

Tasmanian Conservation Trust

Tasmanian Conservation Trust

191-193 Liverpool St, Hobart

e-mail: biodiversity.tct@gmail.com

Do you wish to be contacted when we release the draft Management Plan in 2012? **Yes**

### **Theme 1: Values and conservation**

	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Comment received</b>	<b>Existing management / progress to date</b>	<b>Possible future management direction</b>
<b>1.1</b>	<p><b>Linking Values to Outcomes in the Management Plan (MP)</b></p> <p>The MP must ensure its management policies and actions protect the elements identified in the Wellington Park Act, and in addition, the elements identified by the community as being valued by them.</p>	<p>The Parks Forum review of the MP suggests that the Values described in the MP should be linked to Key Outcomes and that ‘risks to those values would help in determining performance measures and success in the future.’</p> <p>Consultation to date highlights a wide range of elements of the Park which are highly valued by the</p>	<p><a href="#">Chapter 2 of the current MP</a> (<i>The Basis for Management</i>) gives high recognition to the variety of elements identified by the community as being valued by them, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Environmental Values and their significance</li><li>• Cultural Values and their significance</li></ul>	<p><b>Direction 1</b></p> <p>Maintain the strong focus on the variety of Values described in the current MP and link them to Desired Outcomes. Describe the threats to the Values along with an overview of likely management actions and how those actions might be measured or monitored.</p> <p><b>Note:</b> This Desired Outcomes and Threat</p>

community. In summary they are:

*diversity of landscapes, flora and fauna, range of recreation activities, accessibility, sense of remoteness and wilderness despite proximity to the city, sense of place, historic and cultural significance and educational opportunities.*

- Tourism and Recreational Values and their significance
- Water Supply Values and their significance.

It describes the goals and objectives to achieve the protection of these values. Specific key outcomes are not described although are implicit in the objectives and the actions described in Chapter 10 (Maintaining Park Values) of the MP. This chapter describes the threats to the values of the Park and the actions recommended to reduce those threats. Many of those actions have been achieved such as the development and ongoing implementation of a Fire Management Strategy, improvement of fire trails, numerous heritage studies,

Mitigation approach is the structure followed in many plans for natural areas including the current [Tasmanian World Heritage Area Management Plan](#) (1999) (pp 31-41).

It allows for threats such as climate change, pest species and fire to be directly linked to both the values to be protected and the actions needed to achieve that protection.

Given that the tourism and recreational values are critical elements identified, this approach also allows for their consideration as both values to be protected and potential threats to be managed. Monitoring and evaluation are also a critical part of this approach.

landscape assessment studies, weed management of specific weedy sites and control of feral goat numbers.

For a more detailed review of progress made to date in protecting the values of the Park click [here](#).

### Comment on issue 1.1

**Direction 1 approval rating:** Strongly approve **X** Approve Unsure Disapprove Strongly disapprove

Comments: Also see general comments in cover letter regarding the need to identify and address new threats.

The TCT supports the statement made in this section that tourism and recreation are both values and threats. We urge that this sentiment be reflected in all sections of the Draft Management Plan which relate to recreation and tourism.

We want the management plan to clearly identify a hierarchy of values where conservation is the over-riding value and recreation and development be allowed only where proven to be consistent with this higher value. This would primarily allow only passive recreation and restrict other recreation to more robust environments.

## 1.2

### Heritage Values

### 1.2.1

#### Heritage Values - Historic Cultural Heritage

If a site has heritage significance it should be listed either in the State register or the planning

The current management approach increasingly recognises heritage issues, as knowledge increases as

#### Direction 2

Continue to protect and manage the Park's cultural

<p>scheme, not just in the MP.</p>	<p>further studies are completed. An audit conducted in 2005 lists in excess of 300 sites/places/items, most of which are recognised as ‘sites’ under the MP. This results in the requirement of conservation policy statements to be prepared before these ‘sites’ are actively managed or disturbed. It is debatable whether listing under other legislation will improve a listed site’s management or create a more confusing and duplicated assessment process.</p> <p>Note: currently the Pipeline Track is the only place in the Park listed under State heritage legislation.</p>	<p>heritage under the current provisions of the MP.</p> <p><b>Or</b></p> <p><b>Direction 3</b></p> <p>From the 2005 heritage audit, develop a list of heritage items of high State and/or local level significance for listing under the State’s cultural Heritage legislation and local government planning schemes, as well as recognising them in the MP. We note that this will increase the complexity of assessing and approving management works and permits for development of those sites but it may increase the recognition of these sites and the ability to promote and celebrate them.</p>
------------------------------------	---	--

**Comment on issue 1.2.1**

**Direction 2 approval rating:** Strongly approve **X** Approve Unsure Disapprove Strongly disapprove

**Direction 3 approval rating:** Strongly approve Approve Unsure Disapprove Strongly disapprove

Comments: The TCT supports Direction 2 but this does not support direction 3. We do not know enough about the benefits of Direction 3 and do not give a rating. We find it difficult to support direction 3 as only the disadvantages have been expressed and we are unsure of the possible benefits. The draft management plan should provide a better explanation of the pros and cons of such a proposal.

1.2.2	<b>Heritage Values - Aboriginal Heritage</b>	An Aboriginal Heritage audit of the Park is needed.	The current MP recognises the need for better information about Aboriginal heritage. Some discussions have occurred with Aboriginal organisations but a survey has not progressed at this stage. Also, it is important to establish a long-term relationship with the Aboriginal community prior to investigating heritage values and sites.	<b>Direction 4</b>  Establish an ongoing relationship with the Aboriginal community and subsequently investigate an Aboriginal heritage audit.
-------	--	--	---	--

**Comment on issue 1.2.2**

**Direction 4 approval rating:** **X** Strongly approve Approve Unsure Disapprove Strongly disapprove

Comments: The TCT strongly supports the development of an ongoing relationship with the Tasmanian Aboriginal

Community. A thorough investigation of Aboriginal Cultural Heritage areas in the park must be carried out and conducted by and Aboriginal Heritage Officer approved by the Aboriginal community. The State Government is committed to replacing the *Aboriginal Relics Act 1975* with more up-to-date legislation. The Draft Bill of the new legislation is due out for public consultation in June 2012. It should be noted that the time frames for the Draft WPMP and new Aboriginal Legislation may overlap and issues of Aboriginal Cultural Heritage within the Park may have to be re-assessed. This may require suspending or delaying the WPMP review until the new act is in place to ensure it is consistent. In addition, consideration might be given, in consultation with the Aboriginal community, to returning the Park's name to one of its original Aboriginal names; Unghanyahletta, Pooranetterre or Kunanyi.

**Theme 2: Activities, use and development**

Issue	Comment received	Existing management / progress to date	Possible future management direction
2.1	<b>Use and Development</b>	<p>As part of the review of the current MP, external consultants (SGS Economics with Myriad Research) were asked to evaluate how activities, use and development are assessed under the current MP, what future opportunities the Park should offer and to make recommendations for improving the MP in relation to these issues. A</p>	<p><a href="#">Chapter 6</a> of the current MP details how use and development is assessed and managed. It describes what is permitted and prohibited in the various zones in the Park.</p> <p>The SGS report indicates that <i>‘the use and development tables are clear and logical. The tables reflect an approach that combines prescriptive and performance based</i></p> <p><b>Direction 5</b></p> <p>The future MP should be <i>‘multi user focussed and consider the needs of user groups.’</i></p> <p>In essence this means the MP needs to be able to facilitate and provide for recreational activities and uses within the Park, while managing any possible conflicts between user groups and activities, and</p>

complete copy of the report is available [here](#).

The reports notes the comment that that the Trust 'is not seen as an active promoter of uses and activities (in the sense of initiating projects and providing infrastructure), but more as a regulator (is a particular use allowed or not)'.

planning' and that 'the Park protecting the Park values. has a range of intrinsic natural, scenic and heritage values that require protection by the Management Plan while at the same time it allows the Park's recreational values to be used and developed. This requires a fine balancing act and the use and development tables reflect that'.

### Comment on issue 2.1

**Direction 5 approval rating:** Strongly approve  Approve  Unsure  Disapprove  Strongly disapprove

Comments: We support a multi user focus but conditional to what uses and that they are consistent with conservation.

See section 1.1 regarding recommendation that there be a hierarchy of values.

While we appreciate the SGS review of activities, use and development, we would have appreciated a similar review of the conservation values and threats. Such a review should be done immediately and inform the development of the draft management plan. Also see general comments in cover letter.

2.2

### Existing Zoning Mechanisms

General acceptance of the zones, what they mean and their boundaries although

The current MP contains 6 zones; the Recreation Zone, the Natural Zone, the

### Direction 6

Continue with a zoning system, in the MP. However

some suggestion that the Restricted Area Overlay related to the Drinking Water Catchment Zone is unnecessary.

Remote Zone, the Drinking Water Catchment Zone, the Pinnacle Zone and the Springs Zone.

The SGS report comments that the current system '*is logical and provides a solid starting point for managing use and development in the different parts of the Park in line with their specific values and tourism and recreation opportunities*'.

Further comments on the specific zones are provided below.

take account of the new planning template being introduced by the Tasmanian Planning Commission. Zone the Park as Environmental Management Zone within each of the five municipal planning schemes covering the Park and utilise the special use overlays suggested in Planning Directive 1 to maximise use and development opportunities within particular activity areas in the Park.

## Comment on issue 2.2

**Direction 6 approval rating:** Strongly approve Approve Unsure Disapprove Strongly disapprove

Comments: If the TPC planning template mentioned is the *Planning Scheme Template for Tasmania May 20 11* then there is little benefit to using it as Mt Wellington is a unique planning area and the template was developed to guide local councils to develop normal planning schemes. Changing the current zoning to recreation is opposed as it would significantly weaken the development controls. No rating scale is given.

Also see comments in sections 2.5 and 2.6.

2.3

**Assessment and Approvals Processes**

A number of stakeholders and the external consultants commented on the approvals section of the current MP being confusing and difficult to understand. There is confusion as to when a Project Proposal Form (PPF) is required.

The SGS report comments that Chapter 6 of the current MP is *'not easy to read and understand for a possible operator or the general public'* and *'is necessarily complex given the application of both the Wellington Park Act and the Land Use Planning and Approvals Act. The process however works well for management agencies in terms of protecting Park values and inclusiveness in decision-making, however may demand assessment for works that may be considered 'routine management'*.

**Direction 7**

Clarify the assessment processes within the Plan and delineate between the Trust approval process and the Council approval process. Clearly define the respective processes for permits, licences, leases and development applications.

**And**

Work to simplify the approvals process for routine management works.

**Comment on issue 2.3**

**Direction 7 approval rating:** Strongly approve **X** Approve Unsure Disapprove Strongly disapprove

Comments: [The TCT agrees with this on the condition that clarification and defining respective processes for permits](#)

does not result in any weakening of criteria for permit approval or excluding activities from requiring a PPF.

The TCT acknowledges that, while some people may have concerns regarding the approvals process, we believe it has many beneficial attributes. We note the SGS found that “The process however works well for management agencies” and we wish to add that it also largely works for conservation interests.

<b>2.3.1</b>	<b>- Existing Commercial Operators</b>	The SGS report notes the general satisfaction levels of existing commercial operators, however indicates dissatisfaction with current pricing structures.	Currently commercial operators in the Park are approved via the general Parks Commercial Visitors Services system and the fees are established via this process and apply to all commercial operators in all of Tasmania's Parks.	<b>Direction 8</b> Continue approving commercial operators for the Park via the one-stop Commercial Visitors Services system as it provides a one stop shop for anybody wishing to obtain a commercial operator’s licence in any of Tasmania’s parks or reserves.
--------------	--	---	---	--

**Comment on issue 2.3.1**

**Direction 8 approval rating:** Strongly approve **X** Approve Unsure Disapprove Strongly disapprove

Comments: TCT supports Direction 8 and in support of it we wish to highlight the SGS comment that “notes the general satisfaction levels of existing commercial operators” .

<b>2.4</b>	<b>Future Opportunities</b>	General comments from the community are divided between those who recommend maintaining the	The SGS report notes that ‘a <i>cable car is not mentioned in the plan. Due to its contentiousness it would be</i>	<b>Note:</b> It is intended that the future MP will address the issue of commercial development in the Park
------------	-----------------------------	---	--	---

level of use and development that is currently there, but no further development other than minor upgrades to infrastructure and those who believe the Park has a lot more recreation and development potential and fully support development such as a cable car and associated infrastructure such as a restaurant/cafe.

A number of comments were received about linking the Park to wider forested areas and opportunities for multi day walks connecting the Park to other existing tracks outside of the Park.

*beneficial for potential developers, operators and the general public if the Trust could provide some guidance on the implications of the Management Plan for a possible cable car proposal.’*

In consultation with existing commercial operators, the report notes that when asked about what future opportunities they would like to see in the Park they mentioned ‘, a range of the desired activities and infrastructure including: Bus access; parking; food outlets; road upgrades; shelters and picnic facilities; and visitor information.’

The SGS report considers that the Trust should be more active in its promotion of the Park and investigate

more clearly.

The cable car is more specifically referred to under Theme 7 Access & Transport, 7.3.

### **Direction 9**

Maintain the current approach of the Springs being the primary activity node, with commercial development focused there and prohibiting commercial development in other areas of the Park,

**Or**

### **Direction 10**

Allow for consideration of commercial development in other areas of the Park (for example the Pinnacle). This could be just for temporary commercial facilities such as food vans, for small scale permanent facilities or for

links, activities and infrastructure that promotes greater use. The report notes however the existing resourcing constraints and the increased management implications of greater use.

Note: The current levels of permitted and prohibited development are outlined [in Appendix 1, Table 1 of this report](#).

See Issue 4.2.2 in this report.

larger scale commercial infrastructure. For any permanent facilities it would be subject to a number of criteria that would need to be rigorously assessed as part of the application assessment process. The assessment criteria would need to address issues such as

- visual impact;
- environmental impact assessment (covers a wide range of environmental issues that a development may impact on such as water quality, plant and animal species, geology, waste disposal etc);
- economic viability;
- implications for the

Springs area as the primary visitor and commercial node;

- historic cultural and Aboriginal heritage;
- access;
- traffic management and parking; and
- the likely maintenance regime required given the climatic conditions on the mountain.

(There are also likely to be other issues that the specific design of the proposed development would create.)

#### **Comment on issue 2.4**

**Direction 9 approval rating:** Strongly approve  Approve  Unsure  Disapprove  Strongly disapprove

**Direction 10 approval rating:** Strongly approve  Approve  Unsure  Disapprove  Strongly disapprove

Comments: The TCT supports Direction 9 conditional to site being reviewed. If development must go ahead in the Park, then the Springs is a better place as the Pinnacle is a very sensitive area. The WPMP should prohibit all permanent

commercial development on the summit but furthermore, development should only be allowed at the Springs and the Act should be amended to reflect this. The WPMT needs to remind the HCC that extending the permit for development at the Springs while no development occurs only creates more interest for development of the Pinnacle. Should development go ahead at the Springs, then a site plan must be re-done as well as an up-to-date Natural Values assessment of the area as the original one for the current development permit was carried out a long time ago.

WPMA should state that when current springs develops permit expires that it only be re-issued subject to finalisation of a new site plan and must be through a open tender process.

**2.5**

**The Springs**

Should be the focal point of the mountain and vehicle access should stop here with a shuttle bus from here to the summit. Perhaps with a fee to travel on the shuttle bus.

A visitor centre is needed here. Also an all weather viewing platform and good public toilets.

Restrict development to the original hotel site and preserve the main picnic area intact free for public enjoyment.

The Springs Zone is currently managed via the provisions in the MP especially; -s2.3.3, s5.3, and relevant sections in Chapter 6. [Appendix 1, Table 1 and 2](#) illustrate what activities, use and development are currently permitted and prohibited in the Springs Zone. [A Springs Master Plan, Site Development Plan \(SDP\) and Conservation Plan](#) also provide additional levels of control. The need to upgrade facilities at the Springs is

**Direction 11**

Remove the Springs as a zone in its own right in the MP and include it in the Recreation Zone. To comply with Planning Directive 1, create a Specific Area Plan covering the Springs area.

Note: further information about the Springs including future commercial activity is covered under Theme 2, Activities, Use and Development, which includes Future Opportunities 2.4.

Toilets at the Springs need urgent upgrading.

recognised. The approval for the visitor centre at the Springs includes new public toilets and provides for public picnic areas. The planning permit to develop the Spring expires in February 2014. It is considered premature to do any significant upgrade work beyond required maintenance until such time as the permit for the visitor centre is acted on or else definitely expires.

### Comment on issue 2.5

**Direction 11 approval rating:** Strongly approve Approve Unsure Disapprove **X**Strongly disapprove

Comments: The TCT strongly disapproves of Direction 11 because we believe it would weaken development and use controls. The template was developed as a guide for local councils to develop planning schemes and Mt Wellington is a very different and arguably unique situation. The priority should be protecting the environment and not conforming to the template for no apparent reason.

2.6

**The Pinnacle**

Allow for a cable car at the Pinnacle.

The Pinnacle Zone is currently managed by the provisions in the MP, especially s 2.3.3, s 5.3 and

**Direction 12**

Remove the Pinnacle as a zone in its own right and

No cable car.	the relevant sections in	include it in the Recreation
Provide for a small food/drink outlet here.	Chapter 6. <a href="#">Appendix 1, Table 1 and 2</a> illustrate what	Zone. To comply with State Planning Directive 1, create
Improve the toilets	activities, use and development are currently permitted and prohibited in	a Specific Area Plan covering the current Pinnacle area
	the Pinnacle Zone. <a href="#">The Pinnacle Zone Site</a>	<b>Note:</b> further information about the Pinnacle including
	Development Plan (SDP) provides additional levels of control, while the Summit Area Historic Heritage Assessment requires consideration.	future commercial activity is covered under Theme 2, Activities, Use and Development, which includes Future Opportunities 2.4. Any
	Currently under the SDP a cable car is prohibited in the Pinnacle Zone.	commercial development would be required to be rigorously assessed as is described in 2.4.
	<i>The SGS report states ‘Due to its contentiousness it would be beneficial for potential developers, operators and the general public if the Trust could provide some guidance on the implications of the Management Plan for a</i>	The issue of the cable car is also covered under Theme 7 Access and Transport Management, which includes Alternative forms of Vehicle Access to the Summit 7.3.

*possible cable car proposal.*

Currently a cafe or restaurant is prohibited in the Pinnacle Zone. A food van is possible via a permit.

Improvement of the toilets is budgeted for.

The HCC are replacing the existing toilet facilities during the summer of 2011–12.

### **Comment on issue 2.6**

**Direction 12 approval rating:** Strongly approve Approve Unsure Disapprove **X**Strongly disapprove

**Comments:** The TCT strongly disapproves of the development of a cable car to the Pinnacle and as such we endorse the current SDP prohibition on one in the pinnacle zone. Development of a cable car would involve large areas of land clearing, not only to allow for construction but also in terms of fire break maintenance, plus have high visual and possibly noise impacts across the entire face of the mountain. It is also likely that, to make a cable car financially viable, it would need to be approved on the basis of it providing the only mechanised transport to the summit. This would clearly be an unacceptable business monopoly and restrict all users to the cable car or walking to get to the summit.

### **Theme 3: Visitor facilities**

	Issue	Comment received	Existing management / progress to date	Possible future management direction
3.1	<p><b>Visitor Facilities</b> (see also Theme 2 Activities, Use and Development headings)</p>	<p>Composting toilets are needed at the Chalet, Junction Cabin, and the junction of the Main Fire Trail and the new Cascade track.</p>	<p>The need for improved facilities at some high visitation areas is recognised. However no new facilities have been constructed due to a lack of a comprehensive management approach to the nominated areas e.g. Junction Cabin.</p> <p>Constraints exist in terms of environmental, access and cultural heritage issues, however increased visitation at some sites may result in adverse environmental and sanitary impacts.</p>	<p><b>Direction 13</b></p> <p>Prepare landscape master plans for the high use visitation areas, including: the Chalet; Junction Cabin; the Pipeline Track, to guide future need and design of amenities in sympathy with existing natural and cultural values.</p> <p>In other locations, continue to monitor visitation and assess the need for facilities, taking into account proximity to other facilities and level of degradation occurring due to a lack of a toilet in the area.</p>

**Comment on issue 3.1**

**Direction 13 approval rating:** Strongly approve Approve Unsure Disapprove Strongly disapprove

Comments: It is concerning that landscape master planes for high visitation areas were not conducted a considerable time ago. These must be completed as a priority and until they are there should be no further development or use

approved which would affect use of these high use areas. Any development of visitor amenities must be justified, especially toilets, as they can increase use and therefore increase demand for toilets and other services. If visitors have coped without additional facilities for this long, then why is there need for more? In addition, the significant cost of maintaining extra facilities needs to be seriously considered by the WPMT.

3.2

**Signs and Interpretation**

Better signs needed and promotion of walking tracks	Further information on the implementation of relevant actions is contained in the <a href="#">Detailed Review</a> (Section 8.3 - Actions 1 to 14).	<b>Direction 14</b> Amend the existing Sign Strategy to facilitate larger information signs at the Springs.
Need major park signs in Franklin Square, Fern Tree and the Springs showing bus timetables, locations for various activities, what to take, vantage points for sight-seeing, suggested walking tracks and times and a link to the Bureau of Meteorology, showing the weather at the Springs and on the summit.	The need to further improve information at main entry points to Park is recognised.  The Trust's <a href="#">Sign Manual</a> (2000, updated) outlines the priorities governing the erection/replacement of signs and has undergone regular review. Implementation has occurred throughout the Park, mainly in relation to use of recreation tracks and trails.	<b>And</b> Work with the relevant Councils and other partners to facilitate the placement of information signs outside of the Park, including: Franklin Square; Fern Tree; and Glenorchy.
Need interpretative displays along tracks detailing geology, flora and fauna, historical sites etc.	The placement of interpretation panels needs	<b>And</b> Develop an Interpretation Strategy to guide the location of interpretation panels in the Park and the type of content required in

to be part of an overall strategy. A Park-wide Interpretation Strategy is one of the management actions from the current MP that has not occurred however the Springs Area Interpretation Strategy, 2009 provides guidance on the themes to be interpreted in the Park. The [Wellington Park website](#) provides significant levels of information about the Park.

the various locations.

**And**

Identify in the Strategy opportunities for tracks suitable as study trails where a higher level of interpretation and education materials would be provided.

**Note:** The Visitor Centre is recognised as a critical element in enhancing the education and interpretation opportunities in the Park and if it goes ahead will include visitor information and interpretative displays. The need for improved signage and interpretative displays in other areas of the Park and outside the Park is also understood.

**Comment on issue 3.2**

**Direction 14 approval rating:** Strongly approve  Approve  Unsure  Disapprove  Strongly disapprove

Comments: Additional signs explaining why certain activities are not allowed in the Park should be erected. For example; signs along tracks where dogs are permitted highlighting the damage that off lead dogs can do to both fauna and flora, impact on other users and cause animal welfare concerns e.g. stray dogs. Perhaps some images of wildlife that has been attacked by dogs and animal burrows that have been excavated by dogs. Signage and images educating visitors about weeds in the park and how they are spread by human activity would also be useful. These should include acknowledgement and possibly advertisement of the contribution of volunteer groups. Signage could also be used to create study trails which identify areas of value in the park and also threatened species.

**Theme 4: Recreation**

	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Comment received</b>	<b>Existing management / progress to date</b>	<b>Possible future management direction</b>
<b>4.1</b>	<b>Walking</b>			
<b>4.1.1</b>	<b>- Specific trails</b>	<p>New links at the Springs and Cascades are excellent.</p> <p>Tracks such as the Fern Glade Track, Pipeline Track, Sphinx Rock and the Pinnacle Track need improvements.</p> <p>Need to prioritise routes for upgrading - suggest Pinnacle Track, Lenah Valley track to Junction Cabin and the Organ Pipes track.</p>	<p>Further information on the implementation of relevant actions is contained in the <a href="#">Detailed Review</a> (Section 4.3 - Walking Tracks - Actions 1 to 16) of this report details the management actions taken to date with regard to walking trails, under the current MP.</p> <p>Management Activities with regard to track management</p>	<p><b>Direction 15</b></p> <p>Derive track priorities for the life of the next MP from the Walking Track Strategy until such time as it is reviewed and derive maintenance priorities from the agencies' asset management systems.</p> <p><b>Note:</b> Immediate priorities are upgrading Radfords Track to bring it back to a</p>

follow the recommendations of the [Walking Track Strategy \(2003\)](#). In particular the Strategy describes the priorities for guiding resource allocation to upgrade existing tracks (pg 21). Briefly they are:

class 3 standard, control erosion and reduce bike speeds. Other priorities are Pinnacle Track erosion control, erosion control on the rock climbers' access track to the Organ Pipes and the placement of track markers on the Lost World Track.

1. Ensure safety
2. Avoid unreasonable risk
3. Avoid/reduce impact on natural/cultural values
4. Reduce environmental impacts that will cause ongoing problems
5. Enhance the access, enjoyment and experience of users on high use tracks
6. Enhance the access,

An important consideration is the recommendation of the draft Greater Hobart Mountain Bike Master Plan to allow bike use on selected walking tracks - see 4.2 Mountain Biking (below).

enjoyment and  
experience of users  
on tracks with a  
lower level of use.

In addition, each land  
management agency that is  
responsible for areas of the  
Park runs an asset  
management system which  
assists in determining  
maintenance requirements  
for walking tracks in  
accordance with the required  
standard.

#### **Comment on issue 4.1.1**

**Direction 15 approval rating:** Strongly approve Approve Unsure Disapprove Strongly disapprove

Comments: Support is needed for resourcing for track management. Until current track management problems have been solved and current tracks are being managed appropriately, new tracks and track upgrades (which are not for environmental reasons) should not be considered. How priorities are to be drawn for the life of the next MP needs to be specific. Mismanagement of current tracks is a comment complaint from visitors to the Park. A rating score is not given.

#### **4.1.2**

- Multi Day Trails

Multi day trails linking  
Salamanca to the Snowy

The current MP recognises  
the Tasmania Trail, which is

**Direction 16**

<p>Range via Wellington Park and to Judbury should be considered with walkers huts in appropriate locations.</p>	<p>a multi use, multi day trail that extends from the North to the south of the State and runs through the Park via Jefferys Track and White Timber Trail.</p>	<p>Investigate the potential for multi day walks to connect Wellington Park tracks to those outside the Park utilising strategically located camping and/or walkers huts/bunkhouses</p>
<p>To further facilitate a multi day walk the Park boundaries should be extended westwards to link with the SW National Park and World Heritage Wilderness Area east of Snowy Ridge</p>	<p>No specific provisions for camping or walkers huts are detailed in the current MP but camping is allowed in the Natural Zone. The current plan also provides for the investigation of a bunk house strategy.</p>	<p><b>Or</b></p> <p><b>Direction 17</b></p> <p>Investigate whether a westward extension of the Park boundaries will best facilitate multi day walking tracks as well as providing for wildlife corridors. Much of this land is State forest but an extension would require detailed consideration of the exact route of any track, tenure of the actual land holdings involved, implications of changes in reservation of the land and cost and management implications for the Trust in enlarging the</p>
<p>Need to link the Park to the wider forested areas to provide for wildlife corridors. Multi day walking track would achieve this plus create economic opportunities across the region.</p>		

Park boundaries.

**Comment on issue 4.1.2**

**Direction 16 approval rating:** Strongly approve Approve Unsure Disapprove Strongly disapprove

**Direction 17 approval rating:** Strongly approve Approve Unsure Disapprove Strongly disapprove

Comments: In principle, multi day tracks are acceptable but would require support from Forestry Tasmania and the State Government. We understand that a proposal to extend the park to the west has been considered within the Intergovernmental Agreement on Tasmania's forests and we recommend the WPMP support this proposal and reflect it in the draft management plan. A substantial amount of money would be required just to investigate and plan tracks, not to mention build them. As per section 4.1.1 the priority should be fixing current tracks. If land surrounding the Park boundaries is to be considered as an extension of the Park, then the natural values contained within the land would need to match those of the Park and other areas should be considered (not just those areas to the west of the park). Camping sites are preferable to the construction of huts.

4.2

**Mountain Biking**

The Park provides great mountain bike riding options and is increasingly popular. Instead of being seen as a threat to the Park it needs to be seen as a legitimate use and opportunity to promote the Park.

Walking and downhill

Currently mountain biking in the Park is managed in accordance with the [Wellington Park Bike Strategy \(2005\)](#), and is permitted on publicly accessible roads and fire trails, and specified walking tracks that have been subject to a risk and safety

**Direction 18**

Maintain the current MP's focus on permitting mountain biking on publicly accessible fire trails and some specified walking tracks only.

**Or**

mountain bike riding on narrow walking tracks are not compatible activities.

Mountain bikers are creating illegal trails in places.

Dangerous downhill riding on Radfords Track.

assessment. Numerous recommendations in the strategy have been progressed, and there are considerable bike riding opportunities, including the Glenorchy Mountain Bike Park. The Trust is also participating in the development of the Greater Hobart Mountain Bike Master Plan -

The Management Plan however must balance the needs of bike riders with the needs of other users and the protection of Park values. This means ensuring the safety of all users and the protection of social and environmental values.

The lower slopes of the Park and outside the Park have had a number of illegal tracks constructed and the land management agency responsible generally takes

### **Direction 19**

Endorse the direction suggested in the Draft Greater Hobart Mountain Bike Master Plan towards more multi use of tracks, particularly the tracks recommended in the draft plan.

### **Note;**

[The Draft Greater Hobart Mountain Bike Master Plan](#)

is currently on public display. It examines how mountain biking is managed in the Greater Hobart area, including Wellington Park.

The draft Master Plan recommends allowing bike use of the following walking tracks (subject to risk and environmental assessments): Lower Sawmill Track; Woods Track; lower Old Hobartians Track;

action to remove them if they are on their land. In some cases they have been built on private land.

It is recognised that the speed at which downhill cycling can occur on sections of the Radford Track can create some risks to other track users, however its width and location make it popular and convenient for downhill biking. Currently there are no authorised downhill trails with vehicle access available, which is resulting in inappropriate use of trails (such as Radfords Track) and unauthorised trail construction.

Shoobridge Track and the Lenah Valley Track (Shoobridge Track - Junction Cabin, and Old farm fire trail - Old Hobartians Track).

The draft Master Plan also recommends options for improving downhill cycle opportunities both within and outside the Park and reducing the pressure on Radfords Track. The Master Plan recommends that the existing Hunters Track be utilised as a bike specific track, on the basis that a new walking track is constructed from Junction Cabin to the Chalet (and then linking to the Pinnacle). Other new bike-specific trails are proposed to link to Junction Cabin (from Main fire trail) and to promote better access from the Lenah Valley area.

**Note:** In the short term

works will be prioritised for Radfords Track to bring it back to a class 3 standard, control erosion and reduce bike speeds.

**Comment on issue 4.2**

**Direction 18 approval rating:** Strongly approve  Approve  Unsure  Disapprove  Strongly disapprove

**Direction 19 approval rating:** Strongly approve  Approve  Unsure  Disapprove  Strongly disapprove

Comments: If restricted to appropriate tracks and done with full compliance with regulations mountain biking can be a legitimate socially valuable recreational pursuit. No further expansion of mountain bike use should be considered until current users show full compliance.

The TCT recommends maintaining the status quo. Mountain bike riders and clashes with other trail users is an issue (comments from other user groups). The number of tracks available to mountain bike riders should be limited to currently permitted tracks and not include tracks that are popular for walkers. The newly constructed North South mountain bike track should be sufficient enough for mountain bike riders.

**4.3**

**On road Cycling**

Promote more cycling in the Park.

On road cycling in the Park along Pinnacle Road has been undertaken for many years.

**Direction 20**

Facilitate on road cycle activities and events along Pinnacle Road.

**Comment on issue 4.3**

**Direction 20 approval rating:** Strongly approve  Approve  Unsure  Disapprove  Strongly disapprove

Comments: As [long as existing road is used and no new infrastructure is built.](#)

4.4

### **Dog Walking**

Many dog owners are ignoring the rules re dog control in the Park.

Off-lead dog exercising could be considered in a part of the Park. One of the best suited areas could be on the grassy open area to the side of the Main Fire Trail, north of Old Farm Road.

The current MP allows for on-lead dog walking in the Recreation Zones below Pinnacle Road and in the Glenorchy area. It does not provide for lead-free areas due to concerns regarding the safety of other Park users and potential impact on local flora and fauna.

Despite this, walking dogs off-lead is the second most frequent regulatory offence (after unauthorised trail bike access) and occupies a significant amount of the Ranger's limited time.

A number of dog off lead exercise areas already exist in the [Hobart Council area](#), and in the [Glenorchy City Council area](#)

#### **Direction 21**

Maintain the existing approach of designated on-lead access areas, and do not provide for lead-free areas given concerns regarding the safety of other Park users and potential impact on local flora and fauna.

**Or**

#### **Direction 22**

Allow an extension of the on lead dog walking areas by allowing dogs on lead above the Springs on selected tracks.

**And/Or**

#### **Direction 23**

Trial an off lead dog

walking area in the Park.

**Note:** Given the popularity of dog walking and the time spent issuing warnings and notices there would appear to be a strong demand to allow for an area where dogs can be walked off lead.

One of the few such areas that could be suitable to trial for off-lead dog walking is on the eastern edge of the Park, along the grassy expanse to the side of the Main Fire Trail, north of Old Farm Road. Issues that would need further investigation before any decision as to the suitability of the area for off-lead dog walking are: the agreement of Cascade Brewery (which owns a section of land adjoining this area); whether fencing is required; potential impact on flora and fauna, and other Park users;

maintenance and management issues for the Hobart City Council; and the adequacy of existing parking.

**Comment on issue 4.4**

**Direction 21 approval rating:**  Strongly approve  Approve  Unsure  Disapprove  Strongly disapprove

**Direction 22 approval rating:**  Strongly approve  Approve  Unsure  Disapprove  Strongly disapprove

**Direction 23 approval rating:**  Strongly approve  Approve  Unsure  Disapprove  Strongly disapprove

**Comments:** Off lead dogs pose a great danger to wildlife and their habitat. The dog walking page on the WP website refers to an incident where a platypus was found to have been killed as the result of a dog attack. Research conducted in Victoria found that during a five year period dogs were responsible for 1,163 attacks on wildlife (cats were responsible for 1,631 attacks) (WIRES, 2010). In addition, dogs spread disease to wildlife as they carry pathogens. Dogs can also act as a link for parasite exchange among humans, livestock and wildlife (McPherson 2005). Apart from the direct killing of wildlife, dogs can also chase and harass wildlife which results in increased stress to native wildlife. The mere presence of dogs and in particular, the smell of dog urine also deters the use of habitation in the area and may permanently keep native animals away. Dogs roaming off lead can also trample vegetation and remove vegetation in popular areas by trampling, digging and scratching the ground. Dogs defecating on trails and irresponsible dog walkers not removing it. Dogs interfering with other track users.

We cannot support any off-lead areas or any expansion of current dog exercise areas until a

thorough assessment of impacts, appropriate management measures and requirements under the Dog management Act is done and made available for public comment.

## 4.5

### 4 Wheel Drive access

4-wheel driving is a legitimate recreational activity on public land but is being gradually shut out of the Park. It is growing in popularity and 4 wheel drive tourism is an opportunity that the Park should be offering.

4-wheel driving is allowed on Jefferys Track and White Timber Trail without a permit. A permit is required to access the East West Trail, Montrose Trail, Mount Hull Trail, Collins Cap Trail and Ringwood Trail as shown in [Map 4](#) of the MP. Further 4-wheel drive access opportunities are limited, with most of the other fire trails being located in high visitation areas, or are fragile and unsuitable to ongoing use. 4-wheel driving permits are issued by the Parks and Wildlife Service and are subject to weather and track conditions. The Trust has worked with a State Government Recreational Vehicle Working Group to explore opportunities for 4-

#### **Direction 24**

Maintain the existing level of access for 4-wheel driving in the Park. Continue to monitor impact on Park values, track condition, management implications and impact on other Park users.

#### **Or**

#### **Direction 25**

Allow for further opportunities for 4 wheel drive access eg Big Bend trail, subject to monitoring of trail condition.

wheel driving on public land.

**Comment on issue 4.5**

**Direction 24 approval rating:** Strongly approve  Approve  Unsure  Disapprove  Strongly disapprove

**Direction 25 approval rating:** Strongly approve  Approve  Unsure  Disapprove  Strongly disapprove

Comments: It is questionable whether 4-wheel driving is a 'legitimate' recreational activity, in Wellington Park or any other public reserve; given the huge environmental impact 4 wheel drives have (both responsible and irresponsible drivers). It is permitted in many areas primarily because managers bend to political pressure and not because 4-wheel driving is environmentally acceptable or has general social support. How has 4 wheel driving 'being gradually shut out of the Park'?. Is there any information available in relation to the number of illegal tracks that have been created by 4 wheel drivers in the Park and the environment impacts of this?

**4.6**

**Rock Climbing**

There should be better access tracks and parking facilities for rock climbers

Rock climbing is acknowledged as a valued and legitimate recreation activity within the Park, and is largely managed by the climbing community. Some upgrades of parking facilities have occurred, and discussions regarding the upgrade of access tracks are progressing.

**Direction 26**

Continue current discussions with the rock climbing community to provide sustainable and effective access to the various climbing locations.

**Comment on issue 4.6**

**Direction 26 approval rating:** Strongly approve Approve Unsure Disapprove Strongly disapprove

Comments: The WPMT should establish a code of conduct in collaboration with climbing clubs. The Launceston City Council has a very good example of this in the 'Rock Climbing Code of Conduct for the Cataract Gorge Reserve' publication ([http://www.launceston.tas.gov.au/upfiles/lcc/cont/\\_council/community\\_engagement/publications/rock\\_climbing](http://www.launceston.tas.gov.au/upfiles/lcc/cont/_council/community_engagement/publications/rock_climbing_dl_brochure_10.pdf)

[dl\\_brochure\\_10.pdf](http://www.launceston.tas.gov.au/upfiles/lcc/cont/_council/community_engagement/publications/rock_climbing_dl_brochure_10.pdf)). The Launceston Council adheres to a philosophy of "clean climbing" in order to minimise the impact on the environment.

4.7

**Para Gliding and Hang Gliding (Free Flying)**

Wellington Park offers the longest free flying flight route in Australia. The current MP allows for free flying but is passive about it and could be more proactive.

Free Flying is allowed in the Recreation Zone and Natural Zone of the Park - see [Map 3 in the current MP](#). It's also allowed in the Pinnacle Zone (subject to being permitted in the SDP). The current [Pinnacle Zone Site Development Plan](#) discusses Hang Gliding in more detail. **Direction 27** Work with the association to establish the requirements for a suitable launch site(s) for free flying, identify those locations in the Park and assess whether it is appropriate to identify them as such in the new MP.

**Comment on issue 4.7**

**Direction 27 approval rating:** Strongly approve Approve Unsure Disapprove Strongly disapprove

Comments: As very few people are likely to participate in this activity no new infrastructure should

be put in place. Existing low level facilities are acceptable.

4.8

**Horse Riding**

The Park is becoming more significant for horse riding as other traditional areas outside of the Park get built up and become unsuitable for horse riding. While some Park trails allow horse riding there needs to be more ideally linking to areas in Kingborough and Collinsvale.

Tracks which horse riding is permitted on are defined in [Map 4 of the current MP](#).

All access, apart from Jefferys Track and White Timber Trail, requires a permit. A number of access points cross private land, and access may be subject to land owner approval.

The MP does not identify potential parking or float turn-around areas.

Consultation and meetings have occurred with representatives of the horse riding association to address this issue however the nature of the access points means provision of floating areas is problematic.

**Direction 28**

Work with horse riding associations and individual riders, adjoining land owners and relevant Councils to investigate potential links between the Park and bordering areas in Kingborough eg. Mountain River and Leslie Vale areas and Collinsvale, and possibilities for provision of float parking areas.

**Comment on issue 4.8**

**Direction 28 approval rating:** Strongly approve Approve Unsure Disapprove **X**Strongly disapprove

Comments: The TCT recommends that no additional horse riding should be encouraged in the Park. Horses are notorious for spreading weeds and damaging trails. Conflicts with other users is an issue

4.9

**Registered Trail Bikes and other registered motorised off road recreational vehicles**

Keep as illegal in the Park.  
Provide opportunities for trail bike access.

Under the current MP trail bikes and similar vehicles are not permitted in the Park except (if registered) on Pinnacle Road and Jefferys Track.

Illegal trail bike access continues to be an issue in the GCC and PWS management areas of the Park. The Trust's Ranger issues warnings and infringement notices for this more than any other form of infringement of Park regulations.

Trail bikes continue to be considered a negative impact on the safety and enjoyment of other Park users, and a threat to the local environment.

**Direction 29**

Continue the existing MP policy of prohibiting trail bikes and other motorised recreational vehicles in all areas of the Park except Pinnacle Road and Jefferys Track given the continuing negative impacts that trail bikes have on the safety and enjoyment of other Park users and on the local environment.

**Or**

**Direction 30**

As a pilot test case, consider allowing commercial tour operators to run trail bike and/or other motorised recreational vehicle tours under licence and limited to

designated fire trails.  
Monitor and review the  
impacts of the trial.

**Comment on issue 4.9**

**Direction 29 approval rating:**  Strongly approve  Approve  Unsure  Disapprove  Strongly disapprove

**Direction 30 approval rating:**  Strongly approve  Approve  Unsure  Disapprove  Strongly disapprove

Comments: Illegal entry by trail bike riders is already a major problem in the Park as admitted in the discussion paper. Allowing a commercial tour operator to run trail bike tours in the Park could encourage more use of the park by illegal trail bike riders. Monitoring trail bike activities and enforcing penalties for illegal and irresponsible activity would require additional staff. Once allowed on any tracks in the park, trail bikes will leave the permitted tracks and can easily create their own tracks. In this way bikes can cause much more damage and are harder to control than four-wheel drives. Off rail bikes would also spoil the quality of the Park for other uses, especially walkers who are seeking some peace and quiet.

**Theme 5: Drinking water catchment management**

	Issue	Comment received	Existing management / progress to date	Possible future management direction
5.1	<p><b>Drinking Water Catchments</b></p> <p>See <a href="#">Appendix 2</a> for Zone maps and Overlay</p>	<p>To help protect raw water quality the MP needs to more clearly define the key outcomes relating to the protection of water quality</p>	<p>The Wellington Park catchments are a key part of Southern Water's bulk water supply and supply (at little cost) over 20% of the</p>	<p><b>Direction 31</b></p> <p>Maintain the importance of protecting water catchments and include key desired outcomes in relation to</p>

so that it is easier to report against these objectives.

drinking water of Greater Hobart. The protection of drinking water catchments is a fundamental requirement of the Wellington Park Act 1993, and [Chapter 9](#) of the MP addresses this issue. Southern Water have noted the success of the existing balance between protection and use of the drinking water catchments.

drinking water quality. Further the implementation of catchment management strategies prepared by Southern Water for the various catchment areas.

### Comment on issue 5.1

**Direction 31 approval rating:**  Strongly approve  Approve  Unsure  Disapprove  Strongly disapprove

Comments: [The TCT supports direction 31.](#)

5.2

### Restricted Area Overlays

The Restricted Areas Overlays in the Drinking Water Catchments Zone are unnecessary and are inconsistent.

The protection of the Park's water quality was the key factor in introducing the [Drinking Water Catchment Zone - Map 3A](#) and [Restricted Areas Overlay - Map 3B](#) in the current MP. Whilst various comments are received about whether

### Direction 32

Continue the Restricted Areas Overlays in the Drinking Water Catchment Zone as they occur in the current MP.

**Or**

the Overlays are too restrictive, there appears to be widespread acceptance of the Drinking Water Catchment Zone.

The Wellington Park drinking water supply is vulnerable as the water undergoes minimal storage time before consumption and is at risk of contamination from erosion, fire, landslip, as well as humans and animals. The quality and quantity of water harvested from the Park are under pressure from recreational activities and from potential impacts of landslips and fires. For at least part of the year, water from some catchments does not meet Southern Water requirements for disinfection and supply. A healthy ecosystem is the best protection for a water

### **Direction 33**

Reassess the Restricted Areas Overlay for inconsistencies and to determine the appropriate level of activities, particularly around the Knights Creek reservoir area.

**Note:** Additional catchments now managed by Southern Water (Rocky Creek, Stephenson's Creek, and Illabrook) will need to be examined and management provisions for them included in the MP.

supply catchment.

Many actions listed in the current MP to protect the catchments have been progressed. Works completed include water intake access track improvements, track improvements at St Crispin's Well, delivery of education programs, water quality monitoring, including at Knights Creek Reservoir, weir improvements at North West Bay River and catchment condition inspections.

**Comment on issue 5.2**

**Direction 32 approval rating:** Strongly approve  Approve  Unsure  Disapprove  Strongly disapprove

**Direction 33 approval rating:** Strongly approve  Approve  Unsure  Disapprove  Strongly disapprove

Comments: Allowing for activities within the Restricted Area Overlay is problematic. One of the major causes of water contamination is run-off from eroded areas. At present both the Zig Zag track and Ice House track are in poor condition resulting in significant amounts of run-off. The MWMT must focus on managing existing tracks (either improving the condition or closing them) in or near the catchment zone before even contemplating allowing for

additional activities to be permitted.

**Theme 6: Fire management**

	Issue	Comment received	Existing management / progress to date	Possible future management direction
6.1	<b>Fire Management</b>	<p>Uncontrolled bushfire presents a significant ongoing risk to the Park. These risks include to life, to the natural, heritage, scenic and recreational values of the Park and to the infrastructure within the Park.</p> <p>The new MP should have broad objectives for fire management, should state the actions required to achieve them and ensure each action is auditable.</p>	<p>The current MP recognises bushfire as a significant risk to the Park.</p> <p>Further information on the implementation of relevant fire management actions is contained in the <a href="#">Detailed Review</a> (Chapter 2, Section 10.4, Actions 1 to 29).</p> <p>The Fire Management Strategy is the detailed document that assesses the bushfire risks in the Park and measures to reduce these risks such as hazard reduction and maintenance of fire trails, fire breaks and water supply.</p> <p>A GIS database has been developed which details the</p>	<p><b>Direction 34</b></p> <p>Continue to recognise the risk to both built and natural assets from uncontrolled bushfire, and the possible changes to this risk as a result of climate change.</p> <p><b>And</b></p> <p>State broad objectives and actions for fire management to be adopted in the fire management strategy, including evaluation of planned burns conducted in the Park to allow for ongoing adaptive management.</p>

burn units and burnt areas and information regarding the vegetation and natural values.

There has been significant improvement of fire trail condition, particularly in the GCC management area.

Waterholes and dams in the Park that can be used to supply water for fire fighting have recently been refurbished and 9 new waterholes constructed.

Planned burning is only carried out in the dry forest on the lower eastern slopes of Mt Wellington. Most burns have been completed as scheduled in the fire management strategy.

**Comment on issue 6.1**

**Direction 34 approval rating:** Strongly approve  Approve  Unsure  Disapprove  Strongly disapprove

Comments: [Objectives need to be made in relation to climate change and its impact on vegetation and fire](#)

management.

## Theme 7: Access and transport management

	Issue	Comment received	Existing management / progress to date	Possible future management direction
7.1	Access to the Park	<p>Better public transport links to the Park are required, particularly in snow periods.</p> <p>A 4-wheel drive shuttle bus service connecting Fern Tree to the summit should be considered.</p>	<p>Further information on the implementation of relevant actions is contained in the <a href="#">Detailed Review</a> (Section 4.3 - Roads and Vehicular Access Tracks - Actions 17 to 37) outlines progress under the current MP in relation to transport issues. In brief:</p>	<p><b>Direction 35</b></p> <p>Maintain the current system of access to the Park being predominantly by private car with no fee charged to access or park in the Park.</p>
		<p>Private vehicle access to Pinnacle Road should be maintained.</p> <p>A fee for vehicular access and parking in the Park could be charged and would assist in providing funds for Park management</p>	<p>An alternative access to Pinnacle Road which bypasses Pillinger Drive was investigated but rejected in favour of improving Huon Road intersection which was completed.</p> <p>Car parking at the climber's car park on Pinnacle road</p>	<p><b>Or</b></p> <p><b>Direction 36</b></p> <p>Seek to implement the Sustainable Transport System report endorsed by the Trust, including: maintaining private vehicle access to Pinnacle Road; investigation of a fee for service shuttle-bus system; and ongoing promotion of walking and biking access. The System includes criteria</p>

was upgraded with more space provided, but a subsequent small landslip reduced the extent of parking area available.

against which any future alternative transport options to the Park should be considered.

**And**

A traffic management plan for the access roads during snow times has been implemented as part of the [Pinnacle Road Snow Management Policy](#). The policy seeks to ensure that Pinnacle Road is accessible at all times.

Investigate options for park funding, including user pay models.

A [Sustainable Transport System](#) report was endorsed by the Trust in 2009. The report recommends maintaining existing access by private cars however seeks to establish a fee for service shuttle-bus system within the Park.

Although the Park in essence has the status of a National Park there is

currently no fee charged to access or park in the Park. A user-based fee for vehicular access could provide a source of revenue for the Trust to assist with the management of the Park.

**Comment on issue 7.1**

**Direction 35 approval rating:** Strongly approve Approve Unsure Disapprove  Strongly disapprove

**Direction 36 approval rating:** Strongly approve Approve Unsure Disapprove Strongly disapprove

Comments: TCT does not support direction 35. In principle we support a fee being charged for public use of Pinnacle road. The precise fee needs to be determined based on mode of transport. During times of snow, a 4-wheel drive shuttle bus should be the only vehicle permitted to drive up to the Pinnacle and it should be considered that this be a free service.

The Trust needs to be more assertive and effective in communicating its policy regarding accessing the mountain during snow events, in particular the summit. Many critics of the trust's approach do not realise the very dangerous and often unenjoyable conditions at the summit, and driving to the summit, during and after snow and that snow is often present for only short periods.

7.2

**Access for Snow Recreation**

Desire to have greater access to snow on Pinnacle Road. The issue of road access is detailed under the heading Access & Traffic

The sporadic nature of snow fall and variations in extent and cover, as well as the need for maintenance vehicle access to the

**Direction 37**

Continue implementation of existing snow management access approaches.

Pinnacle, means planned recreational access for snow play, is very difficult to achieve.

The [Snow Management Policy](#) (2003, updated) developed protocols for managing access to the snow in winter conditions and is reviewed annually. Many of its recommendations have been implemented. The Hobart City Council provides substantial on-ground support to ensure access to snow is maximised and clearing of Pinnacle Road carried out quickly and safely.

**And**

Further investigate implementation of the [Sustainable Transport System](#), including establishment of a year-round shuttle-bus service with particular emphasis on winter access.

## Comment on issue 7.2

**Direction 37 approval rating:** Strongly approve **X** Approve Unsure Disapprove Strongly disapprove

Comments: [The TCT approves the continuing implementation of the existing snow management access approaches except for recommendation in section 7.1 regarding providing a shuttle bus from the Springs.](#)

7.3

**Alternative forms of vehicular access to the summit of the Park eg Cable Car**

Very mixed comments regarding a cable car. Some strongly supporting, others strongly against one.

The SGS report recommends that '*Due to its contentiousness it would be beneficial for potential developers, operators and the general public if the Trust could provide some guidance on the implications of the Management Plan for a possible cable car proposal.*'

Currently, commercial activities most likely required to support a cable car are prohibited from all zones apart from the Springs Zone. Further, a cable car, skifield infrastructure or other larger infrastructure projects at the Pinnacle are specifically prohibited under the [Pinnacle Zone Site Development Plan](#).

Further, the Management Plan requires that, for any private commercial

**Direction 38**

Maintain the existing prohibition on development of commercial facilities within the Park, outside of the Springs Zone. Effectively, this creates a constraint on commercial development outside of the Springs Zone.

**Or**

**Direction 39**

Allow for the consideration of alternative forms of access and associated commercial infrastructure, particularly in the Pinnacle Zone. Assessment of such developments would be rigorous and involve consideration of issues as previously described in 2.4, including:

- visual impact;

development within the Pinnacle and Springs Zones, the Trust call for expressions of interest for the development.

The Trust has carried out substantial consultation on access issues as part of the development of the Sustainable Transport System. The System seeks to provide an affordable and achievable system incorporating a variety of transport modes, recognising the physical constraints of the Park.

The Springs area continues to offer the best location for 'long stays' and the delivery of interpretive opportunities, and consequently any transport system should logically utilise this area.

- proposed route;
- ongoing accessibility to Pinnacle Road;
- economic viability;
- environmental impact assessment (covers a wide range of environmental issues that a development may impact on such as water quality, plant and animal species, geology, waste disposal etc);- implications for the Springs area as the primary visitor and commercial node;
- associated infrastructure at the Pinnacle;
- traffic management and parking; and

- the likely maintenance regime required given the climatic conditions at the summit.

(There are also likely to be other issues that the specific design of the proposed development would create.)

**Comment on issue 7.3**

**Direction 38 approval rating:** ~~X~~Strongly approve Approve Unsure Disapprove Strongly disapprove

**Direction 39 approval rating:** Strongly approve Approve Unsure Disapprove ~~X~~Strongly disapprove

Comments: The TCT approves Direction 38. Legislative should be made to prohibit any permanent commercial development at the Pinnacle, including a cable car or gondola or any similar transport type. Furthermore, permanent commercial development should only be allowed at the Springs.

7.4

**Heli Pad at the Summit**

Provide for a landing pad constructed of non permanent materials for helicopter landings, primarily for limited commercial charter usage, and also for safety and training purposes. Likely

The current MP allows for consideration of a helicopter landing pad.

A large section of the summit area lies within the Pinnacle Zone although a small section of the SW summit area has a Natural

**Direction 40**

Maintain the existing level of infrastructure for helicopter landings which is for emergency and search and rescue operations only, using existing informal

landing location would be on the south side of the Pinnacle in the general vicinity of the major telecommunications tower.

Area zoning and remainder of the SW section has a Drinking Water Catchment zone applying. Any application for a helicopter landing pad would need to meet the requirements of the Management Plan and the Pinnacle Zone Site Development Plan and other specific planning policies and strategies.

landing areas.

**Or**

**Direction 41**

Allow for a small helipad constructed of non permanent materials in the general vicinity of the major communications tower for limited commercial charter landings, and emergency and training operations. Commercial operations would be subject to conditions relating to number of flights allowed, agreed fly zone, and times of the day.

**Comment on issue 7.4**

**Direction 40 approval rating:**  Strongly approve  Approve  Unsure  Disapprove  Strongly disapprove

**Direction 41 approval rating:**  Strongly approve  Approve  Unsure  Disapprove  Strongly disapprove

Comments: It has not been made clear what the future implications of a commercial helicopter venture are. The noise associated with a helicopter conducting scenic flights around the Park would be horrendous. It would disturb the peace of other user. The cost of building a structure needs to be taken into account. We find it quite bizarre that this

proposal was considered in the discussion paper and wish to know how this came about?

**Theme 8: Park boundaries**

	Issue	Comment received	Existing management / progress to date	Possible future management direction
8.1	Park Boundary	See information under the heading 'Multi Day trails'.	<p>The MP recommends a number of <a href="#">possible additions</a> to the Park, subject to availability and resources. Several areas are able to be included in the Park following acquisition by a Council or transfers of ownership, including: a large lot at the western end of Lenah Valley Road; and several lots along the Pipeline Track in Neika.</p> <p>The Trust is also investigating the inclusion of several areas reserved under the Regional Forestry Agreement process, managed by Forestry Tasmania.</p>	<p><b>Note:</b> Today's land managers increasingly recognise that issues such as climate change and park fragmentation increase the threats to the natural values of many parks and best practice land management promotes the need to think about park management at a landscape scale and look at opportunities to achieve connectivity with other natural areas or areas with significant bushland.</p> <p><b>Direction 42</b> Maintain the existing Park Boundaries</p> <p><b>Or</b></p>

### **Direction 43**

Investigate the opportunities for extending park boundaries to link with other conservation managed lands on private property and on crown land.

This may also provide better opportunities to promote multi day treks through the Park on many of its existing trails.

### **Comment on issue 8.1**

**Direction 42 approval rating:** Strongly approve Approve Unsure Disapprove Strongly disapprove

**Direction 43 approval rating:** Strongly approve Approve Unsure Disapprove Strongly disapprove

Comments: [TCT supports Direction 43. Also see section 4.1.2.](#)