consultation and Tasmanians all around the state go to the trouble of putting submissions in, as might expert groups and representative organisations, as might the proponent and others; if there is going to be no expert review, analysis and interrogation of those and then synthesis through an integrated assessment to a final outcome with final recommendations made - if we miss out on that and we as a parliament are expected to do that expert work in a rushed fashion in response to a quick piece of legislation which may well come to us in less than two months, then that would be an appalling abrogation of an appropriate planning process.

I hear the member for Elwick when she says there is a lot of information relating to this proposed stadium project. There are umpteen reports you could read if you wanted to. There is all sorts of data and analysis. It is difficult when you are not an expert in this space to decide how to interpret and analyse it all and where to land with your interpretation and analysis. That is why we look to an expert process. That is why we look to what had been put in place through the TPC. Once we are in that process, that is why we look to it to be completed properly. Then what does come to us as a parliament - and on the agreed timeline of the PoSS process, it would come to us as a parliament later this year. The final report would have to be provided to the minister by the TPC by 17 September. Presumably at any point from then the government could bring something to this place to consider.

If we cut that short and we do not have the expert panel complete the work they started in light of the submissions made in this consultation period, and we pre-emptively have to be voting on yes or no on the stadium in this place in less than two months, then that will put all members here in an incredibly difficult position. If the member for Elwick thinks it has been difficult to keep up with all the information available to this point, just wait until you have to do that with about a week's notice at the end of May. There is no way then to say, 'Just a minute, this was supposed to happen in six months with independent expert advice to us about these matters'. We will be the ones having to make those expert decisions and analysis. That is not something any of us are in a position to do effectively in this place.

That is why it would be an appalling abrogation of responsibility on the part of the

government. It would be an absolutely anti-democratic, anti-good governance and anti-Tasmanian best interests to pull up stumps right now on the PoSS process or in the very near future, maybe even on 9 May, and decide to bring legislation to this place instead. It is a shocking suggestion that the government would even be looking at that.

I do not believe members in this place would feel at all comfortable with that - certainly not independent members of this place who will be the ones genuinely in a position to have to fully look at all the information. Let us face it, if you are a party-aligned member, you are going to vote the way your party tells you, most likely - sadly, but that is most likely what will happen.

Ms O'Connor - Well, every Green vote is a conscience vote, to be clear.

Ms WEBB - There is only one of you here anyway, so there you go.

The reality is, though, it is the independents in this place who will be in the position of having to avail themselves of all the information they possibly can and be desperately trying, because we are all diligent people here, to do our job to the best of our ability. We will be desperately trying to do that expert-level analysis and assessment of all that information to arrive at a responsible decision, to try to arrive at what we believe is the right decision.

That is an appalling position to be in, when what we should have in any planning process - and many of us here, not me, but many others here are from a local government background and understand the planning process very well, our planning system and how we set that up, so that at various stages they are experts in forming decisions being made. Local councils have that. They have expert planning staff on board to provide them information and expert assessment of the things they are to consider. That is effectively what the TPC and the panel process is supposed to be providing to us, ultimately, when we do come to vote on this stadium at some point.

Imagine being on your local council, some of you who were here in those positions in times past, and suddenly you are told no, your planning staff will not be giving you their expert advice on this incredibly significant development in your local council area. You will have to turn around and engage with all the material about this development and you as an individual will have to come to your decision about yes or no. Imagine if that happened. Unacceptable. That is not how a planning system is supposed to work.

I will gather my thoughts here while I work my way through some responses to be made. I found it really interesting listening to both the government response and the minister's response and Labor's response to this motion.

Ms O'Connor - There was not much difference between the responses.

Ms WEBB - Well, there is that, but the thing I was going to note was that I did not hear any of those contributions express any concern about the two glaring red flags raised in the IAR, the panel's interim report. I did not hear anyone express any acknowledgement or concern about the fact that this project could affect our state's credit rating or that there is an utterly alarming public safety risk in relation to the evacuation from this venue.

There is no acknowledgement in any of those contributions by the government, the minister or Labor of any issues raised in this report. Not one. It makes me wonder, did any of those contributors actually read this report? I cannot say for sure. I would let the Leader of Government Business off the hook because she is providing the government response as a

channel for that. Presumably somebody in the government has read this report and fed through into the government's submission - still did not acknowledge anything in it.

I do not know whether the minister for sport has read this 150-page report - or thereabouts - 123 pages for the substantive report and then the appendices. We could let him off the appendices. Maybe he has read the 123 pages of the actual substance of the report. I do not know. I do not know if the member for Pembroke has read this report before he made his contribution today.

Mr Edmunds - Why don't you draft up a test and bring it in.

Ms WEBB - I am only saying I did not hear –

Ms O'Connor - Why don't you tell us whether you read it or not?

Mr Edmunds - Of course I read it. I am shadow minister for sport.

Mr PRESIDENT - Order. We will not have debate across the Chamber.

Ms WEBB - My point is very clear. I did not hear any reflection on any matter of substance from this report in any of those contributions, and that is telling. There are some interesting matters I would like to pick up on going through a few of the contributions.

I agree, the member for Hobart raised the issues about the public-private partnerships matters in the new ministerial direction. The member for Murchison picked up on that and spoke. I am always interested to hear what the member for Murchison has to say on financial matters. She spoke very strongly about the need to be very circumspect about entering into public-private partnerships, and that is another matter for another day. Although, it does go to the substance of this motion and the call in the motion, because that is there to say, 'Hang on, there's things here we're rushing into that we're going to need more time on.' Because we are trying to meet an unrealistic timeline in this agreement, we are not necessarily achieving the best outcomes for our state. Again, it actually supports the call in this motion, which is to seek to reopen negotiations on matters timeline and location because they are the two really tricky parts right now that are driving potentially catastrophic outcomes for our state.

The government says that the TPC panel apparently have overlooked many of the benefits. The TPC panel were working off information provided by the proponent, the Macquarie Point Development Corporation, and presumably the government was assisting to have that information prepared. That information was provided to the panel. The panel assessed it. Is the government saying that the panel did not do its job? Is the government saying that the panel was not capable of doing its job. That it got it wrong? I do not know what it was saying, but here is the thing. It is an interim report. It is a draft report. The proponent, Macquarie Point Development Corporation, can provide any further information it wishes during this stage, presumably to address some of those matters and then the panel will look at that information, as it will all the rest provided through the consultation. If it needs to correct its view expressed in this report, presumably, it will correct its view.

As I said, I do not like the language that was used as part of the criticisms of this panel and the work it has done. It undermines an important statutory entity in our planning system. How can this government turn around and bring a DAP bill back to this place anytime? A DAP bill which is based on the premise of the TPC appointing a panel to assess developments. If the government is up here at this podium saying that the TPC appointed panel cannot do its job or

is been biased or selective or has been legally questionable and should be given limited if no weight in terms of consideration of its assessment, how can they turn around and bring us a piece of legislation - no doubt in a few months' time maybe - suggesting we put in place DAPs, which is based on the very premise that the POSS process really works under; a panel appointed by the TPC. What an astounding, hypocritical position for the government to present to this place. Astounding.

I find these statements from the government really hyperbolic. They say things like this: 'We are 100 per cent focused and committed on delivering this game changing precinct and stadium which will create thousands of jobs and deliver economic activity for decades to come.' They say that in the face of all evidence, we have clear independent expert evidence which says that this stadium - that is what this interim report says - the stadium itself, positioned in Macquarie Point where it is proposed to be, precludes any of the other precinct developments, essentially, it cannot be a multi-use area with all these vibrant things going on. It cannot be because they need to leave enough room around the stadium for people to get in and out safely.

Categorically, this report puts that to bed. This is not a precinct we are talking about. It is a stadium, simply and only, in this location. It does say that jobs will be created in construction, between 1500 and 3300 or thereabouts FTE in construction. We do not know whether those are Tasmanian jobs. They will be there for a few years. That is great. Do you know what? Any way that we spent a billion dollars, three-quarters of a billion dollars. Let's say we had to spend that anywhere: we would create that many jobs. So there is nothing special about this stadium and these jobs. Any public money of that magnitude that we spend. In fact, this report tells us if we spend public money to the same extent on a different project, we would get a better return, potentially. That is what it is saying. We could pick numerous other ways to spend public money of this magnitude and we would get more jobs created and we would get more economic benefit, and we might not put our credit rating as a state at risk, and we would not establish for ourselves decades of debt. There are better options for spending public money.

It says that there will be 203 to 238 full-time jobs once the stadium is in operation. That is what this report is assessing. It is assessing the stadium and the related things to its operation - 200 jobs. Again, the report says, 'You know what, if we spent this money in a whole range of other ways, we would get more jobs than that in an ongoing way.' It is fine to celebrate the creation of jobs. We all celebrate the creation of jobs. But do you know what you have to ask straight away? It is, given the public money you are proposing to spend, is that the best bang for buck we can get when it comes to jobs, jobs, jobs, and if experts tell us: no it is not, then we really have to think about whether this is the right way forward. Again, more time to consider this would be useful. Renegotiating that would be useful, because if this is a contested area of discussion, we need to find a way through and to decide what is going to be in the best interests of our state.

I really appreciated the member for Mersey's contribution. I think probably of any single person in this whole parliament, the member for Mersey will be categorically the most sporty of us. He is a champion sportsperson across numerous sports, as we heard today. Moving on, the member for Mersey genuinely is a devoted sportsperson. I also know because of his background as an educator that he thinks a hell of a lot about the young people in this state and about matters such as aspiration in our young people and particularly aspiration around sport. He has been a champion for that in this place, speaking up a lot on matters to do with funding for sport in this state, in different codes and in different regional areas. I thought the contribution was particularly interesting to listen to and I appreciated it.

A lot of members spoke about this wonderful idea that we are providing young Tasmanians with an aspiration to compete. We are already seeing a blossoming of participation in Auskick and the like. That is true. This report says, 'Yes, that is related to the team', so the stadium itself is not the driver of that. The team is the driver of that. I know we are going to come back to people insisting on 'but the AFL says if there is no stadium, there is no team'. I will get to that in a minute, but let us be really clear, the excitement is about the team. The generation of interest and engagement in young people is about the teams and the aspiration to play on the team is about the team, not about this particular stadium, in this particular location, on this particular timeline, which are all dictated by the AFL and not relevant in and of themselves to the aspiration element of a state team.

The minister spoke quite a bit about setting up our team for financial viability over time. I think that is something we would all agree is important. The member for Murchison spoke about that very effectively and rung those warning bells about not getting ourselves into less-than-advantageous situations in public-private partnerships.

The other thing I would say about this is that yes, we want to set the team up for financial viability over time, but that has to be alongside and compatible with setting up our state for financial viability, and not risking key financial outcomes for our state. When you have experts on a panel, and one of those experts is a previous head of our Treasury department, and the panel says the potential here is that this stadium project could jeopardise our state's credit rating, what you are doing is you are pitting our state's financial viability and best outcomes against a team. That is just not fair. Those two things should not be mutually exclusive. They should be able to be compatible. We should be pursuing both of them in a cohesive, coordinated way.

The way we do that is that we as a state take control of this situation and drive it. The AFL is never going to be pursuing those two things in a cohesive and coordinated way. They will never be putting the financial outcomes and the financial health of our state at the top of their priority list. It simply does not make sense for them to do that. We should not expect them to do that. That is why, when it is decision-making relating to our state, we look to our state leaders to pick up the baton and to be driving the conversations and the decisions about what needs to be in place here to achieve the dual aims of financial viability for our team, but not at the expense of, indeed in complement to, our state's financial viability and positive financial outcomes.

It is always quite tiresome, I find, when you have people listing all the other states and how wonderful things are there, and how we are just trying to do what they are doing. All those situations have their own particularities and differences. The member for Murchison spoke to some of those. She has just been informing herself about those quite effectively. All power to them.

Ms Forrest - Western Australia is also awash with money.

Ms WEBB - Every single circumstance for each state is different. Did they have to have them at the outset of their team starting? No, none of them did. They all had a timeline towards those outcomes. Did their stadiums have to go through their planning systems successfully?

I know we hear a lot about the fact that in various other states there was opposition to the stadium being built, but then everyone is happy now because it is so wonderful. Did it go through their legislated planning system and have every opportunity to be assessed and then decided on under their planning systems? I suspect they did. I suspect that if there are examples in those other states of stadiums that were pushed through by a government acting in a very autocratic manner to pre-empt and avoid a planning system, we would probably be discussing that. That is not, I believe, what happened. If someone wants to correct me on that, I would be really keen to hear it. Were there any other premiers that signed secret deals behind closed doors and then tried to ram it through without a proper planning assessment? It is an open question.

One thing that I need to mention because it was an unnecessarily offensive thing to have said. It came from the minister, which is sad. It is unfortunate because he is a northern-based member. To reflect on Macquarie Point as if to disparage the idea people would feel concerned about what is put on that space and to reflect on that area as 'a piece of land with a sewerage work on it' is really offensive. It is his government that has been in charge of the Macquarie Point development process since at least 2014 when they came into power in this state as a government. The progress of development of that area has been slow and something that many people have felt frustration about over the years, but that is a piece of land that is at the front part of our city.

As the member for Mersey eloquently described, it is literally what you see as you come up the river, or what you see as you look across the river from the other side. It is an area of our city, the Sullivans Cove that we have put in place for at least 30 years or so a special planning system because it is recognised as so historically significant to the character of our capital city. On that front, it is not surprising that this piece of land, which is decided to be redeveloped, might take some time for that consideration to occur - particularly because there was significant remediation of various sorts that had to occur on the piece of land. To many of us driving past, it did not look like much was happening for 10 years, but actually quite a bit was happening. We were also going through what would be an appropriate process, when considering as a city what we should best do with what is the prime piece of real estate in our capital city. Through the choice of what we put on it, we absolutely shape the way our city looks and feels.

In this Integrated Assessment Report, that is addressed to some extent and discussed. It talks about the fact that we have got various planning system arrangements and acknowledged rules about development, both in Sullivans Cove and in central Hobart, that are all about the natural amphitheatre of our incredibly beautiful capital city.

It has Timtumili Minanya running through it, Kunanyi as a backdrop and, rising through the foothills, from the river to the mountain, our centre of our city and our inner suburbs laid out in a natural amphitheatre.

It talks about the fact that we have in a fairly sophisticated way over recent decades, put in place for ourselves a careful set of rules that understand the character of our city: the important things we need to protect, what we want to enhance or what we want to avoid, when we put development in place. As this report says, none of that has been taken into consideration with the proposed stadium at Macquarie Point.

It absolutely blasts all of it out of the water - by just plonking this incredibly substantial development, that is not in keeping with any of that character, and those rules put in place to protect it, right there on the face of our city.

I would encourage the minister to not repeat that kind of sentiment when he is reflecting on our capital city and what is the most valuable piece of real estate yet to be developed in it. It is really not a good look. From the government's point of view, I think the government needs to be really careful when a member of the government, a member of Cabinet, says such disparaging and inaccurate things about our capital, particularly when it is a member who is not from our capital or the south of the state. It is incredibly offensive and unnecessary.

I agree with the member for Murchison that what we have here is a proposition where the team is a low-risk proposition and the stadium is high risk. There is no other way to interpret that: massive support for the team, incredible contention around the insisted-on stadium. That is all the more reason that we need to be, at this point in time, thinking to ourselves what is the most constructive way forward here, to leverage off and maximise the low-risk proposition of our team, to reduce the high risk that sits around the proposed stadium.

That is what this motion is seeking to do.

It is seeking to lay out a way forward that says, based on where we are now, this looks like it could be in trouble and it could put our team at risk. It is time to start renegotiating some elements to at least give us breathing space to further discuss two key things: timeline and location. In the meantime, we can get on with all the wonderful things occurring around the growth and development of our team, none of which is controversial in terms of the benefits we are already seeing, the pride and enjoyment people are getting out of it, the engagement in our communities, none of that.

I find it interesting to hear from the Labor contribution the sentiment that this is too important to get wrong. I absolutely agree with it. We were meaning entirely different things, though, in agreeing on that. This is too important to get wrong and therefore, virtually within a day or two of having this Integrated Assessment Report, this draft report, come out, to be saying full throated, 'Yes, we are all for it, we are pushing it through, it is going to happen' without actually addressing any of the issues raised or acknowledging them is absolutely mind boggling to me.

Labor thinks that our reputation will be in tatters if we do not build this stadium. Our reputation will be in tatters if we do, actually. Not only that, our capital city will be degraded and diminished and also we will not have the opportunity to have found the best outcomes possible from a stadium development, which if we take our time - potentially consider other locations, we can minimise the potential for the poor outcomes in the current location that is identified in this report and maximise all the potential good outcomes that could flow from it.

I find it really quite interesting to have Eddie McGuire quoted at us here as how we are going to embarrassed, apparently, if we do not build this stadium, because we can all pull out quotes from AFL-related sources, certainly Jeff Kennett in his tweet from last week that I will read, when the Planning Commission report came out.

Jeff Kennett tweeted this:

Tasmanian Planning Commission report today has killed the possibility of a new AFL stadium being built in Hobart at an estimated cost of \$1.2 billion, over \$700 million that would have to be paid by Tasmanians which they can't afford. Great embarrassment for the AFL Commission and former administration. No social concern by the AFL towards the community of Tassie. AFL contribute a miserable \$15 million for a project that will cost \$1.2 billion to build and cover operating losses.

Fancy here that we see Jeff Kennett being a better champion for the best outcomes of our state than our own state government or Opposition. It is absolutely astounding. Mr Kennett is on the right track when he says that the AFL should be ashamed basically of putting us in that position and that is why I maintain the assertion that it would be a reputational risk to the AFL to reject efforts at renegotiation at this point on matters relating to timeline and location.

We are well in the process of having our team established here and up and going. We are well down the track to that. Can you imagine if our state government was to suddenly put our state's interests at the forefront and go to the AFL and say, 'Right, this is not looking like a good outcome, we need to sit down and talk through some details and renegotiate some bits'?

Can you imagine the AFL turning around and saying 'No, bugger off?' and then what that would look like to the whole country having led us down the garden path, having our team, 200,000 people signed up for their \$10 memberships already, all the wonderful things beginning to happen in our communities, the high-performance centre allocated down there for Kingston, all of that underway for the AFL to turn around and say, 'No, we are not going to talk to you about those two details in that contract, no, go away.' That is the end of the team.

Do you think that is going to happen? I do not think it would if our state government acted like a state government, interacting with a corporate entity and asserted the best interests of our state.

I think there is win-win here for the AFL and for our state government to engage in renegotiation. It is just the inclination and the willingness to do it from our state government that is the problem.

I am nearing the end of my summing up. I appreciate the time I have been allowed to take to do it. There were matters of significance that came up in people's contributions, so I appreciate being able to work my way through some of those. The thing that sits at the centre of this is this absolutely dogged assertion that apparently renegotiation will mean no stadium and therefore no team. I believe both those subsequent assumptions are wrong.

Engaging in renegotiation does not necessarily mean no stadium. It might mean a different timeline for a stadium, it might end up being a different location for a stadium but it does not mean no stadium.

It means renegotiating.

I absolutely refute and will always refute this idea that no stadium means no team.

I think that we have a team, it is in progress already and the stadium is still a matter of discussion. It has not passed our planning system yet. It has not passed this place. So, we are already proving it wrong. We have a team and we do not have a stadium. There is a willingness in our community to discuss a stadium, which they were never given the opportunity to do at the outset, but I think they would be willing to do henceforth.

If we look at matters relating to location, relating to timeline, relating to cost and financial outcomes, all of those things could be progressed if they were done under good governance in open, honest, transparent ways and with our state government squarely putting our state's best interests at the forefront of those conversations. That is what renegotiation offers. That is what this motion calls for the opportunity for there to be. On that, I commend the motion to the House. I thank people for their discussion. I encourage members to support this motion. It is a sensible and mature way forward.

The PRESIDENT (Mr Farrell) - The question is that the motion be agreed to.

The Council divided -

AYES

Ms Armitage (Teller)
Mr Gaffney
Ms O'Connor

NOES

Mr Duigan
Mr Edmunds
Ms Forrest

Ms Webb

Mr Harriss
Mrs Hiscutt
Ms Lovell
Ms Palmer
Ms Rattray (Teller)
Ms Thomas
Mr Vincent

Motion negatived.