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Explanatory Note

This report has been prepared by the Wellington Park Management Trust as part of a multi-stage assessment of the landscape values of Wellington Park.

This assessment focuses on the social values of Wellington Park, in particular those which relate to landscape. The assessment is based on a ‘Community Values Survey’, undertaken in late 2010-early 2011 by means of a short questionnaire that the greater Hobart community generally was encouraged to complete. The geographic scope of the study was the whole of Wellington Park.

The aim of this study is to understand to what extent, and in which ways, the community, in particular the Greater Hobart community, value Wellington Park. A core part of the assessment was to assess how the Wellington Park landscape is appreciated in order to contribute to an understanding of the full range of landscape values that are being assessed in the broader Wellington Park Landscape Assessment.

Wellington Park has acknowledged important landscape values which have applied since the early days of European settlement of Hobart, yet these have not been previously assessed formally or in detail. The main aim of the overall Wellington Park Landscape Assessment therefore is to provide important landscape values information to assist in managing the Park to meet the objectives of the Wellington Park Management Plan.

This report is one of three assessments of the landscape values of Wellington Park that make up the overall ‘Wellington Park Landscape Assessment’. Once completed the three key landscape assessments – this social values assessment, a visual landscape character and quality assessment, and an historical landscape character assessment – will contribute to a single synthetic summary report on the landscape values of Wellington Park.

________________________

DISCLAIMER - This report has not been formally endorsed by the Wellington Park Management Trust, and does not necessarily represent the views of the Wellington Park Management Trust or the individual Park land management agencies.
"Mount Wellington — the Mountain — has meaning for all Tasmanians, and particularly for those who live in its shadows. The Mountain has ever been a reference point, whether viewed from the distance or from its foothills ..."

"Indifference to Mount Wellington is rare. Its strong stance on the skyline calls for some sort of response".

The Mountain — a people's perspective (Stoddart 2004, pp v & 4)
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Background to the Assessment

Wellington Park (refer Figure 1) has acknowledged important community held landscape values and other social values, which in some cases borders on, or becomes, a spiritual attachment.

The broad range of social values however have not previously been formally assessed, yet given the large number of people living around and within sight of Wellington Park and their use of the Park, this information is critical to the successful long term management of the Park. This is particularly so, given that one of the management goals for the Park is to "retain the essential cultural characteristics of the Park" (WPMP 2005, 14).

This assessment was designed to develop an initial broad based understanding of how the community within the greater Hobart region values Wellington Park and areas and places within it, and to document this for management purposes. The results are also designed to feed into the current Wellington Park Landscape Values Assessment Project, hence the assessment has a strong focus on landscape and place-based values.

The specific objectives of the present assessment have been to –

- determine through a ‘Community Values Survey’ utilising a simple open ended questionnaire (and possibly a second, later, more detailed questionnaire if considered warranted) how the greater Hobart region community value Wellington Park;
- investigate how the community values the Wellington Park landscape to provide social values information for the Wellington Park Landscape Assessment project;
- examine the implications of this community valuing for the management of Wellington Park; and
- review the proposed future stages of the broader Wellington Park Community Values project in the light of the findings from this project.

The assessment of social values has been based on a ‘community values survey’. The survey took the form of a simple questionnaire with a small number of open ended questions and biostatistical questions.

To encourage a large number of responses from throughout the greater Hobart area, the questionnaire was available on-line on the WPMT website and in downloadable form from the website, and hard copies were distributed to a number of public places in the region (eg, Council offices, State Library branches and rural area stores). This distribution was supported by advertising in local newspapers, on radio, and through various local government community forums (eg, organisation newsletters). The questionnaire was available from the end of September 2010 to the end of June 2011.

The questionnaire and project advertising was also designed to encourage those with no particular interest in Wellington Park to respond to the survey to identify what proportion of the community do not particularly value Wellington Park.

The Landscape & Social Values – The Questionnaire Results

In total 458 responses were received. This is considered to be a good response for the type of survey it is and an adequate sample for analysis.
The responses come mainly from the greater Hobart region, but also from southern Tasmania more broadly, and there are a small number of responses from other parts of Tasmania, interstate an overseas. The assessment is therefore seen to have good geographic representation. There is also a good balance of representation on the basis of gender and age, except for the 0-20 year old range which is very poorly represented.

The results, based on semi-quantitative analysis, indicate that –

- The whole of the Park is valued for a range of reasons, but the strong focus of valuing is Mount Wellington.
- The social values of the Park are very diverse and cover a number of individual values across the categories of ‘landscape value’, ‘aesthetic value’, ‘sense of place value’, ‘personal meaning and association’, ‘personal function’, ‘community function’, ‘scientific value’ and ‘historical value’.
- Overall, the landscape and place values are valued more highly than personal meaning and association and function, or community function.
- Although not considered to be a comprehensive list, a number of places and features within the Park were identified as being of special social value. The most highly valued natural place is the summit of Mount Wellington, but the Springs, the Organ Pipes, Sphinx Rock, the Pipeline Track and the Zig Zag Track are also highly valued.
- Individuals value the Park very differently, but with only minor differences by age or gender. The exception is the 0-20 year age group who appear to value personal and community function more highly than the landscape and place values, and do not value the Park for such a range of reasons as the other age groups.
- Some individuals value Wellington Park and Mount Wellington extremely strongly, to the extent that ‘it defines their lives’.
- For many individuals the Park is extremely important, but this importance derives from values which can be held from without or can be considered from a distance, and is not necessarily related to being able to visit the Park or live on its edge.

The most important single values identified by the assessment (in order of importance) are –

1. the ability to walk in the Park on what is seen as a good track network;
2. the naturalness/wilderness quality of the Park;
3. the landscape of the Park at a general level;
4. the Park’s location next to Hobart, as a natural area next to Hobart, or bookending Hobart with the Derwent on the other side;
5. the native biota; and
6. the aesthetics of the Park at a general level.

Other important values (ie, noted by more than 20% of respondents) include –

- the views to/of Mount Wellington,
- the changeability and variability of the Park,
- the atmospheric nature of the Park (primarily Mount Wellington),
- Mount Wellington and the Park as a backdrop to Hobart,
- the sense/spirit of place of Hobart engendered by Mount Wellington and the Park,
- that Mount Wellington is a landmark (or signature) for Hobart and ‘home’,
• family associations,
• bike riding, and
• the accessibility of the Park.

With respect to ‘essential community function’, conservation was seen as the most important function (by c.17% of respondents). Recreation was seen as the next most important function (15% of respondents). Tourism, fresh water supply and education were all seen as important, but only by a relatively small proportion of respondents (<10%). These values are considered to be lower than might be expected if a survey was undertaken to specifically establish how people valued these functions, however it is probable given the other social values that the relative importance of the different functions would remain much the same.

Managing the Landscape & Social Values

The present assessment, through its systematic and broad based approach, fleshes out the existing values knowledge framework and provides a more fine textured appreciation of the values of Wellington Park, including the relative importance of these values and the reasons behind community views about management of the Park.

Generally, the results support the findings of the previous assessments which have looked at the importance of Wellington Park, or parts of it, to the community. These findings provide support for the current management policy for Wellington Park, in particular the priorities for management. The main impression gained from the responses is that the Park should be managed to ‘keep it as it is’.

The findings of this assessment can contribute to the refining of the zoning within the Park and the prescriptions for the different zones, as well as assist management in recognising specific features, areas and values of importance within the Park and provide for their management.

The way in which the Park is valued by the community indicates that management should aim to –

• keep the natural values and wilderness quality, particularly on the forested slopes and alpine plateau areas,
• keep the Park big and respect the boundaries,
• maintain the Park essentially as a low intensity use space where people are easily able to have space to enjoy the Park on their own or in small groups,
• continue to provide for family activities as at present,
• allow the current range of recreational activities and keep the Park accessible,
• allow for new compatible recreational activities, but limit infrastructure, and
• infrastructure should be kept to a minimum and be carefully planned to avoid loss of naturalness and to avoid visual impacts.

Although the findings from the present assessment contain useful broad based information for management, there are some inadequacies in the data that should be addressed. These include improving the sample size for the 0-20 year age group, understanding what proportion of the

---

1 Less than 50% of respondents indicated that Wellington Park had an essential community function of any type.

2 ‘Wilderness’ is used here rather than for example ‘wildness’, as this is the term used by respondents. It is a perceived quality and expresses a specific quality not encompassed by ‘wildness’.
community value Wellington Park, understanding how strongly the different values are held by individuals, and improving the understanding of those values which are not clearly understood from the responses. The detail of the social values information could also be improved, either by a more detailed questionnaire or community mapping. Another way in which the social values data could be developed is by broadening the geographic scope of the survey (ie, to include greater representation of Tasmanians from outside the greater Hobart area and of visitors to the state).

Recommendations

As the findings from the present assessment appear to essentially support current management policy at the general level, no recommendations are made for urgent changes to Wellington Park management policy or processes. Rather, the following recommendations are seen as strengthening certain approaches that are currently contained, implicitly or explicitly, in the management policy.

Recommendation 1 (priority - ongoing)

Given that this assessment has identified a range of social values, including landscape type values, that attach to Wellington Park, in some cases quite strongly, it is recommended that the findings from this social values assessment, in particular the comment in Section 6 (Issues for Management) be used to inform future management of Wellington Park, including in management planning.

Recommendation 2 (priority - ongoing)

It is recommended that special consideration continue to be given to the maintenance of the landscape values (ie, landscape, aesthetic and sense of place values), in particular the maintenance of the essential naturalness of Wellington Park, the perceived wilderness qualities and the preservation of the native vegetation as, with the exception of using the Park for walking, these are the most important community values indicated by the assessment.

Recommendation 3 (priority - ongoing)

Given that this assessment has clearly established that there are a range of social values, including landscape type values, that attach to Wellington Park, and that some of these views are strongly held and/or indicate strong personal valuing, it is recommended that social values form part of the suite of values that are assessed for all management and new use and development.

Recommendation 4 (priority - ongoing)

In keeping with best practice (including the Burra Charter guidelines (Australia ICOMOS 1999)), it is recommended when social values are considered in relation to making management decisions in relation to Wellington Park, and notwithstanding the above, that –

1. the range of social values are considered,
2. the social values are considered along with other potential values, and
3. no values are given undue emphasis over other values.

Recommendation 5 (priority – immediate to short term)

It is recommended that to address the key issues of bias in the present assessment, the following two supplementary research components be undertaken as a priority –

--

1 Considerable interest was expressed by respondents in completing such a questionnaire.
1. asking four to five school classes in different geographic areas, and of different ages, to complete the existing questionnaire (to address the issue of the very small sample size for the 0-20 year old category); and

2. undertaking a rapid, random sample survey of Hobart residents of the extent to which they value Wellington Park or parts of it (but not how they value it), to understand the actual proportion of the community who value Wellington Park in some way.

(Both these supplementary projects could be undertaken as University student research projects).

**Recommendation 6 (priority - medium to long term)**

To further develop the Trust's understanding of the landscape and other social values of Wellington Park and their geographic specificity, it is recommended that the following broad based, longer term research into the social values of Wellington Park be undertaken –

1. Development of a more detailed and less open ended questionnaire to be completed by a sample of respondents to the present survey (and supplementary survey of young people) who indicated that they were interested in completing such a survey.

2. Undertake additional assessment on the contemporary value of views and viewscapes to and from Wellington Park, including the Mountain.

3. Longer term community mapping (proposed in the broader Landscape Assessment Project as a later stage to gain detailed information).

Consideration should also be given to expanding the geographic scope of the survey (or a similar survey), as the opportunity arises, to include Tasmanians outside the greater Hobart area and visitors from outside Tasmania.
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1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the Project

Wellington Park (refer Figure 1) has acknowledged important landscape values. As a dominant natural feature, the Wellington Range has become “inextricably linked with the community’s sense of identity and self-image” and this results in Mount Wellington, a key element of the Park, and potentially the whole Park having “symbolic value of great importance to the community” (WPMT, 1996, p.139). In some cases this relationship borders on, or becomes, a spiritual attachment. Mount Wellington is also acknowledged as important state-wide as indicated by Mount Wellington being voted as one of Tasmania’s top heritage icons in the National Trust (Tasmania) 100 Tasmanian Heritage Icons listing in 2009 (The Examiner, 10/11/2009).

These community, or social, values appear to have applied since at least the early days of European settlement of Hobart, hence also have historical validity. They apply to the whole of the Park, although the nature and importance of the values will vary from place to place within Wellington Park.

Little however is known about the detailed values that locals and visitors hold in relation to Wellington Park (Omineca 2010) and these social values of the Park have not previously been formally assessed. The information that is available at present is a general appreciation of what the community values about Wellington Park, particularly in relation to their use of the Park, which has been developed from a small number of surveys and submissions responding to planning for the Park and from a limited amount of anecdotal information.

Given the large number of people living around and within sight of Wellington Park and who use the Park, understanding the way in which this ‘community of interest’ values Wellington Park or places within the Park is critical to the successful long term management of the Park. This is particularly important given that one of the management goals for the Park is to "retain the essential cultural characteristics of the Park” (WPMP 2005, 14).

More concrete reasons for assessing social values relate to facilitating the use of the Park. As public estate and a publically accessible place, management should seek to meet the public’s needs and desires where these are consistent with the purposes for which the Park was created. Also, understanding the ways in which the Park is valued, and taking this into account in the development of new uses and infrastructure, is likely to make this process more straightforward. It potentially will avoid the frequent strong rejection of major developments in Wellington Park experienced in the past, and the often single-minded strong demands for new uses and development, both of which are indications of the strong valuing of the Park by the community where the values are not being respected or heard.

Part of this strong valuing comes from the Wellington Park being a mountain range with a visually prominent mountain, Mount Wellington, at its eastern end above the city of Hobart.

---

4 Mount Wellington was ranked as no.11 out of 100.
5 Prior to European settlement in the area, it is highly likely that the Wellington Park area, in particular Mount Wellington was valued by the Tasmanian Aboriginal people of the region, but this knowledge, regrettably, is not available today.
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FIGURE 1 (A)
Location and extent of Wellington Park
[source – WPMT]
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FIGURE 1 (B)

Wellington Park & its Relationship to Hobart
[source – Derwent 1:100,000 Land Tenure Map, Tasmap]
As noted by Truscott et al (2003, 3) “... community connection and meanings abound in the mountains. Not only is it essential to identify and manage the cultural heritage of mountains as a multi-layered cultural landscape, but it is essential to include the intangible values that are held by all communities connected to those landscapes ...”.

The present assessment is Stage 1 of what is seen as a longer term Wellington Park Community Values Project which is aimed at better, more detailed understanding how the local/regional community values Wellington Park (on the basis that this community of interest most strongly values the Park). The proposed subsequent stages of the longer term project include –

- more detailed community values assessment through a more detailed questionnaire/s, possibly area based, and
- a community mapping project/s.

The present project is also designed to feed into the comprehensive Wellington Park Landscape Assessment Project also being undertaken by the Trust. The present project is one of three major studies that comprise the landscape project. The other two studies, already completed, are an Historical Landscape Character Assessment (Sheridan 2010) and a Landscape & Visual Character and Quality Assessment (Inspiring Place & Chetwynd 2011).

This project has been undertaken by the Wellington Park Cultural Heritage Coordinator (CHC), Anne McConnell, and steered by the WPMT Manager, Michael Easton.

The project commenced in November 2009 with development of the project and the questionnaire. The Survey, launched at the end of September 2010, ran for six months (ie, until the end of March 2011). 6 The analysis was undertaken in September – October 2011. 7

1.2 Study Aims and Objectives

Aim

The aim of the Wellington Park Social Values Assessment is to develop an initial broad based understanding of how the Wellington Park local community (ie, the public within the greater Hobart region) values Wellington Park and areas and places within it, and to document this for management purposes and to feed the results into the Wellington Park Landscape Values Assessment Project.

Objectives

The major objectives of the Wellington Park Social Values Assessment are to –

- determine through a ‘Community Values Survey’ utilising a simple open ended questionnaire (and possibly a second, later, more detailed questionnaire if considered warranted) how the greater Hobart region community values Wellington Park;
- investigate how the community values the Wellington Park landscape to provide social values information for the Wellington Park Landscape Assessment project;
- examine the implications of this community valuing for the management of Wellington Park; and

---

6 The questionnaire however remained on the website, and completed survey forms were accepted until the end of August 2011.
7 The Project Officer was on leave during May – August 2011, hence the delay in completing the project.
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- review the proposed future stages of the broader Wellington Park Community Values project in the light of the findings from this project.

1.3 The Study Area – Wellington Park

The Management

Wellington Park is an 18,250 ha area of public conservation reserve (with conservation status equivalent to that of a national park) situated on the western edge of Hobart (refer Figure 1).

Wellington Park is managed under the Wellington Park Act 1993 by the Wellington Park Management Trust. The management framework (ie, policy, objectives and approach) is established by the Wellington Park Management Plan 2005 (the WPMP), which is a statutory plan.

In recognition of the values, uses and context of the Park, the management goals for Wellington Park (WPMT, 2005, p14) are to –

- protect the Park’s environment for the long term;
- manage water catchments in the Park as sources of clean water;
- retain the essential cultural characteristics of the Park⁸;
- provide for community, tourism and recreational use and enjoyment of the Park consistent with the above goals.

The Park is located in five local government areas – City of Hobart, City of Glenorchy, Derwent Valley, Huon Valley and Kingborough. The on-ground management is undertaken by the Hobart City Council (HCC), the Glenorchy City Council (GCC) and the Tasmanian Parks & Wildlife Service (PWS). Southern Water also has a management interest as approximately over 20% of the greater Hobart area’s drinking water supply comes from the Park.

The Landscape

The bulk of the Park is made up of the Wellington Range, a long, relatively flat range of around 800m-1,000m asl that runs west from Hobart, and which links to the mountainous country of South West Tasmania. The top of the range is in effect a plateau, with a small number of peaks which sit on the plateau. These are Mt Connection, Collins Cap, Collins Bonnet, Mt Montagu, Trestle Mountain, Mount Marian, Mount Patrick, Mount Charles and Mount Hull. The other main mountains, including Mount Wellington and Mount Arthur are high points on the plateau on its eastern edge. Mount Wellington, at 1,271m asl, is the highest point in the Park.

The flanks of the Range are relatively steep. This, together with the height of the plateau, the distinctive sandstone benches at around 600m-700m asl and high level sections of vertical dolerite cliff face and small peaks such as Cathedral Rock, give much of the Range a visually prominent and distinctive profile. The steepest and highest face is the eastern, or Hobart face, which rises from sea level to 1,271m in just 8 km horizontal distance (ie, from the Derwent River approximately five kilometres east of the Park boundary to the summit of Mt Wellington). This face, the most commonly viewed face from Hobart, is made more distinctive and prominent by the presence of a large face of columnar jointed dolerite, the

⁸ Emphasis this study.
Organ Pipes, just below the summit and the fact that the peak is the most easterly elevated point, with the flanks falling back to the west on both sides.

Other distinctive (including visually distinctive) landscape elements of Wellington Park are the extensive dolerite boulder fields on the upper slopes of the range, the alpine vegetation across much of the plateau, and the old growth native forest that clothes the flanks of Wellington Range. These vegetative elements and the relative lack of disturbance of the vegetation give the Range and the Park an apparently natural appearance. The rapid change in elevation also means that there is a rapid change in vegetation with height, from lowland dry sclerophyll forest to alpine heath. The very steep vegetation cline on the eastern face from sea level at the Derwent River to the summit of Mount Wellington is unusual and as such has recognised botanical significance.

A number of major watercourses (and their tributaries) flow down the flanks of the Range. On the Hobart face, these are the New Town Rivulet, Brushy Creek (a tributary of the New Town Rivulet), Guy Fawkes Rivulet (a tributary of the Hobart Rivulet), Hobart Rivulet and Sandy Bay Rivulet. To the south these are Browns River, North West Bay River, Mountain River and Crabtree Rivulet (a tributary of Mountain River). On the northeast side are Humphries Rivulet and Islet Rivulet, and on the north side are Myrtle Forest Creek (a tributary of Faulkners Rivulet), Glen Dhu Rivulet, and Illa Brook and other headwater creeks of the Lachlan River.

On the flanks of the Range most of these watercourses have rainforest riparian zones with abundant ferns and fern glades. There are also numerous cascades and a number of waterfalls. The best known are Wellington Falls on North West Bay River, Silver Falls, O’Gradys Falls, New Town Rivulet Falls, and Myrtle Forest Falls.

As noted above, there has been limited development within Wellington Park in the past, and the Park is essentially a natural area. Historical activities such as the construction of water supply systems, logging of the forested flanks and lower western plateau areas, minor quarrying, some scientific work (mainly weather observation), and 200 years of tourism and recreation have however left evidence in the landscape.

The evidence of the historical activities is mostly in the form of archaeological sites which are visually minimally intrusive and often overgrown ruins which are quite aesthetic. Recreation and tourist activities have had the most long term, obvious impact, mainly in the eastern part of the Park. Recreation has resulted in a number of tracks (most of which are still in use today) and a small number of timber hut sites and later, extant stone huts. The tourist infrastructure is perhaps the most obvious in the landscape, and includes the Pinnacle Road, a lookout, shelter and toilets at the summit (Pinnacle), an extensive modified area at the Springs, and a small number of Park edge areas of recreational focus with shelter sheds and toilet facilities (Bower Park at Fern Tree and Myrtle Forest).

The Local Community & Their Interest

It is difficult to define the ‘community of interest’ for Wellington Park. Clearly it will include those people who live adjacent to the Park. This includes the people of Hobart and Glenorchy, and residents and farmers around its northern and southern flanks. But how extensive is this community? How far away can people live and still value Wellington Park?

Because this study is partly concerned with landscape, it was decided to treat the ‘community of interest’ or community with the main interest as those who regularly use or can see, or are otherwise potentially influenced by the Park in an ongoing manner. This is considered to be

---

9 The land on the western edge is State forest and there are no people living in this area.
the greater Hobart community, taking in those who live in Hobart and the adjacent municipalities. This is in effect the major part of the population of southeastern Tasmania.\(^\text{10}\)

It is acknowledged however that there will be wider public interest, possibly extending to all of Tasmania and interstate to those who have visited or who once lived in the greater Hobart area and who still have some attachment to Wellington Park, or for whom it has some meaning. This broader group were not targetted as this was seen as a ‘community’ of much lesser interest in respect to this study, and is a much more difficult ‘community’ to survey to produce useful, unbiased data.

The interest of the community has never before been formally assessed, although there have been a number of opportunities, mostly planning and management related for the community to indicate their interest.

Community values were initially identified in evaluations undertaken preparatory to creating Wellington Park (Pinkard 1991). These finding were then reviewed in the research undertaken to prepare the first Wellington Park Management Plan (Hepper & de Gryse 1994). In both cases the values were derived from public responses to the management of the Wellington Park area.

The only other known studies which have looked at how Wellington Park is valued by the community are two studies focussed on Mount Wellington. These are a Ph.D. thesis by Angus Barnes on Mount Wellington and sense of place (Barnes 1992), and a study by Emily Stoddart of the ‘people’s perspective’ on Mount Wellington (Stoddart 2004). Although both studies look at the community’s views, they use only a small and select sample of people.\(^\text{11}\)

The above studies and other public comment to date have indicated that there is considerable community interest in Wellington Park, mainly the eastern part (east of North West Bay River – Collinsvale). This is primarily for recreation, but also because Mount Wellington, and to a lesser extent the Wellington Range, creates a major sense of place for nearby residents, and is perceived by them to have other use values (eg, for water supply and tourism). Some of these values are very strongly held by individual community members, for example as indicated in Barnes (1992) and Stoddart (2004). This range and strength of interest appears to have been consistently held since at least the 1980s when the first evaluations were undertaken by Pinkard (1991) preparatory to creating Wellington Park, and clearly some of this strong valuing extends back to before the creation of Mountain Park and the Mountain Park Act in 1906.

Because of the way in which the information has been collected, the community views that have been identified to date need to be recognised as being strongly issue based and representing the views of those who have a very strong attachment to, or who heavily use, Wellington Park or parts of it.

\(^{10}\) While this study treats the greater Hobart population as one community for the purposes of this study, in reality this ‘community’ is made up of different communities of interest, with some of these different communities, eg, Park neighbours, themselves comprising discrete communities, including on the basis of location.

\(^{11}\) There are also two studies of use and value which have been undertaken for small high use areas – Myrtle Forest (Ingkhaninan 2004) and Fern Tree Park and Bower (Andrusko (2010)).
2 HOW THE ASSESSMENT WAS UNDERTAKEN

2.1 Project Approach

The key goals of this initial social values assessment were to –
- acquire information on the wide range of social values;
- achieve wide coverage of the 'local community', and
- obtain a response from those who do not have strong attachments as well as those who do.

The project approach was developed to meet these goals. In the absence of similar previous assessments the approach to the present project was developed from a review of standard approaches to visitor surveys and methods used for social values assessments undertaken for cultural heritage assessment, and tailored to meet the needs of the current project.

The approach adopted was to undertake the assessment by means of a community values survey. The survey was in the form of a simple questionnaire with a small number of open ended questions and bio-statistical questions (refer Appendix 1).

In order to sample broadly from the identified ‘community of interest’ (ie those living in the greater Hobart area), the project attempted to make the questionnaire widely available within the greater Hobart area. It did this through making the questionnaire available on-line on the WPMT website, as well as downloadable from the website, and through distributing hard copies of the questionnaire to a number of public places in the region (eg, Council offices, State Library branches and stores in the adjacent mainly rural areas). This was supported by advertising the project through local newspapers and radio, and through various local government community forums (eg, Hobart Bushcare newsletter). There was also an invitation for people to phone the WPMT and request a copy of the questionnaire to be sent to them.

The questionnaire and project advertising was also designed to encourage those with no particular interest in Wellington Park to respond to the survey to assist in identifying what proportion of the community do not particularly value Wellington Park and to indicate what they valued in preference to Wellington Park.

Although not ideal, this approach recognised the timing and cost constraints for such a project. Originally it was proposed to use a 'postcard' as the basic response medium, with a more detailed questionnaire to be developed for those who wished to provide more detailed responses. The 'postcard' approach was seen as having the benefit of not being too onerous to complete and being relatively easy to distribute. Research however established that distributing the postcards was not as easy as originally envisaged and that the cost of producing and distributing the postcard to households would be prohibitive for the project. There was also concern that if attractive, people might choose to keep the postcard, rather than use it to respond.

To address anticipated biases in the sample of respondents (eg, poor range of age groups or locations from where responses came) there was initially also provision in the project to run some focus groups or to use some specific groups (eg, school children and School for Seniors groups). Given the time and cost constraints this also was not carried out, although two seniors groups were used to trial the questionnaire (refer Section 2.2).
The analysis has been kept simple and, given the questionnaire style of open ended questions which requires an essentially qualitative rather than quantitative analysis, has two parts. The analysis comprises –

1. a tabulated list of all responses noting which values are identified as being held by individual respondents (using recognised values) which was then quantitatively treated (refer Appendix 2 for an example); and
2. a listing of comments of interest (ie, comments which explain particular values that are held) by respondent (refer Appendix 3).

It should also be noted that the values considered by the present project are contemporary (ie, present day) values. The historical appreciation of Mount Wellington and the Wellington Range, at least in relation to the landscape, is addressed in the Wellington Park Historical Landscape Character Assessment by Sheridan (2010).

The present assessment is also not concerned with the views of specific interest groups (eg, the Aboriginal community or the residents of specific neighbouring areas). If it is considered useful to look at special interest group values, this will be undertaken at a later stage.

The original project outline is provided in Appendix 4.

2.2 The Questionnaire – Development & Distribution

The Development Process

The development of the project questionnaire involved design of the questionnaire, establishing and implementing a distribution plan, and establishing and carrying out an advertising campaign.

The process generally was as follows –

- Review of other assessments of community values for Wellington Park to determine what approaches had been taken, what responses were obtained and what values had been identified.

- A review of approaches to the questionnaire, in particular whether to have open questions or not. Issues identified in this review were –
  - the difficulty of getting people to address values rather than management or desired uses (which they are most familiar with being asked about in relation to land areas),
  - the lack of experience that the public has with being asked to discuss how they value things/places, and
  - the difficulty of constructing a questionnaire that allows for respondents to describe how they value a place in an understandable way and one which does not constraint the responses, particularly given that there has been no previous systematic assessment of social values for Wellington Park.

The review suggested that open questions, supported by a checklist of potential values would allow for the most comprehensive and valid responses. It also indicated that the wording of the questionnaire was critical to help people understand what was required and to achieve a personal response and avoid management and ‘desired outcome’ responses.
• Development of the questionnaire and formatting it to be recognisable as a Wellington Park related document. The hard copy questionnaire was developed first. This was an iterative approach which revised the questions, comment, layout and style until a satisfactory result was obtained. An initial draft was trialled with two seniors groups.

• The on-line questionnaire was then developed from the hard copy questionnaire using the same questions, prompts and map. Some wording for the front page of the on-line Community Values Survey page was also developed and suitable images selected.

• The Survey was essentially launched in mid-September 2010 when the on-line questionnaire was available. Over the next 4-6 weeks the hard copies were distributed as per the distribution plan (see Questionnaire Distribution below).

The on-line and hard copies of the questionnaire were initially available until the end of December 2010. However, given the delay in getting the questionnaire distributed and as insufficient responses had been received by this time (partly due to the advertising being delayed), the availability of the on-line questionnaire was advertised as continuing until the end of March 2011.

In reality the on-line questionnaire was not removed from the website until the end of August 2011 and none of the hard copies were recalled until the same time, and all responses received up until the 31st August 2011 were used in the assessment.

• Advertising of the Community Values Survey was also undertaken from mid-September 2010. This included a range of community based and broader media options (see Questionnaire Advertising below) as planned or as the opportunity arose.

A more detailed questionnaire was also prepared to draft stage, but was not used for this project given the excellent response to the first questionnaire.

Questionnaire Design

The project questionnaire was designed as a basic two page questionnaire on a single A4 sheet. The hard copy version is reproduced in Appendix 1.

The questionnaire comprised –

• 1 tick box question to establish the respondent’s ‘level of attachment’ to the Park;

• 1 open ended question designed to elicit comment on the range of values held by the respondent (includes a prompt – a checklist of general categories of social value);

• 1 map of Wellington Park for the respondent to identify places of special value to them (also for use for orientation);

• 1 open ended question designed to elicit a response more specifically on the landscape values (this question was modified from a question in Barnes (1992));

• 1 question seeking basic demographic information for analysis, including age, gender, place of residence;

• 1 question asking if the respondent is interested in filling out a more detailed questionnaire to enable respondents who are interested to be notified if and when a more detailed questionnaire is to be used;

• summary information about the project (at start); and

• other information, including the mailing address for returning the completed questionnaire.

The online questionnaire had the same content, but a simpler appearance.
The open questions and supplementary information on the questionnaire were carefully worded to try and encourage responses about personal values and to avoid responses related to management, use and/or desired outcomes. This distinction was seen as fundamental given the values oriented nature of this assessment.

Questionnaire Distribution

The distribution of the questionnaire was via a number of avenues in order to reach as many of the local community as possible as economically as possible.

The planned distribution, carried out in October 2010, is shown in Figure 2. Some later opportunistic distribution occurred in late January – early February 2011. This is also shown in Figure 2 (italicised).

The distribution which occurred was different to that originally proposed (refer Appendix 4). This was due to some options not being possible due to time and/or cost constraints, or other difficulties.

The final distribution however did attempt to reach as many greater Hobart community members as possible without creating any particular biases. This was one of the reasons for relying heavily on public, in particular local government, mechanisms, and trying to get a balanced geographic distribution across the region.

Most of the local government community distribution opportunities were based on advice from the Community Development Officer in each Council. Different approaches were taken in the different municipalities as the community engagement programs vary from Council to Council.

As the emphasis of the project was on the greater Hobart region community, the above opportunities did not target visitors to the region. Visitors however were not discouraged from responding.

Questionnaires were not distributed to walking clubs and other special interest use groups (other than community associations) as this was considered to potentially create a bias in the results away from a general community response. These groups however are known to have a keen interest and individuals in these groups were considered likely to respond anyway. To avoid various biases, questionnaires were also not distributed within the Park or at key entrance points.

Questionnaire Advertising

Advertising of the Community Values Survey was considered critical to getting a good response, including in terms of numbers, geographic spread and wide ranging interest in the Park.

It was proposed to use the usual cost free advertising opportunities used for Wellington Park activities generally (ie, Mercury, local newspapers, radio, local community, newsletters and email lists of bushwalking, environmental, etc, group). A one page item in the Mercury (including the questionnaire) to encourage people to respond was also considered, but not followed up. A media release to get coverage on TV was also proposed, but not followed up.

The advertising was aimed at making the community aware of the project and Survey, and encouraging people to complete the forms online or otherwise, including if people did not value the Park in some way.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Mechanism</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WPMT Website</td>
<td>• on-line form</td>
<td>general / electronic media users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• downloadable form</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPMT Office</td>
<td>• hard copies posted to individuals on request</td>
<td>regional community – meets personalised needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handouts at the 2010 Mountain Festival events</td>
<td>• via the HCC and Festival organisers</td>
<td>greater Hobart community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Tasmania office (Macquarie Street, Hobart)</td>
<td>• questionnaire with A3 poster in WPMT stand in Service area</td>
<td>core community of Hobart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council offices in region</td>
<td>• questionnaire with A3 poster in Service area</td>
<td>regional community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Hobart City Council)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Clarence City Council)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Glenorchy City Council)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Brighton Council)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Derwent Valley Council)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Kingborough Council)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Huon Valley Council)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Select State Library branches</td>
<td>• questionnaire, and A3 poster</td>
<td>regional community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(State Library, Hobart)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Rosny LINC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Kingston LINC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Select POs near Wellington Park</td>
<td>• stand with questionnaire, and A3 poster</td>
<td>neighbouring communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Lenah Valley PO)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(South Hobart PO)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Select shops near Wellington Park</td>
<td>• stand with questionnaire, and A3 poster</td>
<td>neighbouring communities – especially rural communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Grove Shop)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sandfly Shop)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Fern Tree General Store)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Collinsvale Store &amp; PO)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Lachlan Valley Food &amp; Wine)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community centres</td>
<td>• via the relevant Community Development Officer</td>
<td>select local communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Kingston Community Health Centre)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Chigwell Community House)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(West Moonah Community House)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Goodwood Community House)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Collinsvale-Glenlusk Community Association)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenorchy Precinct Groups</td>
<td>• electronic and hard copy mailout via the Community Development Officer</td>
<td>Glenorchy residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brighton Alive</td>
<td>• mailout via the Community Development Officer</td>
<td>Glenorchy residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailout to Glenorchy Precinct Groups</td>
<td>• via the Community Development Officer</td>
<td>Glenorchy residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age based focus groups</td>
<td>• questionnaire distributed to groups by Project Officer (in one case accompanied by a presentation)</td>
<td>seniors (no school focus groups undertaken so this age group not targeted due to time constraints)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Rosny School for Seniors)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Koonya U3A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skyline Service Station (S. Hobart)</td>
<td>• stand with questionnaire, and A3 poster</td>
<td>local community (Feb 2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fern Tree Community Association</td>
<td>• distribution to all Fern Tree residents as February newsletter insert</td>
<td>local community (Feb 2011)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FIGURE 2**

*Questionnaire Distribution*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Mercury</td>
<td>16/9/2010</td>
<td>regional/state community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABC Radio</td>
<td>4/10/2010</td>
<td>regional community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCC Staff email list</td>
<td>20/10/2010</td>
<td>special focus local community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingborough Community email list</td>
<td>Oct 2010</td>
<td>special focus local community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Shore Sun</td>
<td>Nov 2010</td>
<td>local community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingborough Chronicle</td>
<td>Nov 2010</td>
<td>local community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Gazette (New Norfolk)</td>
<td>Nov 2010</td>
<td>local community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenorchy Gazette</td>
<td>Nov 2010</td>
<td>local community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huon Valley News</td>
<td>Nov 2010</td>
<td>local community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brighton Community News</td>
<td>Nov 2010?</td>
<td>local community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCC Bushcare Newsletter</td>
<td>Nov 2010</td>
<td>special focus local community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huon Valley Council</td>
<td>Nov 2010?</td>
<td>local community/special focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Mercury</td>
<td>12/1/2011</td>
<td>regional/state community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABC Radio</td>
<td>30/1/2011</td>
<td>regional community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Tasmanian</td>
<td>early Feb 2011?</td>
<td>regional/state community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABC Radio</td>
<td>early Feb 2011?</td>
<td>regional/state community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FIGURE 3**

Questionnaire Advertising
As well as advertising at the start it was proposed to have additional advertising towards the end of the response period to remind people about the Survey and to encourage those who had not responded to do so.

As it turned out, there was good newspaper, newsletter and email list advertising in the first eight weeks of the Survey, and intermittent radio and Mercury articles from then until February near the advertised March end of project. This meant that there were several public ‘reminders’ at different levels during the period of the Survey (Oct 2010 – March 2011).

The actual advertising is shown in Figure 3. Where possible (mainly in newspapers) one or more images were included. For solicited articles, the WPMT supplied images. These were carefully chosen to portray areas of the Park other Mount Wellington to indicate that the Survey was Park-wide. An A3 colour poster was also prepared (refer Appendix 1) to accompany the hard copy posters in public venues (see Figure 2) as a way of drawing attention to the Survey and encouraging people to complete the questionnaire.

2.3 The Values and their Analysis

Framework

There is a large field of analysis of place and people’s connection to place (as discussed for example by Barnes (1992) and Andrusko (2010)). This body of thought and research however has not been used in the present assessment as it tends to be use, primarily recreation based, or focussed on particular ways of valuing (eg, Williams & Stewart 1998), hence does not encompass the broad range of values (tangible and intangible) held by individuals. The other main body of work in the area of place and meaning is focussed on understanding the relationship between place and meaning, but at a largely theoretical level (eg, Tuan 1974).

The present study has therefore, based itself instead on cultural heritage and landscape, particularly cultural landscape, approaches. Its focus is the exploration of what is termed in cultural heritage studies, ‘social values’. The assessment was aimed at understanding the broad range of these social values for Wellington Park or parts of the Park.

The concepts of ‘meaning’ and ‘association’ which underpin the recognition of social value (as an aspect of cultural significance) in the Burra Charter (Australia ICOMOS 1999) have been used as the basis for recognising ‘social value’. The Burra Charter defines these two concepts as follows -

*Associations mean the special connections that exist between people and a place (Article 1.15). Associations may include social or spiritual values and cultural responsibilities for a place (Explanatory Note).*

*Meanings denotes what a place signifies, evokes or expresses (Article 1.16). Meanings generally relate to intangible aspects such as symbolic qualities and memories (Explanatory Note).*

Because this study deals with landscape, aesthetic value was also considered important. The Burra Charter defines aesthetic value as follows –

*Aesthetic value includes aspects of sensory perception for which criteria can and should be stated. Such criteria may include consideration of the form, scale, colour, texture and material of the fabric; the smells and sounds associated with a place and its use (Article 2.2).*

The assessment also allowed for other aspects of cultural significance as recognised in the Burra Charter (ie, historical, scientific and spiritual value) to be considered.
In order to avoid constraining responses these values were not made explicit in the questionnaire or related material. The short checklist of potential values in the questionnaire however was based on this framework, but also listed some ‘categories of value’ related to these types of value which might be expected to apply for Wellington Park (eg, the scenery, the views, places of beauty, the history, family reasons, what you do there). The recognition of discrete values however was needed to analyse the results. This is discussed below.

Identification of Values for the Analysis

To analyse the responses from the open questions a set of specific ‘social values’ was constructed. In order to construct the set of values, ‘categories’ of social value were recognised and within each ‘category’ individual values (value types) were identified. The categories of social value were derived from a synthesis of 1. Carys & Swanwick’s (2002, taken from Sheridan 2010) landscape ‘wheel’ which recognises a hierarchy of landscape elements that together make up a landscape; and 2. the values recognised by Pearson & Sullivan (1995) as making up ‘social value’ and ‘aesthetic value’. These two sets of values are shown in Figure 4. The landscape wheel is a holistic approach to describing or recognising landscape and was useful in ensuring that the range of landscape related values were considered.

Additional select local research with a strong social value and landscape emphasis was also used to help develop the categories and value types. This included the Sarah Island Conservation Management Plan (McConnell et al 2003), and the Mount Wellington Summit Area Historic Heritage Assessment (McConnell & Handsjuk 2010) reports. In addition, most of the Survey responses were briefly examined initially to determine the nature and range of values indicated in the responses.

The above sources were used to construct the following eight categories of value for the assessment analysis –

- Landscape Values
- Aesthetic Values
- Sense of Place
- Personal Connection and Meaning
- Personal Function
- General Function
- Essential Community Function
- Other Values (scientific and educational value)

These categories of value were divided into between two and eleven individual values (value types). These values were specifically relevant to each category (however some values apply to more than one category, in which case they were allocated to the most logical category).

---

12 The checklist was constructed from categories/types of social value in the Burra Charter (Australia ICOMOS 1999), Sullivan & Pearson (1995), a social values assessment study by the author and Anna Gurnhill for the Sarah Island Conservation Management Plan (McConnell et al 2003) and additional values (in particular landscape type values) that might be expected for Wellington Park based on previous work (Hepper & de Gryse 1994, Stoddart 2001).

13 As a number of respondents noted ways in which they thought the Park was important generally, rather than specifically important to them, it was necessary to develop these two categories, which otherwise might not have been considered.
The full suite of categories and values for each category is shown in Figure 5. The scheme in Figure 5 also shows how the bio-statistical data was integrated into the analysis.

Because some respondents were not explicit about how they valued Wellington Park, a small number of ‘general values’ were also introduced. These are column L (generic park value only), column M (Landscape/scenery general), and column Z (general aesthetic quality).

In undertaking the analysis it became clear that a number of the values could be subdivided. In order to avoid a very complex values analysis, it was decided not to sub-divide the values further, but to note these other values and the number of responses separately and report these as part of the findings in relation to that value (refer Section 3).

The Analysis

Given that the data are derived from responses to open ended questions, the analysis has been in two parts – one qualitative and one semi-quantitative.

The semi-quantitative analysis comprised analysis of a tabulated list of all responses. This analysis uses the questionnaire responses to identify where discrete values are being indicated in the response (see Identification of Values, above). This data was entered into an Excel spreadsheet. An example of the spreadsheet, showing the values recognised is provided in Appendix 2.

For each respondent, a numerical value of ‘1’ was allocated for each value a respondent was assessed as indicating, and a null value was used where a value was not identified. This enabled the number of responses to be summed for each value and for a single respondent. Graphs showing how many respondents indicated a particular value were then constructed for each value category, and these graphs have formed the basis of the semi-quantitative analysis. Additional graphs were constructed showing the percentage of respondents in particular categories (eg, age groups) that indicated individual values. More rigorous statistical treatment was not considered warranted given the nature and quality of the data.

Because of the richness of many of the responses and the unique, specific and often evocative wording of many of the responses, the more detailed, explanatory and illustrative comments have been tabulated, by individual. This tabulated list includes general values comment (the first main question), comment in relation to the ‘landscape question’ (the second main question), and lists, by individual response, places or features within Wellington Park specified as being personally important. This tabulated comment is provided as Appendix 3.

---

14 This scheme is the final scheme. The initial scheme was revised after processing approximately 50 responses which strongly indicated that new values needed to be recognised, and some re-organisation was required.
The above ‘wheel’ is taken from Sheridan (2010), but is initially derived from Landscape Character Assessment: Guidance for England and Scotland by Carys Swanwick and Land Use Consultants (2002), prepared for the Countryside Agency and Scottish Natural Heritage.

SPECIFIC SOCIAL & AESTHETIC VALUES RECOGNISED BY PEARSON & SULLIVAN (1995)

- landmark or signature
- Strong symbolic qualities
- Spiritual or traditional connection between past and present
- Represents/embodies important collective meanings
- Association with important events having a profound effect
- Symbolically represents the past in the present
- Represents attitudes, beliefs, behaviours fundamental to identify
- Essential function leading to attachment
- Longevity of user association
- abstract quality
- evocative response
- meaning
- landmark quality
- landscape integrity
**FIGURE 5**

Scheme of value categories and individual values developed for the analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENERAL DATA</th>
<th>IMPORTANCE - GENERAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Identifier</td>
<td>B Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifier</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response No</td>
<td>Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLXXX</td>
<td>HCXXX</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LANDSCAPE VALUES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M Landscape/ scenery general</th>
<th>N Weather/ skyscape</th>
<th>O Rocks/ geology/ landforms</th>
<th>P Natural vegetation &amp;/or fauna</th>
<th>Q Naturalness/ wilderness</th>
<th>R Specific natural value/ features</th>
<th>S View to Mt W'ton</th>
<th>T View general/ to Other</th>
<th>U View from Mt W'ton</th>
<th>V View from Springs</th>
<th>W View from general/ other</th>
<th>X Landscape integrity</th>
<th>Y Landscape connections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**AESTHETIC VALUES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Z Non-specific aesthetic quality/ beauty/ shape</th>
<th>AA Changeability/ variability (eg, weather, landscape)</th>
<th>AB Atmospheric (incl colour, mood, drama)</th>
<th>AC Sounds</th>
<th>AD Smells</th>
<th>AE Specific feature</th>
<th>AF Backdrop to home</th>
<th>AG Backdrop to city</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**SENSE OF PLACE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AH Context/ proximity to city</th>
<th>AI Sense of place/ spirit of place</th>
<th>AJ Landmark/ signature</th>
<th>AK Symbolic value/ Icon (of home/ Hbt)</th>
<th>AL Familiar/ comfortable/ evokes belonging/ represents home</th>
<th>AM Weather observation</th>
<th>AN Association with significant event</th>
<th>AO Identified special places</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Wellington Park Social Values & Landscape – An Assessment

McConnell, A. (March 2012)

A Wellington Park Management Trust Report
## PERSONAL - CONNECTION & MEANING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AP</th>
<th>AQ</th>
<th>AR</th>
<th>AS</th>
<th>AT</th>
<th>AU</th>
<th>AV</th>
<th>AW</th>
<th>AX</th>
<th>AY</th>
<th>AZ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spiritual</td>
<td>Renewal/</td>
<td>Peacefulness/</td>
<td>Sociableness</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Place to take</td>
<td>Memories</td>
<td>Commemoration</td>
<td>Celebration</td>
<td>Important to</td>
<td>Continuity or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>escape/</td>
<td>escape/</td>
<td>(incl time with</td>
<td>experience/</td>
<td>visitors/</td>
<td></td>
<td>/ memorial</td>
<td></td>
<td>be close to</td>
<td>regularity of use/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>health/</td>
<td>relaxation/</td>
<td>friends/</td>
<td>association</td>
<td>sightseeing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>wellbeing/</td>
<td>reflection/</td>
<td>community)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>perspective</td>
<td>solitude</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## PERSONAL - FUNCTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BA</th>
<th>BB</th>
<th>BC</th>
<th>BD</th>
<th>BE</th>
<th>BF</th>
<th>BG</th>
<th>BH</th>
<th>BI</th>
<th>BJ</th>
<th>BK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gatherings/</td>
<td>Walking</td>
<td>Dog walking</td>
<td>Rock climbing</td>
<td>Snow/</td>
<td>Bike riding</td>
<td>Trail bike</td>
<td>4WD</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>Strong personal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>picnics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Snowplay/</td>
<td></td>
<td>riding</td>
<td>driving</td>
<td>activities</td>
<td></td>
<td>meaning/definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>skiing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## PERSONAL/COMMUNITY - FUNCTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BL</th>
<th>BM</th>
<th>BN</th>
<th>BO</th>
<th>BP</th>
<th>BQ</th>
<th>BR</th>
<th>BS</th>
<th>BT</th>
<th>BU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>Connection to nature/</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Conservation</td>
<td>Fresh Water Provision</td>
<td>Scientific value</td>
<td>Historical Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>universe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes:

1. ‘Historical Value’ is only ascribed where respondents indicate they value the ‘history’ of the Park or parts of it. This value does not include valued ‘heritage’ (valuing of heritage was ascribed to BR (Conservation) except where a specific place or type of heritage was noted as being valued, in which case they have been included in ‘specific natural value/feature, or ‘identified special place’ as relevant).

2. ‘Scientific value’ is only ascribed where this is stated. All references to the maintenance or protection of natural and other values have been ascribed to BR (Conservation).

3. There were a small number of values indicated by respondents that were difficult to ascribe to one of the above values. The main values in this category were ‘affects way of being’ and ‘affects/defines lifestyle’ and similar. These types of values were ascribed to BK (strong personal meaning/definition of self/integral to life).

4. A number of respondents indicated that ‘snow’ was an important value of Wellington Park. Where it is clear that this value relates to aesthetics the snow value has been ascribed to the ‘special feature’ value within ‘Aesthetics’, in most other cases it has been ascribed to ‘snow/snow play’ in ‘Personal Function’, even though it is not always clear that using the snow is a part of the valuing.
3 RESULTS – ANALYSIS OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

3.1 Who Responded and How

There were 458 responses to the questionnaire which formed the basis of the Community Values Survey. Although this represents just under 0.2% of the greater Hobart population, this quantity of responses was considered a good result for a voluntary survey. It is also considered to provide an adequate sample (assuming no strong biases).

Who Responded

The following summarises who responded to the Survey, and is based on analysis of the bio-statistical data and general questions in the questionnaire.

Importance of Wellington Park to Respondent

- Almost all people who responded (98.7%) did so because Wellington Park was important to them in some way. This not an unexpected outcome from a voluntary survey, although respondents with a range of interests were desired.
- Three responses were received from people to whom Wellington Park was not important. These responses indicated that the Park was not valued at any level, mainly because they did not live anywhere near the Park.
- Three responses were received from people who had no particular interest (category ‘Don’t Care’) in Wellington Park. All these respondents however indicated that they did value the Park in some way (they indicated 1-3 values each), with one respondent noting it was a good place for communications towers.

Gender

- There was a good balance of responses from males and females with 232 (50.6%) responses from males and 215 (46.9%) responses from women (note - there were 11 responses with no gender information).
- With one exception responses were from individuals, with only one response being a combined response from 2 people (identified as ‘C’ in tabulation). There were also several cases where separate responses were received from couples (identified as such from the same surname and address).

Age

- The proportion of responses in different age groups was:
  - 0-20  11  2.4%
  - 21-40  145  31.6%
  - 41-60  178  38.9%
  - +60  102  22.2%
  [note - there was no age data from 23 (4.9%) respondents]
- There was therefore a relatively good balance of responses from the age groups 20-40 yrs, 40-60 yrs and +60 yrs. (The older age group was bolstered by the 33 responses from the two older age focus groups).
• Young people (0-20 years) are very poorly represented in the Survey, being only 2.4% of the respondents, as opposed to a desired c.25%. This supports the original proposal to include some younger age focus groups (using schools).

Geographic Spread
• Generally the geographic spread within the greater Hobart region and Park neighbour areas was excellent (and better than hoped for) with responses from a spread of localities (refer Figure 6). This is considered to provide a minimally biased geographic basis for analysis of the values for the region.

• The majority of responses (387 / 84.5%) were from the greater Hobart region and Park neighbour areas, but there were a small number (54 / 11.8%) from Tasmania more broadly, although mostly the southern part15, a small number (6 / 1.3%) of interstate responses and 3 (0.6%) overseas responses (these were mostly people who had lived in Tasmania previously and who had moved away) (note - there were 15 responses with no location information) (refer Figure 6).

• Although the geographic spread is broad for the greater Hobart region (extending to Bridgewater and Brighton, Lauderdale, Tinderbox and Snug), as might be expected the greatest number of responses were received from those suburbs closer to the Park, and there tends to be a drop off away from the Park. The Eastern shore suburbs have a relatively high number of responses and this is presumed to be due to the prominent views to Mount Wellington from this area.

• South Hobart and Fern Tree have the highest numbers of responses of any suburb (44 and 27, respectively). While the highest response might be expected from these suburbs which are both neighbouring areas and close Hobart suburbs, the very high number of responses from South Hobart was not expected.

• There were responses from most of the recognised Park neighbour areas (Collinsvale, Lachlan, Crabtree16, Mountain River and Leslie Vale (& Fern Tree, Mount Stuart & Lenah Valley), but these were relatively low outside of the Hobart suburbs. It is interesting that while a relatively high number of responses were received from the city of Glenorchy area, no responses were received from the Park neighbour areas of West Moonah, Tolosa and Merton.

• 120 (26.2%) respondents indicated that they had previously lived close to Wellington Park. This included 2 of the 3 overseas respondents, and all of the interstate respondents. Of the 54 Tasmanian respondents not living in either the greater Hobart or a Park neighbour area, 31 (57.5%) had previously lived in this area (ie, closer to Wellington Park). The other respondents in this category had moved within the greater Hobart region and Park neighbour area.

• The above suggests that a number of people choose to live relatively close to Wellington Park, and this is supported by a number of the written responses.

15 The higher number of responses from the South region of Tasmania appears to be a real reflection that it is more valued in the south, however there is a slight bias from the Koonya focus group responses which result in a higher number of responses from the Tasman and Forestier Peninsula areas.

16 The number of Crabtree responses (10) is disproportionately high and appears to be higher than might be expected because of the current concerns about logging in the White Timber Mountain area.
### FIGURE 6

#### Breakdown of responses by locality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Area total</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overseas (USA &amp; Switzerland)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSW</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasmanian</td>
<td></td>
<td>441</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Tasmanian (outside greater Hobart)</td>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>(New Norfolk, Molesworth, Pelverata, Huonville, Franklin,</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cygnet, Raminea, Channel (below Conningham), Lunawanna,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tea Tree, Mt Direction, Richmond, Penna, Seven-Mile Beach,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sorrell, Dodges Ferry, Forestier Peninsula, Tasman Peninsula)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East</td>
<td>(Launceston, Tamar, Hadsen, Westbury)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>(all Devonport)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Hobart</td>
<td></td>
<td>359</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(HCC)</td>
<td>Hobart (&amp; Battery Point, Glebe)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West Hobart</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North Hobart</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mount Stuart</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Town</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lenah Valley</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sandy Bay</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mount Nelson</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dynnryme (&amp; Tolmans Hill)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ridgeway</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Hobart</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fern Tree</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(KC)</td>
<td>Taroona (&amp; Bonnet Hill)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kingston</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blackmans Bay</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Howden / Tinderbox</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Margate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Snug / Conningham</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(GCC)</td>
<td>Moonah</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lutana</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Glenorchy</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Montrose / Goodwood</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chigwell / Berriedale / Rosetta</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Austins Ferry / Claremont</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(DVC)</td>
<td>Granton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(BC)</td>
<td>Bridgewater</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brighton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Old Beach</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(CCC)</td>
<td>Otago/Risdon Vale</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Geilston Bay</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lindisfarne (&amp; Rose Bay)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Montagu / Rosny / Rosny Park / Mornington</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bellerive</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Howrah (&amp; Tranmere)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Arm (Cremorne, Lauderdale, Clifton Bch)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Neighbouring Areas</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collinsvale</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lachlan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Crabtree</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lucaston</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grove</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mountain River</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leslie Vale</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sandfly / Kaoota</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 – There is an unresolved discrepancy in this figure - the sum of responses add up to 361, not 354 as they should if the total is 458 responses.
• A small number of respondents (13 / 2.8%) indicated that they had previously lived close to Wellington Park and gave the same postcode as their present residence. This response suggests that 1. the question was interpreted as requiring a response regardless of where people lived now (although intended for people not living close now) or 2. the response indicates the importance of continued residential proximity to the Park by these respondents. This was particularly the case for a relatively large number of younger respondents (0-40 yrs) who indicated that they had previously lived close to Wellington Park, but from the given postcodes appear to have not moved or not moved far.

How People Responded

The following summarises how people responded to the Survey, and what influenced them to respond and their responses. It is based on analysis of the nature and timing of questionnaires received (the receipt of questionnaires was tracked) and the nature and timing of distribution of the questionnaire and the advertising of the Community Values Survey.

Online versus hard copy responses

• Of the 458 responses, only 104 (22.6%) were on the hard copy forms, with the rest 356 (77.4%) being online responses. If the focus groups responses are not considered (these were on hard copy forms), then only 19.3% of responses were on hard copies compared to 80.7% online responses.
• Since almost 3,000 hard copies of the questionnaire were distributed, and more in electronic format, this indicates that there is a strong preference by people to use online questionnaires.
• There appears to be no significant preference for any one age group to favour hard copies over an online response. There is however a slight trend for older respondents to use hard copies with the hard copy responses in each age group being (with the focus group responses removed) – 0-20 yrs – 9.1%; 21-40 yrs – 6.2%; 41-60 yrs – 13.5%; +60 yrs – 20.0%).

Legitimate – Non-legitimate Responses

• Only 4 non-legitimate responses (not included in the response count) were received. These were all online responses. Two had nonsense/irrelevant comment for all responses, 1 had “Cable Car Now” for each response, and 1 respondent misinterpreted the questionnaire, interpreting it as a place to ask questions about visiting the Park. Given the online survey was available for almost nine months, this low number of non-legitimate responses is considered to be a very responsible use of the online survey.

Influencing the Responses

• The number and overall rate of response is considered relatively low for a population centre the size of Hobart. The response received reflects the views of only c.0.2% of the population of greater Hobart. The average rate of response is c.16.4/week (2.3/day) in the main project period (advertised period), or 9.3 .week (1.3/day) over the full period the questionnaire was available.

17 Note – because of the long time frame for making a response, two respondents replied twice. In both cases the two responses have been conflated into a single response. This therefore gives 458 respondent responses, not 460 actual responses.
• The rate of responses was significantly improved in direct response to the major project advertising (Mercury articles and radio interviews). This is clearly shown in the online response rate. Without advertising, the online response rate was between c.3/day and <1/week; but with advertising (newspaper or radio), the online response rate increased significantly. The most marked increases were from the early ABC radio interview which created a jump from 1/day to 15/day, and the January 2011 two page Mercury article which resulted in a jump from 2/day to 68/day. These peaks however are very short lived (a one day very high peak which then tails off over 3 to 6 days).

• The general rate of response and the effect of the advertising indicate that insufficient responses would have been received without the advertising.

• Although this has not been specifically analysed, there are small peaks in the numbers of responses received from particular regions (eg, Huonville, Derwent Valley, Clarence) and it is likely, given when they occur and their nature, that the advertising in the local newspapers has been responsible for this, as well as some influence by local word of mouth initiated by the advertising.

Other Influences on the Responses

• Most responses appear to be genuine, personal responses with no particular influences evident. There are a small number of responses however that appear to have been strongly influenced by two current issues - the cable car for Mount Wellington (c.25 responses) and mountain biking (c.50 responses) – and can be considered to slightly skew the responses. The use of the two older age focus groups, which inadvertently contained a significant numbers of keen bushwalkers, has also slightly skewed the responses (max 38 responses) in favour of walking.

• There is a sharp peak in responses (from c.2/day to 23/day) in late January/early February 2011. These responses are almost all from people for whom mountain biking is an important Park use, and this peak therefore appears to be a response to lobbying within the mountain biking community to make sure their interests were heard (see also comment next section). This sharp peak in responses was possibly artificially enhanced because of the consultation being undertaken at about this time for the development of the local regional mountain bike strategy.

• There were also several responses that appear to have been influenced by the cable car for Mount Wellington debate. However, only one response did not address the questions asked in the questionnaire (see Legitimate – Non-legitimate Responses above).

How Well People Describe Social Value & Landscape Value

• The responses were very variable in terms of how the values were described, with between 1 and 26 specific values being noted per respondents.

• It is obviously difficult to know whether a small number of values reflect low valuing or a simple approach to valuing Mount Wellington, or difficulty in articulating how they value the Park. There was a sense in analysing the responses that the respondents, although clearly valuing the Park in many different ways, found it difficult to tease out different values and to articulate how the Park was important to them. This is not unexpected in a culture such as ours where talking about personal emotions is not encouraged.

• The responses (albeit a relatively small number) which noted ‘most of the above’ (referring to the values checklist) or something similar in the main question, are taken as an indication that in some cases people found it difficult to identify how they valued the
park and it was easier to use the checklist and not provide a more personal response. Most of these responses did however add further information in their own words.

- The most striking indication that people found it difficult to articulate how they personally value something is from the responses received immediately following the January 2011 Mercury article. This was the only newspaper article that included personal statements (from a small number of people) about valuing the Park. The responses received for about 2 weeks after this article was published have a greater range of values stated, and more personal values are provided. It is as if seeing how others valued the Park gave respondents licence to more fully detail their own, strongly personal views about what the Park meant to them.

- The way in which the second main question (about if Wellington Range was low hills) was answered also suggests that, apart from views, people often have difficulty describing landscape values, and to a lesser extent social values. In a significant number of cases however the responses to this second main question contributed considerable additional significant values information. This appears to be because it requires a reaction to a particular situation, and people find it easier to respond to a specific scenario rather than a totally open question.

In some cases it appears that this more focussed question prompted a stronger and more ‘emotional’ response as is indicated in the OL250 response –

**Response to Q1:**

*To me the park is somewhere I can easily get to if I want to be apart from the hustle and bustle of life.*

**Response to Q2:**

*The ‘aloofness’ of the altitude and the road climbing out of the maelstrom below has a special magic.*

- There were also a number of responses that described wholly, or in part, why they thought the Park was important generally (ie, to others) rather than to themselves. (It was to accommodate this type of response that the *Personal/Community Function* and *Essential Community Function* categories of value were included in the analysis.)

- Respondents also had some difficulty describing actual landscape values and aesthetic values, and this is reflected in the number of respondents who made only (or largely) a general statement about the landscape being important or aesthetic values being important. In these cases where a landscape value was being indicated, the terms ‘scenery’, ‘landscape’, ‘topography’ and ‘terrain’ were frequently used without any qualification; and where an aesthetic value was being ascribed, a term such as ‘lovely’ or ‘beautiful’ was used without any more detailed description.

- It is very clear from the responses (wording and/or types of value stated) that most people value Mount Wellington rather than the full Park. Only around 38 (8.3%) responses explicitly indicated that the whole of the Park was important to them (refer Appendix 3).

- Although the survey attempted through the questions and supporting information to get respondents to indicate values rather than talk about management, there were still a significant number of responses (123 / 26.9%) that included comment about the management of the Park. There was no appreciable difference between online and hard copy responses in this respect.

Comment about management related mainly to the following–

- new infrastructure (including support and opposition for a cable car, desire for a cafe, a desire to see the summit remain minimally developed);
remedying eyesores (primarily the present communications tower and observation shelter);
- condition of the walking tracks (positive and negative responses)
- numbers and variety of walking tracks (comment mainly very positive);
- numbers and variety of bike riding tracks (comment both positive and negative);
- more 4WD access and trail bike access;
- maintaining the ability to drive to the summit;
- weed problems; and
- fire management.

3.2 How People Value the Park Generally

The survey results indicate that people value the Park for a wide range of reasons.

- Overall, 4,291 individual values were noted by the 458 respondents. This is an average of between 9 and 10 individual values per respondent\(^{18}\), although as noted above, each respondent indicated between 1 and 26 specific values for the Park.

- Figure 7 (below) indicates to what degree each broader category of value is valued. It indicates that all categories of value are valued by the community.

- Figure 7 indicates that it is the Landscape Values and Sense of Place Values that are most important to people. The relatively high valuing of these two categories might be expected given that most respondents might be expected to focus on the values of the visually prominent Mount Wellington. The Aesthetic Values however are almost as strongly valued as the Sense of Place Values. As discussed in Section 3.3, many of the Aesthetic Values are strongly related to the Landscape Values. The degree of valuing for each of these categories represents valuing by an averaged c.18-20% respondents.

- Personal meaning, connection and function (Personal Meaning & Connection and Personal & Community Function) are the next most valued categories. The degree of valuing for each of these categories represents valuing by an averaged c.12.5-15.5% respondents.

- Essential Community Function and Other Values (scientific and historical values) are the two least valued categories. The degree of valuing for each of these categories represents valuing by an averaged c.11% and 7% respondents, respectively. This lower valuing may be a function of the survey (which asked respondents to note how they personally valued the Park) and might be higher if respondents were specifically asked if they thought these were important values of the Park.

- With respect to individual recognised values (refer Figure 5), all of these except trail bike riding were valued to some extent by the respondents.\(^{19}\)

- The degree to which the individual values are valued varies considerably, ranging from 0 (ie, indicated by 0 (0%) respondents) to 284 responses (ie, indicated by 284 (62.0%) respondents).

\(^{18}\) It should be noted that 10 (2.2%) respondents did not note specific values although they said the Park was important to them.

\(^{19}\) As there is ongoing illegal trail bike riding in Wellington Park, this is clearly a value held by some people, but not by those who responded to the survey.
The most highly valued values are:
1. the landscape and the aesthetics of the Park at a non-specific level;
2. the native biota;
3. the naturalness/wilderness quality of the Park;
4. its location next to Hobart, as a natural area next to Hobart, or bookending Hobart with the Derwent on the other side; and
5. the ability to walk in the Park.

The highest valued value is walking (Personal Function, 284 responses) with over half the respondents noting this as a value.

The next highest values are Naturalness/Wilderness (Landscape, 212 responses), Landscape General (Landscape, 206 responses), Proximity to City/Context (Sense of Place, 190 responses), Aesthetic General (Aesthetic, 169 responses) and Native Flora & Fauna (Landscape, 169 responses). This represents valuing by 33% to 50% of respondents.

Note – only 1 response to a single value is allocated per respondent. This means that the maximum response a single value can have is 458 (although in reality this figure is 445 (ie, 10 respondents less for those who only indicated they generally valued the Park and a further 3 respondents less for those who indicated they do not value Wellington Park)).

Note - the graph looks very much the same when the summed values for each category are plotted.

Mainly on tracks which were generally described as providing a good network, good access to a variety of locations/environments, and being of good quality.
- The next highest set of values, valued by 25% to 33% of respondents, are the atmospheric nature (moods, drama, colour, snow, etc) of Mount Wellington (Aesthetics, 122 responses), accessibility (primarily easy to get to/close) (Personal & Community Function, 121 responses), importance as representing Hobart/giving a sense of place (Sense of Place, 120 responses), and identified special places (Sense of Place, 120 responses) and Specific Natural Values/Features (Landscape, 114 responses).

- Bike riding (Personal Function) was also highly valued, with this value noted by 110 respondents, which is just under 25% of respondents.23

- What is perhaps unexpected is that the views to and from Mount Wellington/Park were not valued by more respondents. Although amongst the more important values, these views are only valued by around 20% of respondents (94 and 85 respondents, respectively), and other views to and from Wellington Park were less valued.

3.3 The Landscape, Visual & Aesthetic Values

General
Although the questionnaire asked for people to describe the values of Wellington Park as opposed to Mount Wellington, it is very clear from the responses that most people value Mount Wellington and the attributes of Mount Wellington, and not the full Park. This is believed to result from the community having less experience of, and engagement with, the full Park or areas away from Mount Wellington, largely because other areas of the Park are much less accessible and only visible from lower population area.24 This affects the community valuing for all value categories, including the landscape, visual and aesthetic values.

As noted above, after walking in the Park, some of the landscape and aesthetic values are the most highly valued attributes of Wellington Park (and Mount Wellington) for the community. A number of aesthetic values, personal meanings and functions and essential community function values that are of high-moderate importance are landscape dependent, in particular on the high relief (height) of the Wellington Range and Mount Wellington and on the steep slopes. These result in considerable variation in plants, views and experiences over a short distance; a distinctive profile or shape to Mount Wellington and the skyline of the range; and atmospheric and changeable weather and skyscapes, all of which are highly valued attributes of the Park.

The importance of the landscape attributes in valuing the Park are clearly evident in the responses to the second main question (survey analysis column K) – “If Mount Wellington and all of Wellington Park were low hills rather than a mountain range, how do you think this would affect your appreciation of Wellington Park ...”.

Only 34 (7.4%) respondents indicated that it would have no effect, and only 6 (1.3%) were unsure, while 77.7% (356) of respondents indicated that such a landscape change would affect how they valued the Park.25 Of the 356 respondents who felt that such a landscape change...
would affect how they valued the park, 320 (90%) indicated that such a landscape change would strongly affect how they valued the Park; the others indicated it would have some affect.

Where actual values were indicated in the responses to this question these were fed into the values matrix. The majority of these indicated that it would affect their sense of place (‘Hobart wouldn’t be Hobart without the Mountain’), their views, their ability to have varied experiences in a small area (close to Hobart), it would lessen their ability to enjoy the snow (visually & recreationally), and that it would remove an important landmark from Hobart (refer Appendix 3 for a selection of comments).

**Landscape Values** (refer Figure 8)

- Based on the responses, the landscape generally and its naturalness and wilderness quality were the most important landscape values. The native flora and fauna were also highly valued, and a number and variety of specific natural features were also noted as being of particular importance to various respondents. The skyscape (including weather) and geology and landforms were valued, but by a much lesser number of respondents.

- The most highly valued attribute of the Park landscape (and of the Park after walking) is its naturalness and wilderness quality26 (valued by 212 (47.3%) respondents). Although these attributes have been considered together, the naturalness and wilderness qualities appear to be seen as different qualities by the respondents. The naturalness value appears to derive from the extremely limited amount of disturbance that has occurred in the Park (and from the regrowth from fires and other historical disturbance), particularly on the summit plateau, and from the native vegetation that clothes the slopes of Mount Wellington and the Wellington Range. Landscape integrity was specifically noted as a value by 6 respondents.

The wilderness quality appears to derive from the naturalness of the Park, in particular the continuous, undeveloped extent of native vegetation from the summit of Mount Wellington (and in some cases eastern slopes) into southwest Tasmania, and the largely untracked nature of the Park west of the summit of Mount Wellington (or publically inaccessibility of this area, except on foot). While in many cases the location of the ‘wilderness quality’ was not specified and can be assumed to apply to all of the more natural areas of the Park, the respondent’s comments indicate that this quality applies particularly to the ‘back of the Park’ (ie west of the Mount Wellington summit) and to the plateau.

The naturalness and wilderness values appear to be important as ‘existence’ values (because they are there), as visual values (for the views that can be obtained), and as ‘use’ values (ie, which can be appreciated from within).

- A related value was landscape connection, which was indicated by 41 (9.2%) respondents. The majority of people who noted this value indicated that it was the connection of the Park and Mount Wellington (which they saw as the edge of Hobart), with its native vegetation, to the essentially natural areas to the west. A small number saw Wellington Park as being a significant part of the setting of Hobart or of other areas adjacent to the Park.

26 ‘Wilderness’ is used here, rather than for example ‘wildness’, as this is the term used by respondents. It is a perceived quality and expresses a specific quality not encompassed by ‘wildness’.
The landscape general value, the second most valued landscape attribute (valued by 169 (46.0%) respondents), reflects a range of attributes. It appears that many respondents found it very difficult to articulate what the actual landscape attributes that they valued were, and most frequently used the term ‘scenery’ to refer to these attributes. Some more specific attributes were noted, such as the ‘height’ of Mount Wellington, its ‘dominance’, its ‘size’, and its ‘shape’, as well as respondents using terms such as ‘spectacular’ and ‘impressive’.

Overall, it appears that the most valued landscape attributes are 1. the large size and particular shape of Mount Wellington resulting from its height and steep slopes; and 2. the scenery, which is taken to be the essential natural features of the Mountain and range more generally – the rock formations, the native vegetation and other natural features. This is reflected in the high valuing of the naturalness of the Park and the number of specific natural features noted as being of value by the respondents.

The native vegetation and fauna was the third most valued landscape attribute (valued by 206 (37.7%) respondents). The responses indicate that it is the native vegetation that is most valued, with fauna being much less important. This is also indicated by the importance of the naturalness of the Park (see above) and the large number of specific native vegetation features valued (see below and table, Figure 8).

A particular aspect of importance in the valuing of the native vegetation is the variability of the vegetation over such a short distance, due mainly to the major vegetation cline that exists within the Park, particularly from the lower slopes of Mount Wellington to the summit (see also Aesthetic Values – Changeability). This cline is a specifically noted value by a number of respondents. The alpine and subalpine vegetation appears to be particularly valued communities.

The skyscape/weather was the next most valued landscape attribute, but was significantly less important (valued by 71 (15.8%) respondents) (this is distinct from using the Mountain for weather forecasting or an articulated aesthetic value derived from the skyscape – see below). This value appears to relate to the variety of skyscapes that occur over Mount Wellington and, to a lesser extent, the spectacular nature of many of these skyscapes, including in relation to the occurrence of snow, cloud formations, the mists which hang over the Mountain, and the colour (primarily from sunsets and sunrises). The fact that the Wellington Range creates a special climate (weather/weather pattern) for Hobart is also part of this valuing by a number of respondents, and this would appear to contribute to the sense of place that Mount Wellington creates for Hobart.

The geology and landforms landscape attribute was also valued, but by only by a small proportion of respondents (valued by 22 (4.9%) respondents). This value is in fact an amalgam of a variety of geo-values, including the rocks and rock formations of Wellington Park, the geology and the geological history, and the landforms. Specifically noted geological landform/landscape value types included periglacial landform features, caves (Lost World?), the columnar jointed dolerite, the cliffs, and the potato fields/boulder fields (refer table, Figure 8). Other than the periglacial features, the specifically noted landform values appear to be valued more as general landscape features than as geological features.

Just over 25% (114) of respondents specified one or more natural values of value to them. As can be seen from the table in Figure 8, the alpine environment is a significantly highly valued specific feature, with 34% (39) respondents who specified a value27 identifying the alpine environment as being of importance to them.

27 This equates to 8.7% of all survey respondents.
### FIGURE 8
Response rates for the *Landscape Values* category

![Graph showing response rates for different landscape values categories](image)

#### Specific Natural Values Noted by Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Natural Value</th>
<th>No of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Flora</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpine environment</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-alpine environment</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainforest</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heathland</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildflowers</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchids</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waratah</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banksia</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fungi</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosses/lichen</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berries</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferns/femeters</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foliage</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wattles</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tall/big trees</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Octopus Tree</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Space &amp; Water</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remoteness</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean &amp; fresh</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mists</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runoff after storms</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fauna</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anaspidites</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snakes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Echidna</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallaby</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wedge-tailed Eagles</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Cockatoo</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birds</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birdsong</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landform &amp; Geology</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shape/skyline</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rocky peaks</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cliffs/rocky escarpments</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columnar jointing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organ Pipes</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Continued next page -*
Specific Natural Values Noted by Respondents - continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Natural Value</th>
<th>No of Responses</th>
<th>Natural Value</th>
<th>No of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disappearing tarn full</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cathedral Rock</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpine pools of water</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sphinx Rock</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ice on puddles</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Boulder slopes/potato</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fields</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rivers/creeks</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Rock formations</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterfalls</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Caves</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellington Falls</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Geological history</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(ancestral, solid, enduring)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Heritage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage sites</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological sites</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Specific flora values appear to be more valued than other natural values with the greatest number of specified features (16) and with wildflowers and ferns/ferneries being relatively highly valued features.

Only 8 fauna values were specified, but overall these were not valued by many respondents, with the most valued of these being birds, identified as being important by 10 respondents, and birdsong, identified by 2 respondents.

Water features appear to be the next most highly valued specific natural features after flora features, with rivers/creeks being valued by 17 (14.9%) respondents who noted specific features, and waterfalls by 21 (18.4%) respondents (with Wellington Falls specifically being noted by 4 respondents). The extent of the Park was specifically noted by 4 respondents as being important to them.

Interestingly, although the geology and landforms value was only valued by 22 respondents, a greater number of respondents noted geological and landform features as being of importance to them as individual features. The shape of the Mountain and/or Range, the cliffs and the boulder fields were noted as being important by 8 or more respondents, with cliffs being noted by 15 respondents, of which 5 responses specifically identified the Organ Pipes. The other named natural features of importance were Cathedral Rock and Sphinx Rock.

- Cultural heritage, including archaeology was noted as being important, but only by a small number (8) of respondents.

Views & Viewscapes\textsuperscript{28} (refer Figure 8)

- The views appear to have less importance to the community than many other values. Given the prominence of Mount Wellington and the historical and contemporary anecdotal evidence that suggests the views to and from Mount Wellington at least are highly valued, the relatively low valuing of the views indicated by the survey is unexpected. Overall, views (both looking in and looking out) can be considered to be moderately valued, with no views being valued by more than 21% of respondents.

\textsuperscript{28} This set of values is about the views and viewscapes that are valued. It is distinct from, and does not include, the actual ‘landscapes’ or ‘landscape features’ that are valued, which are considered above under ‘Landscape Values’.
The views to and from Mount Wellington are the most valued views, with these being valued by 94 (20.9%) and 85 (19.0%) respondents, respectively. The views from Mount Wellington (presumed to be from the summit) are likely to be higher than indicated in the analysis, as the next most important view (also indicated by 19% of respondents) is views generally from the Park, and it is presumed that this includes views from Mount Wellington (but this has not been specified because it is so ‘obvious’ to the respondent). The valuing of the views to Mount Wellington is also likely to be higher than indicated in the analysis as this view is, similarly, incorporated in view to other/general (noted by 13.4% of respondents). The importance of Wellington Park/Mount Wellington as a backdrop to people’s homes or to the city (15.0% and 23.2% of respondents respectively) also suggest that the views to the Mountain and the Wellington Range are more valued than indicated by the survey analysis.

Many respondents commented on ‘where’ the view to Mount Wellington was important from. Explicit comments indicate that the views generally from the city and from the Tasman Highway on the way in from the airport were the most significant views to Mount Wellington. Valued views to Mount Wellington (and to a lesser extent the Wellington Range) were also indicated from the Brooker Highway and Channel Highway, and from as far away as Pontville (from the Midlands Highway) and Huonville.

The only other specific views that were identified by respondents were to the Organ Pipes (5 respondents), Sleeping Beauty (3 respondents) and Cathedral Rock (1 respondent).

The analysis indicates that as far as explicit view related values are concerned, the views generally from or from specific locations in the Park are equally as important as those from Mount Wellington (although as noted above this ‘general’ view value is considered likely to include views from the summit). Places within the Park specifically mentioned as being important places to look out from, other than the summit, were –

- The Springs 2 respondents
- Sphinx Rock 3 “
- Organ Pipes Track 4 “
- Organ Pipes 2 “
- Zig Zag Track 2 “
- Pinnacle Road 2 “
- Trestle Mountain 1 respondent
- Milles Track 1 “
- Pipeline Track 1 “
- South Wellington 1 “
- (boulder field)

Some of the reasons given for valuing these views out from Wellington Park included because they are from high viewing places, and because one can see a variety of views - from short distance to far distance views.

The comment on the views and viewscapes was not easy to analyse for a variety of reasons (eg, lack of specificity, and confusion with other values), and the results are therefore considered to be a relatively poor indicator of how various views to and from Wellington Park are valued. This is an area that warrants more research.²⁹

Aesthetic (& Other Perceptual) Values (refer Figure 9)

As with the Landscape Values, the Aesthetic Values appear to be something people find hard to describe. As a consequence there is a relatively large number of responses (169 (37.7%) of respondents) that indicate an aesthetic appreciation or valuing of Wellington.

²⁹ It might be useful to test this suite of values in a more detailed survey.
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Park (again with the emphasis on Mount Wellington) at a general or non-specific level. Terms used to indicate this were mainly the ‘beauty’ and the ‘loveliness’ of the Park (or Mountain).

- The second most highly valued aesthetic quality was the *atmosphere* of the Park, primarily Mount Wellington. Atmospheric qualities described included – the moods of the Mountain, the drama, the power, the mystery, the colours, and the light on the Mountain. This value was indicated by 122 (27.2%) respondents.

- The *changeability/variability* of the Park (again primarily Mount Wellington) was also relatively highly-moderately valued, with this value being indicated by 105 (23.4%) respondents. This value in part refers to the changing conditions on the Mountain (eg, the changing weather and light, or the seasons or the snow, and contribute, or can be seen to be related to, the atmosphere of the Mountain. For some respondents however it also means the variation in landscape, environments, views out, etc, across the Park, largely, but not entirely, related to altitudinal differences. This is not a common type of value for a place and it is interesting that it is indicated in some way by such a large number of respondents. This should probably be considered a perceptual, rather than aesthetic or visual value.

- The two other non-visual perceptual values of sounds and smells were only valued by a very small number of respondents, but they are indicated values. Smells were considered of importance by 8 respondents, and sounds were considered important by 5 respondents.

![FIGURE 9
Response rates for the Aesthetic Values category](image-url)
• An aesthetic appreciation of having the Mountain or Wellington Range as a *backdrop to the city* was high-moderately valued (indicated by 104 (23.2%) respondents), and the appreciation of having Mountain or Wellington Range as a *backdrop to their home* was also moderately valued, with 67 (15.0%) respondents indicating this value.

• A number of specific features were mentioned by 53 (11.8%) respondents as being of importance for apparently aesthetic reasons. The numbers of times these values were indicated was not tabulated in the analysis, but those aesthetic qualities which were most frequently noted were (in approximate order of importance) –

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>- of major importance</th>
<th>- of minor importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>snow</td>
<td>sun on the Organ Pipes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sunrises</td>
<td>waratah in bloom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sunsets</td>
<td>snow gums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lush green vegetation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>modern stonework in the new tracks &amp; seats</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4 Sense of Place  (refer Figure 10)

• *Sense of Place* values appear to be held at about the same level as *Aesthetic Values*, with one very strongly valued attribute, and the other attributes being moderately and less valued. The strongest sense of place values indicated appear to relate to Mount Wellington rather than to the Park as a whole.

• The major value overall, and the most highly valued sense of place attribute, is the *context of the Park*. This value was indicated by 190 (42.4%) respondents. The ‘context’ is primarily the proximity of the Park, in particular Mount Wellington, to the city, but also for some respondents it is the fact that the Park bounds Hobart on one side and the Derwent bounds it on the other (ie, the fact that Hobart is located between two significant natural landscape features). The proximity of the Park in this case is a ‘sense of place’ value, and does not mean ‘accessibility’ or ‘views’ (values which are in the other categories *Personal/Community Function* and *Landschapes*, respectively), although there may be elements of these values incorporated.

• The next most important Sense of Place value, indicated by 120 (26.8%) respondents, is *sense of place/spirit of place*. This means that the presence of the Park (or Mount Wellington) is important in making Hobart what it is. This was reflected in a number of responses by the comment “Hobart would not be Hobart without the Mountain (or Wellington Range)”. It is assumed from the comments and highly valued attributes, that the height, shape and essential naturalness of the Mountain and the Range are important contributors to this sense or spirit of place.30

---

30 ‘Sense of place’ and ‘spirit of place’ (genius loci) would normally be treated as separate values, however given the nature of the survey and the responses, it was often difficult to tease out which one of these two values was being indicated, hence the two were treated together. Places said to have a strong ‘sense of place’ have a strong identity and character that is deeply felt by local inhabitants and by many visitors (‘Sense of Place’, Wikipedia, 23/11/2011). In contrast, ‘spirit of place’ refers to the ‘unique, distinctive and cherished aspects of a place; often those celebrated by artists and writers, but also those cherished in folk tales, festivals and celebrations. It is thus as much
A number of respondents (60 / 13.4%) indicated that Mount Wellington was important (often very important) to them because it symbolised home, including through evoking a sense of belonging and/or because it was so familiar. A number of respondents, noted that this feeling occurred when arriving home from being away (intra- and inter- state) and seeing Mount Wellington again. This valuing is seen as separate to ‘spirit of place’ as it is more personal and more specifically about home and belonging, rather than giving the place an important, identifying feel or quality.

A number of respondents (90 / 20.1%) also indicated that in their view Mount Wellington was an important landmark or signature, primarily of Hobart, but for a few respondents it was more of a regional landmark or signature.31

Mount Wellington appears to be considered more important as a landmark or signature than as an icon or symbol of Hobart, as this value was only indicated by (33 / 7.4%) respondents.

A small number of respondents (12 / 2.7%) noted that Wellington Park (and/or Mount Wellington) was important to them because it was associated with a significant event/s. These events include regular or traditional marking of important calendar events (eg, Christmas, New Year, Easter, May Day, mid-summer), personally significant life events (eg, proposals of marriage, loss of virginity), or personally important events (eg, fund raising, a school trip).

The responses indicate that Mount Wellington is far more valued as a place to which one can look to assess what the weather will do (ie, for weather observation), than as an icon, with 45 (10.0%) respondents indicating they value the Mountain for this reason. Where this is valued, this appears to be a regular use, in some cases, daily or more frequent use.

115 (25.7%) respondents identified specific places in the Park that are (or were) of particular importance to them. These places are listed per respondent in Appendix 3, and this information is summarised in the table in Figure 10(B). As can be seen these special places include a large number and variety of places, including a range of natural features. Made features such as tracks and huts, and in some cases large areas, are also included. These places appear to be valued primarily for what they are, not for the activities that occur there. One respondent noted there were a number of ‘secret places’ that were important to them, indicating in the response that it was the secretness of the places rather than any tangible value that made these places important.

The summit (including in some cases the summit lookout specifically) is the most valued specific place.

The other places, and their relative valuing, are not unexpected. What is unexpected is the number of walking tracks (and Jeffries Track), that appear to be specially valued, with the Pipeline Track being the second most valued place, and with the Zig Zag Track, Organ Pipes Tracks and Icehouse Track also being relatively highly valued. When considered with the actual respondent comment, the importance of the tracks appears to be primarily for the views out and for the natural beauty imparted by the vegetation, in particular rainforest and ferns.

---

31 For a number of respondents the view to Mount Wellington from the Tasman Highway on the way into Hobart from the airport or the southeast is also clearly an ‘evokes home or belonging’ value, although it has not been ascribed to this category.
• No particular places were valued by a high number of respondents. Based on the responses, this is thought to reflect the fact that for most people, it is the Park and Mount Wellington generally that is most important, with special places being of lesser importance. This is reflected in the number of responses that identify ‘Mount Wellington’ as the place of importance (refer Appendix 3). It also possibly reflects that with this type of questionnaire respondents are generally more comfortable talking in general terms about how they value the Park.

• A number of large areas were noted as being of importance, generally by only one or a few respondents (refer Appendix 3). These places were geographic areas within the Park, Park boundary locations, and Park entrance locations:
  - The important large and general areas within the Park were - ‘Mount Wellington’, noted a large number of times; the ‘plateau’ or ‘back of the Mountain’, noted frequently; and parts of the western part of the Park (eg, Mt Connection area, Trestle Mtn – Collins Bonnet, Thark Ridge, E-W Trail area) noted by a much smaller number of respondents.
  - The boundary areas included most of the boundary of the Park, exceptions being the northern suburbs of Glenorchy, the Lachlan area and Mountain River area.
  - The entrance areas were most of the main entrance/access points to the Park. Tolosa Park however was not specifically mentioned.

**FIGURE 10 (A)**

Response rates for the Sense of Place Values category
FIGURE 10 (B)
Response rates for Identified Special Places in the Sense of Place Values category

[Items in red are made or other historic features; items in blue are natural features or places]

Notes:
1. The analysis is based on the places of special interest listed in Appendix 3.
2. Places indicated as being of value for a particular function were not included in this table as ‘use’ cannot be taken to reflect ‘sense of place’ values (see also discussion, Section 3.6)
3. Large areas were also not included in the Table, but are discussed elsewhere in this section.
3.5 Personal Meanings & Associations (refer Figure 11)

As can be seen from Figure 11, the Park (and particularly Mount Wellington) has a range of personal meaning and associations for the community.

- The most important personal association is ‘family’ time, generally indicated as being spending time with family members or memories of family times in the Park. Family associations were noted by 94 (21.0%) respondents.

- Other ‘social’ associations were also valued, although moderately, with 58 (12.9%) respondents indicating that an important association was taking visitors to the Park (most commonly to see the views from the summit) and 56 (12.5%) respondents indicating that spending time in the Park with friends (sociableness value) was important. Interestingly, there was some, but not a strong correlation between these three ‘social’ aspects of value with respect to those who indicated these values.

- The Park appears to be important for both social reasons and for escape and solitude, with renewal/escape/health/wellbeing being the second most important association or meaning (valued by 84 (18.8%) respondents), and peacefulness/relaxation/reflection being also moderately valued (by 70 (15.6%) respondents). Although health and wellbeing do not necessarily imply non-social engagement with the Park, for many of the respondents, the health and wellbeing appears to be largely derived from being in a natural and calm environment and away from the stresses of everyday and working life. This value also includes ‘putting life back into perspective’.

- Only a relatively small number of respondents indicated that the Park was important to them for memorial or celebratory reasons (12 (2.7%) and 10 (2.2%) respondents, respectively). These however are very strongly valued meanings/associations.

- Those who valued the Park for its meanings/associations with celebrations did so for a variety of types of celebration held in the Park. These include respondents’ weddings, celebrating special days of the year, dancing or participating in welcoming up the sun on May Day, and the Mountain Festival. Visiting the Park to celebrate anniversaries was not an indicated value, except for one respondent who noted their family celebrated birthdays in the Park (as well as special days of the year such as Easter).

- Memorial values were primarily the scattering the ashes of deceased family members, mainly in the summit area and to a lesser extent at the Springs. Silver Falls is also noted as a memorial site. The survey results suggest this is a more widespread practice in the Park than had been thought. In one case a family has scattered the ashes of their two deceased sons (in the summit area), and the parents expressed the intention for their ashes also to be scattered in the same location. In another case, a respondent shared how they had taken their newly born, dying child to the Park to take its last breath in an environment important to the parents. This aspect of memorial value is clearly a very strongly valued meaning/association. In a small number of cases, particular places in the Park have memorial value because of their association with a deceased person in their lifetime.

---

32 As opposed to fitness which is considered as Personal Function value – see Figure 12.
No respondents noted memorial services in the Park as values (including the two memorial services that are known have been held at the Springs). 33

- A number of people (44 / 9.8% respondents) have an important connection to the Park and Mount Wellington because of their memories of visiting. Where memories were indicated as important, in the majority of cases these are memories of family occasions.

- For a number of respondents the Park is extremely important – not necessarily to go into, but as a place that can considered from a distance or be related to on a number of levels. For a small number of respondents (31 / 6.8%) the Park, primarily Mount Wellington, has spiritual value. There are others (45 / 9.8% respondents) however for whom the Park and Mount Wellington do not have spiritual value, but who very strongly value the Park and Mount Wellington, and for whom the Park and Mount Wellington are of critical importance, to the extent that they can say it ‘defines their lives’ (either who they are or how they live). These people have an extremely strong association with the Park and Mount Wellington, or it holds extremely important meanings for them. For some, this is manifest in a need to live close to Mount Wellington, and in some cases such people have moved away then moved back because they could not live away from the Mountain.

This may seem extreme to some, particularly those who are less attached to Mount Wellington or for whom active pursuits are more important than personal meanings, but this is a not unexpected type or level of valuing because, as noted by Godkin (1980, 74, cited in Barnes 1992, 14), “The importance of attachments to place has been recognised in the psychiatric literature as significant in the development of self identity”.

- Five (1.1%) respondents indicated that to them the Mountain was like a person (ie, anthropomorphised the Mountain). For all but one respondent for whom the Mountain was male, the Mountain was seen as female, in most cases a mother or ‘earth mother’ figure. The way in which this information was provided in the responses indicates that these respondents have very a close connection to the Mountain.

- A relatively large number of respondents (68 / 15.2%) specifically noted that living near the Park (or Mount Wellington) was important to them. This was for a variety of reasons, for example because they liked being close to a large natural area, had constant views, were able to easily access the Park for recreation or nature appreciation, and/or for closer connection at an intangible level.

- A relatively large number of respondents (84 / 18.8%) also indicated that a long or regular association with the Park (or Mount Wellington) was of importance to them. It appears that rather than making the valuing of the Park stronger, the long term or regular association is a value in itself or a part of the way in which they value the Park. There appears to be a strong correlation of this value with ‘living in close proximity’.

Respondents who indicated that a regular association was important, were to a large extent people who indicated that walking or, to a lesser extent, bike riding in the Park were important values (see Personal Function). It is not clear what this correlation implies, but it possibly indicates that for a number of people Wellington Park is particularly important for these forms of recreation, in part because of its proximity to Hobart and its consequent accessibility (see Personal/Community Function).

---

33 The monuments to the small number of people who died historically in the Park are not considered here (they were included in ‘special identified places’ in the ‘Sense of Place’ category (see Figure 10B)).
3.6 Personal Use & Function (refer Figure 12)

This discussion looks at the responses for the Personal Function and Personal/Community Function categories together, as these both appear to indicate personal values that apply to the respondent, as opposed to functions the respondent believes are appropriate for the Park generally (see Section 3.7). The ‘personal function’ related category values are primarily the uses for which respondents value the Park, and in some cases Mount Wellington more specifically.

It should be noted that the numbers given in relation to the Personal Function values are slightly biased by the fact that 42 (9.4%) respondents indicated that they did things in the Park, but did not specify what (see Figure 12).

- As noted above, walking in the Park is the most highly valued aspect of the Park of all the indicated values (in all categories), with walking being important to 284 (63.4%) respondents. Walking appears to be important at a range of levels – taking children and babies for a walk, family rambles, exploration, escape, short walks with a destination or to look at the views or vegetation, longer bushwalks on established tracks for similar purposes or for exercise and to ‘get out’, and long walks to get out ‘over the back’ into the remote western part of the Park. Walking appears to be strongly valued in part as it is associated with the realisation and reinforcement of other values.
Only a minority of walkers indicated places they valued for walking. These are listed (by respondent) in Appendix 3. These places are primarily the network of walking tracks on the Hobart face of the Mountain. Amongst these tracks the N-S Track was noted by a number of respondents. There is also clearly an interest (by a small number of people) in walking on the trails west of Mount Wellington that provide access to the plateau and its peaks, including the Cathedral Rock – Mount Montagu area.

- Bike riding is the next most important indicated single personal function or use of the Park, with 110 (24.6%) respondents indicating this value. This is less than half the number of people for whom walking is important. The bike riding noted by respondents takes a range of forms from gentle rides on the Pipeline Track, to riding up the Pinnacle Road, to cross country and downhill mountain bike riding.

Mountain bike riding was the single most popular form of bike riding noted, with 68 of the 110 (ie, 62%) respondents indicating that they valued mountain bike riding. Of these a small number also rode road bikes. Interestingly, a large number of bike riders, including mountain bike riders, also indicated that they valued walking in the Park. A large number of mountain bike riders also indicated that the natural quality of the Park was important to them, and is presumably a factor in their choosing to ride in the Park.

As with walkers, only a relatively small number of cyclists indicated places they valued for bike riding. These are listed (by respondent) in Appendix 3. The Pipeline Track was by far the most valued place, with the N-S Track being the second most valued place. Main Fire Trail and the Big Bend Fire Trail were also indicated as being important by more than one respondent.

- Recreating in, or going to, 'the snow', expressed generally as ‘going to the snow’, ‘snow play’ or ‘taking the children to the snow’ was the next most valued personal use of the Park, indicated by 64 (14.3%) respondents. Skiing is not included in ‘snow play’, but was indicated by an additional 3 respondents (in all cases cross country skiing). Locations for snow play and skiing were not provided by respondents.

- **Gatherings** (including picnics, barbeques, performances and parties) and **rock climbing** were the next most important indicated activities (by 35 (7.8%) and 31 (6.9%) respondents, respectively).

Where people specified the locations of ‘gatherings’ this indicated that the Springs was the most popular location for these activities, with one respondent noting the Fern Tree Park as a special place for them for this function.

In relation to rock climbing, the only specified locations were the Organ Pipes and Lost World. Lost World was also noted by one respondent as an important place for them for caving.

- All other activities, including ‘Other Functions’ were indicated by less than 5% of respondents (per activity). As can be seen from Figure 12, this is a diverse range of activities which includes experiencing the vastness and remoteness of the Park, playing, exploration, fitness/health, dog walking, other forms of transportation, camping, education and nature appreciation, enjoying the huts, artistic pursuits, and work related.

The more important of the ‘less valued’ activities or uses were (in order of importance) – **adventure/exploration**, **exercise/fitness**, **visiting huts** (including camping in them), **photography**, **nature appreciation**, **dog walking**, **running** and **4WD driving**, all of which were indicated by between 10 and 20 respondents. **Connection to nature** was indicated by 20 (4.5%) respondents, and this appeared to be more of a personal function than a community function, and was different to ‘nature appreciation’ (and probably more related to ‘renewal’ in **Personal meaning/association**).
FIGURE 12
Response rates for the Personal Function category
[items in dark blue are personal (individual) functions; items in pale blue are functions that can be person or community functions]

![Bar chart showing response rates for different personal functions.](image)

### Other Specific Personal Function Noted by Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Personal Function</th>
<th>No of Responses</th>
<th>Other Personal Function</th>
<th>No of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Getting lost/being in a huge area</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adventure/exploration/discovery</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Playing games of imagination</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge/action</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Nature appreciation</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ascending the summit</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Birdwatching</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercise/fitness</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Landscape painting/art photography</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Running</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skiing (cross country)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Overnight camping</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horse riding</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Visiting huts</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driving (on road/to summit)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(including camping in them)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorbike riding (on road)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longboarding</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paragliding</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police/SES search &amp; rescue</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Trail Bike riding has been included as a function although it was not noted as a value by any of the respondents, because it is known to occur, illegally, in the Park, hence is a presumed value.
Transport related activities other than walking, bike riding and skiing indicated as being important were (in order of importance) – 4WD driving (on the existing trails), driving (on road, including the Pinnacle Road), horse riding, motor bike riding (on road, including the Pinnacle Road), long boarding and paragliding. These were indicated by between 1 and 10 respondents only. Trail bike riding was not indicated as a value by any respondent.

- A small number of functions that appeared to be of personal importance, but also to be considered important functions for others or for the community generally, were noted by 22 (4.9%) respondents. These included freedom to do what one loves, to be inspired, fundraising, youth activities and community development. Other more general community functions noted were ecosystem services and a ‘good place’ for TV towers. This latter was indicated by a respondent who indicated they did not value the Park.

- A significant functional value was accessibility, which was indicated by 121 (27.0%) respondents. ‘Accessibility’ here is the ease of getting into the Park, and this appears from the responses to be due primarily to the Park being so close to the residents of greater Hobart, to the road access up Mount Wellington to the summit, and to a lesser extent the fact that there are several Park-edge road heads in the Hobart area.

About 10% of the respondents who indicated this value, indicated that to them ‘accessibility’ meant that the Park was free to the community to use. This value has been considered as a Personal/Community Function as a number of responses indicated that this was an important community value rather than something they alone valued.

### 3.7 Essential Community Functions (refer Figure 13)

*Essential Community Functions* are those functions of the Park that respondents appeared to be indicating were general values that the Park has, or functions it should have, rather than being ways in which they used and valued it themselves. *Other Values* have also been included in this section as these were limited to scientific value and historical value, which are broader Park values and did not appear to be the same type of value as the other personal meanings or associations of the Park.

- Very few respondents (8 / 1.8%) indicated that the scientific values of the Park were valued by them, although a larger number indicated that education was an important community function and that nature appreciation was an important personal function.

- A greater number of respondents (54 / 12.1%) indicated that the historical values of the Park were important. In this case it appears to be the history of the Park, primarily Mount Wellington, that is seen as important and not the heritage or physical evidence, although this is seen as a value by about 1.8% of all respondents (refer Figure 8). Some 18 (4.0%) respondents indicated that visiting huts was important to them, but it is not clear to what extent this involves an appreciation of the historical nature of the huts.

- In relation to ‘essential community function’, conservation (84 / 18.8% respondents), recreation (68 / 15.2%), tourism (41 / 9.2%), fresh water supply (23 / 5.1%), and education (10 / 2.2%) were all seen as important.

These values are considered to be lower than might be expected if a survey was undertaken to specifically establish how people valued these functions since assessing this

---

34 Tourism appears to be viewed in two different ways: 1. Mount Wellington and Wellington Park are seen as an important scenic and aesthetic attribute of Hobart, hence they contribute to the tourist appeal of Hobart; and 2. they are a tourist attraction in their own right with a range of values, but most significantly the views from the summit.
aspect was not the intent of the survey. It is considered probable however that the relative importance of the different functions would remain much the same.

- Specific aspects of conservation that were noted by respondents\textsuperscript{35} included both natural and cultural heritage values, and also specifically included flora, fauna, natural quality and landscape integrity, landscape connections, and wilderness quality.

- Where respondents provided detail on the educational function of Wellington Park, this was in relation to learning about nature, about oneself, and acquiring competency in the outdoors.

\begin{figure}
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\caption{Response rates for the \textit{Essential Community Function} and \textit{Other Values} categories}
\end{figure}

3.8 The Influence of Age and Gender

\textbf{Age Group Analysis} (refer Figure 14)

- The most noticeable difference when the responses are analysed by gender is in the response from the 0-20 yr old age group. Compared to the older age groups, the 0-20 yr age group appears to value a much more restricted range of values, to value the personal function more than any other category, and to value the landscape and sense of place value categories less than the other age groups.

\textsuperscript{35} \textit{Note - not all respondents supplied this specific level of information.}
• Values which are held by a noticeably greater percentage of this age group than the other age groups are bike riding, recreation, recreating with friends, and conservation (although natural values and naturalness/wilderness were only indicated by a relatively small proportion of this age group).

• For the younger age group living close to the Park, accessibility and regular use were all important.

• The younger age group tended to be less specific about the landscape and aesthetic values, with the majority of responses being of a general nature, and with this age group not specifying any natural places of special importance or special aesthetic features, while all other age groups were much more specific about these values. Given that a number of specific uses of the Park were indicated by this age group, this suggests that younger members of the community, while appreciating the landscape and aesthetic values, do so at a general level.

• Given the small sample size, the results from the younger age group may be partially or wholly a sampling bias, but the results are not inconsistent with what one might expect from younger people. Specifically sampling more people in this age range would be useful to get a better idea of the values held by this age group.

• There were no marked differences between the other three age groups. The only trends noted were that the +60 yr old age group, the oldest age group, appear to more strongly value the Park and for a greater range of reasons than the other age groups, but this is not a marked difference.

• Interestingly, it is the +60 yr age group that most strongly value walking in the Park, although they are not significantly different in this from the two middle age groups who also strongly value this function.

• There are some differences between the two middle age groups, but no particular trends or distinct differences were noted.

Gender Analysis  (refer Figure 15)

• The most conspicuous difference between males and females in the responses is that individual females tend to value the Park more highly than individual men. Males and females however value the Park for a similar range of reasons.

• The only aspects that males appear to value more than females are bike riding, the accessibility of the Park and, to a minor extent, recreation, tourism and geological/landform values.

• Although not consistent for all values (particularly with respect to some sense of place values) females appear to value the Park more strongly than males for landscape, aesthetic and sense of place values and with respect to personal meaning and connections, with the level of valuing being more similar however with respect to personal and community functions.

---

36 This is indicated by a greater percentage of women than men indicating individual values (note – since approximately the same number of responses were received from males and females the more higher valuing by women does not imply that more women value the park than men).
FIGURE 14
Responses for individual values by age, expressed as percentage of response per age group.
[Age groups are: 0-20 yrs – red; 21-40 yrs – green; 41-60 yrs – purple; +60 yrs – blue]
FIGURE 15

Responses for individual values by gender, expressed as percentage of response per gender group.

[females — red; males green]
4 RESULTS – RESPONDENT OBSERVATIONS

This section briefly explores the respondents’ responses and observations at a more qualitative level than in Section 3, which provides a more fine grained perspective, and in some cases allows different observations to be made. A selection of respondents’ comments is provided to illustrate the very varied nature of the responses and the varied ways in which individuals value the Park.

A more detailed selection of individual respondent comments is provided in Appendix 3.37

The way in which the Park and Mount Wellington appears to be most commonly valued is summed up in this statement –

“How many cities in this world have a stunningly beautiful sanctuary on their doorstep, so that people can escape from city life” (HC 40).

General

As noted in Section 3, and can be seen from Appendix 3, the responses were very varied, even from respondents who value Wellington Park. Some responses were very simple and included statements such as “love it”, to over 1 page detailed responses.

Responses also ranged from people who did not value Wellington Park or who did not care about it to people to whom it is of central importance in their lives, as indicated in the following responses –

“It’s the most important place in the world to me. I can’t imagine living anywhere else in the world” (HC 35).

“I was born in Dymyrrne, so I have lived under the mountain ALL my life. ... the view from the summit is HOME ... We lived in North Hobart for 6 months, in that time we could not see the Mountain at all, it was a very bad time, so many things went wrong, we HAD to move so we could once again see the Mountain. ... So you can see now why I love the Mountain, and if I cannot see it every morning I am lost” (OL 164).

“It is an integral part of Hobart’s and southern Tasmania’s soul” (OL 320).

There are others who strongly value the Park, but to whom the values are perhaps less ‘personal’, as in the following response –

“Mt Wellington is the iconic symbol of Hobart. The profile of the mountain watches over Hobart: a guardian, a temple and – as night closes in – a powerful protector keeping between the “wilds” of the south [west] and the gentle evening lights of the town nestled below.

The park is the experience of being “within” the temple – the magnificent walks, wild vistas, the incredible plant life, fern glades, trickling streams and towering trees. Walking through and discovering an old aqueduct, or signpost from 100 years ago connects us with those who have loved the Mountain over the generations.

The summit and all its incredible wildness: the city to one side, to the other limitless wild places” (OL247).

37 In Appendix 3 similar sentiments are generally not repeated except where these provide a different way of expressing these sentiments, or a different way or level of valuing a particular attribute or quality of the Park. As a result, Appendix 3 provides only about 50% of the actual comment provided by all the individual responses.
At the same time others value Mount Wellington to such an extent they cannot conceive that others do not value it the same way, as in the following response -

“... go yourself [to an auction] and see what any historic painting of Mt Wellington fetches. We all understand the value of this natural monument and the value that it has held for all those who have been here long before us” (OL313).

In some cases this constrains the response that is provided, as indicated in this comment –

“I could write a lot more but feel that I am stating the obvious” (FGR 11).

And there are others who value the Park for wide range of reasons, such as in the following examples, where the Park is valued for its -

“biodiversity, a place of reference ... It has its own intrinsic values ... It remains connected to the city and I can be on a trail running or riding within minutes from home. ... Personal reasons – special celebrations, announcements, decisions, a peaceful place, a place that energizes you and to share wonderful and memorable experiences” (OL 297).

“Mt Wellington is a landmark to Hobart, it provides a sense of home, it grounds me. It is integral to Hobart’s identity. When I travel the sight of it always brings a sort of proof of journey’s end. ... I think the fact that it is still relatively untouched is one of the mountain’s greatest assets, the fact that it still allows adventure and excitement or contemplation and solitude in equal measure without the prejudice of a designer tourist “drawcard” ....” (OL 350)

and –

“Mt Wellington is the very reason why I chose to study in Hobart .... I am an outdoors country girl, and it is the pinnacle of sanity for me while I live in the city ... Its height is awesome and commands respect. It’s a really exciting naturalist’s classroom ... It has very special personal significance as it is the place where my 9 day old daughter took her last breath when we took her home from the hospital after being kept on life support machines. ... “ (OL269).

In addition, some of the values are just not expected, such as the following –

“With o’seas visitors a night time drive to the Pinnacle is a great way to see the local wild life” (FGR 8).

As can be seen from the above, the reasons people value Wellington Park and Mount Wellington are not predictable and it is not possible to stereotype the community into ‘types’ who value the place in a particular way or at a particular level.

The individual responses to the questionnaire suggest that the way in which Wellington Park and Mount Wellington are valued derives from respondents’ prior experiences, in or away from Wellington Park, from their current situation, from personal events in their lives, from their interests and from their own aesthetic preferences, including how important landscapes are to them.

**Geographic Specificity**

Because the questionnaire was only advertised in the greater Hobart region, it is difficult to determine from the responses how valued Wellington Park is away from the greater Hobart region.
The following comment is from a respondent who used to live in Hobart, but now lives in Launceston, and doesn’t care about Wellington Park. This respondent believes that Wellington Park and Mount Wellington are of no significance to non-Hobartians. He comments –

“I conducted a straw poll with my friends here in the North and Mt Wellington was not important to anyone at all. They didn’t care about it or its surrounds”

(OL278).

Yet this is balanced by another respondent (OL279) who comes from Devonport and who has not lived in the Hobart area, and who clearly values the Park.

The Importance of Wellington Park as a High Level Range

- Many respondents comment on the uniqueness of having such a visually dominant, ‘magnificent’, ‘beautiful’ place as Mount Wellington, or such a large natural area, on the edge of the city. Many note that this is unique in a global context, often commenting that ‘there is nowhere else in the world ...’.

Because of the Mountain, and to a lesser extent the Derwent River, many respondents comment that ‘Hobart is one of the most beautiful cities in the world’.

The Park is also seen as being unique in relation to having such a large unspoilt area on the edge of a city, to having such a varied open public space on the edge of a city with such a range of recreational opportunities, and to generating such great views so close to a city. The unique views appear to be both those to the Mountain and Wellington Range, and those from the summit areas.

- The Mountain, and to a lesser extent the Wellington Range, is a major factor for many in choosing to live in Hobart or in neighbouring areas close to the Park.

- The height and elevation of Mount Wellington and the Wellington range are frequently noted as important elements. They are seen as important in giving the Wellington Park landscape a ‘grandeur’ or a ‘wow factor’, making it a ‘significant backdrop’, providing snow to view or play in, in it having an alpine area, and in the resultant vegetation cline. Many respondents note that Hobart ‘would be dull’ without the Mountain and the Range, or they would miss them. One respondent commented that “A Tasmanian gem would be diminished”.

- A number of respondents comment that ‘Hobart wouldn’t be Hobart’ without the Mountain and, to a lesser extent, the Wellington Range or Hobart ‘just wouldn’t be the same’, indicating that the height and bulk of the Mountain and Range contribute significantly to the sense of place for Hobart.

- Many respondents commented that if Wellington Park were simply low hills it would not be a park and would now be farmland or suburbs. This indicates that it is the attributes, or collection of attributes, Wellington Park has as a high elevation range that are what is important from a conservation perspective. This is summed up in the comment - “I’m fairly certain that “Wellington Hill” (!!) would not have generated Wellington Park” (FGT07).

- A number of others however feel that “The Park itself is more important than the height of the terrain” and that even as low hills the Park would still be important for its native vegetation and recreational opportunities.
Other Landscape Perceptions

- It appears that people who have a long term connection with the Park and who have lived nearby do not think of Wellington Park as an entity with boundaries. Instead, they see a whole connected landscape from the lower slopes where they live to the summit of Mount Wellington or the Wellington Range plateau.

- Other respondents however see the Park, at least in the Hobart area, as providing a natural and ‘defined’ edge to the city, which they see as limiting further urban development to the west. Where this is noted this is seen as a positive constraint.

Special Personal Meanings

- Wellington Park, but probably mainly Mount Wellington, appears to be very important to some members of the community for escape and renewal. There are a range of comments that indicate that it is valued in this way, including as a place to ‘escape from the city’ or escape ‘from technology and the rat race’ and to have ‘solitude’ and to ‘put life into perspective’. To others it has a stronger positive meaning in this sense, expressed variously through to views such as “I love the Mountain. It stabilises me” and calling the Mountain “a comforting site” or “My happy place”.

The use of the Park as an ‘escape’ or ‘sanctuary’ is not just by those who live on the edge of the Park, but includes people from the greater Hobart area. The following comment comes from a resident of Dodges Ferry -

“Wellington Park is very special to me in that it provides a sanctuary to which I can quickly escape from the city and life stresses. Within 20 minutes I can be walking under the canopies of trees or along a rocky scree face. How good is this!” (OL 318).

- For some respondents the Mountain is seen to be a person, generally a mother or ‘earth mother’ figure (except in one case where the Mountain viewed as male). This is expressed at different levels, for example –

  “It’s looking down on us, watching our messy failings with quiet resignation” (OL 217);

  “She has her own personality, a presence, sometimes cool, but always dignified and we nestle just beautifully in her bosom” (OL 204);

  “She is an everyday weather advisor to me ... and I seek her advice on clothes for work each morning” (OL 204)

- In other cases the Mountain appears to be viewed as a sentient being – something that watches over, guards or protects Hobart (also applies to the Mountain where anthropomorphised). An example is this response (OL24) – “Growing up in Glenorchy, the Mountain’s presence always guided me and watched over me”.

Aspects of Using the Mountain

- The ability to drive or ride up (motorbike or bicycle) Mount Wellington is important to a small number of respondents. It is unclear to what extent this reflects a desire to get to the summit or personal enjoyment derived solely from using the Pinnacle Road. A small number of respondents indicated that driving in the Park (primarily on the Pinnacle Road) was important in older age, when walking up steep tracks was no longer possible.
It is not unexpected that bushwalkers will also appreciate the natural values of the Park as these are often seen as going hand in hand, but it also appears to be the case from the responses that mountain bike riders in the main also appreciate the natural environment in which they ride. This is indicated in the following responses -

“Wellington Park is important to me to preserve wildlife and natural bush near the city. I regularly use the mountain bike tracks and run on the Pipeline Track” (OL342).

and –

“Mtb tracks (particularly cross country single tracks (ie, North=south Track) not downhill or fire trails); access to climbing, walking tracks, scenery, views, solitude; having a ‘wilderness’ area close to Hobart is very special” (OL314).

Observations by Those Who Do Not Value the Park

The analysis of the results in Sections 3 and 4, focus primarily on the valuing by the majority of respondents who value the Park (although all values indicated by those who noted they ‘did not care’ about the Park were included).

The following summarises the comment from those who indicated they did not value the Park. The lack of valuing in all cases was related to not living near Wellington Park or Mount Wellington, and to a lesser extent not being interested in natural areas.

“I know nothing about it and don’t particularly like the bush so I have no interest in it” (OL 42).

“Living in Eaglehawk Neck it has no bearing on my life apart from attracting tourists which I class as a ‘nuisance’ because they leave rubbish” (FGT 3).

Those who noted that they didn’t care about Wellington Park did however in each case acknowledge that the Park had some values, including as a tourist destination, for its views, for the snow, and for its proximity to the city.

The most detailed response in this category included the following comments –

“It is just a big mound of dirt with trees on it
A good place for TV antennas to enable the greater number of the population to be able to have a good reception of TV programs
In the winter it is a good tourist attraction (and in all seasons of the year) to see the snow
There are plenty of other parks where people are able to go” (OL 173).

One respondent who lives in the north of Tasmania, expressed the view that Wellington Park was not important to those not living in Hobart, and also indicated that the Park was not particularly relevant to people living in Hobart, but at the same time did acknowledge “that Mt Wellington casts a broad shadow over the capital”, although noting – “that shadow does not reach the North” (OL278).
5 COMPARISON WITH OTHER ASSESSMENTS

Wellington Park Assessments with a Social Values Component

The present assessment is the only study related to Wellington Park, that has undertaken a ‘free’ (ie, unstructured and not related to a particular focus (eg, use, management)) and full social values analysis of the whole Park. This type of assessment is in fact believed to be the only one of its type in Tasmania conducted for a large area rather than a place.

The other formal assessments which have captured, at least in part, the social values of Wellington Park are limited, and include38 –

1. Pinkard’s (1991) report on public comment (voluntary & unstructured based on brochure calling for comment) for a management plan for the proposed Wellington Park,
2. Ingkaninan’s (2004) survey (mixed method) of visitors at Myrtle Forest, and
3. Andrusko’s (2010) survey (mixed method) of visitors and locals at Fern Tree Park and Bower.

These studies mostly concentrate on the use and management of the Park or parts of it, and thus provide a more narrow set of values and a particular bias towards use and management. This is less the case in Ingkaninan’s (2004) and Andrusko’s (2010) assessments which were systematic assessments with specific questions about how the locations being studied were appreciated. Ingkhaninan’s (2004) survey was aimed at generating information from users/visitors that would help in preparing a Site Development Plan for Myrtle Forest, and it included one question specifically designed to elucidate the social values.39 Andrusko’s (2010) survey, aimed at providing use and value information for a future Master Plan for the Fern Tree Park – Bower area, is more complex and highly structured. It included a short visitor questionnaire with two questions which might elucidate social values40, and a longer questionnaire that could be completed away from the site. The questions included the two from the short questionnaire, plus two questions about non-use values. For these two questions (favourite places & site significance), respondents were asked to rank according to level of importance or agreement with a set list of value options. The options for site significance were very much focussed on general values such as importance, attachment and derived enjoyment.

The present assessment is therefore not easy to compare with the other assessments for Wellington Park. However, all assessments produce similar results at a general level in relation to how people value the Park or parts of it. Figure 16 provides a list of the key personal values identified in the various Wellington Park studies. Andrusko’s (2010) survey provides the closest parallel to the present assessment. It also provides a very similar picture of what the important social values are.

Andrusko’s (2010) assessment indicates that there is considerable attachment to Fern Tree Bower and Park, and that this derives from the natural quality of the place, the ability to

---

38 This list does not include The Lands Department & Wellington Range Management Committee’s (1981) review or Hepper & de Gryse (1994) as these did not undertake a formal or primary assessment of social values.

39 In essence asking why Myrtle Forest was important to the interviewee/respondent.

40 These were “What did you like most about the Fern Tree Park & Bower site” and “Is there anything else about the site that stands out from other places you visit”.
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experience solitude there, and the place’s ‘restorative’ qualities. The most valued qualities of the area overall were ‘recreation’ (primarily walking),’ vegetation’ and the ‘psychologically restorative attributes’. This strongly echoes the main values identified for Wellington Park in the present assessment, and is very similar to the important attributes of Myrtle Forest identified by Ingkhaninan (2004).

Andrusko (2010) was also able to examine some interrelationships that were not possible to explore in the present study: He found that activity type had very little influence on the level of place attachment. Andrusko was also able to determine a difference in valuing between locals and visitors. He concluded that locals tended to value the site more, value the historical aspects of the place and value the solitude, whereas visitors tended to value the ‘visual aesthetics’ more, the aesthetics being derived mainly from the vegetation and local setting. He also identifies seasonal patterning of the various uses.

Andrusko (2010) also notes that ‘keep as is’ is the main management recommendation. Although the present assessment did not investigate management, the values and associated comments, including management related comment, also very much indicate a similar position on management by the majority of respondents. There was also a strong preference by the respondents in Andrusko’s survey to prioritise the important natural values over the provision of facilities in managing Fern Tree Bower and Park. This is also indicated in the results from the present assessment.

Pinkard’s (1991) results are not comparable as the consultation, hence comment, is focused fully on management, but it is worth noting that a large number (371) of submissions were received from this consultation which was to feed into the preparation of the first management plan for Wellington Park.

There are also some general indications of valuing from the comment received, which appears to reflect the more explicit values expressed in the present survey, and which have the same implications for management. This is perhaps best expressed in the following comment (Pinkard 1991, vi) –

“Respondents were most concerned with the conservation of flora and fauna on the Range, although many expressed concern for archaeological, historical, geomorphological and wilderness/scenic values. Many respondents expressed a deep affinity with the mountain and its environment”.

This similarity in results, in spite of the range of approaches to obtaining the data, should give management a level of confidence about the reliability and broad application throughout the Park of the identified key social values. Given these values have been assessed over a now 20 year period, the agreement of the results over this time period should also give confidence that these values are long term values for the Park.

The Importance of Mountains

Mountains by their very nature appear to be particularly highly valued landscapes. The special value that humans, the world over, place on mountains is well known and documented (Bernbaum 1997). In Australia mountains are seen as having a special importance –

“Mountains in Australia are generally very sparsely occupied and large proportions of them are dedicated national parks; communities are fiercely attached to these areas, whether local communities, Indigenous groups or the broader community that values them as wilderness and spiritual areas of [for] uses such as recreation” (Truscott et al 2003, 2).
**FIGURE 16**

**Key Social Values Identified in Existing Community Assessments of Wellington Park**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Whole of Park</td>
<td>Whole of Park</td>
<td>Myrtle Forest</td>
<td>Fern Tree Park &amp; Bower</td>
<td>Whole of Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDSCAPE VALUES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>scenic backdrop</td>
<td>nature (flora &amp; fauna)</td>
<td>natural beauty</td>
<td>naturalness / wilderness quality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>aesthetic value (general)</td>
<td>(conservation)</td>
<td>uniqueness</td>
<td>landscape (general) / scenery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nature (conservation)</td>
<td>archaeology, history, geomorphology, wilderness &amp; scenic (conservation)</td>
<td>natural beauty</td>
<td>proximity to city</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>natural beauty</td>
<td>uniqueness</td>
<td>vegetation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>mountain a backdrop to Hobart</td>
<td>beauty / visual aesthetics</td>
<td>aesthetic value (general)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>views from Mt Wellington</td>
<td>proximity to / contrast with city</td>
<td>views to Mt Wellington</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>climate (cool / refreshing / shady)</td>
<td>changeability / variability of the Park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSONAL MEANINGS &amp; ASSOCIATIONS</td>
<td>(none identified)</td>
<td>strong affinity</td>
<td>isolation/seclusion</td>
<td>solitude / peacefulness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USE / PERSONAL FUNCTION</td>
<td>sightseeing</td>
<td>walking</td>
<td>nature appreciation</td>
<td>sense / spirit of place</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>walking</td>
<td>horse riding</td>
<td></td>
<td>accessibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rock climbing</td>
<td>rock climbing</td>
<td></td>
<td>family associations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nature study</td>
<td>cycling</td>
<td></td>
<td>landmark / signature / represents home</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>photography</td>
<td>skiing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>skiing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>walking</td>
<td>picnicking</td>
<td>dog walking</td>
<td>walking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>bike riding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>relaxing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>picnicking/BBQ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>running</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dog walking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>skiing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>snow / snow play</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>exercise / fitness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>picnicking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>rock climbing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note – values in bold are those that were found to be extremely important.

---

41 Hepper & de Gryse (1994) are not included here as their data have been largely based on existing assessments, primarily that of Pinkard (1991).

42 The views from this study were not based on public consultation.

43 The items listed for this study are not actual personal values, instead they are values and activities considered important to provide for in the management of the Park.
This has also been shown to be the case for Mount Wellington by Stoddart’s (2004) book, *The Mountain, a people’s perspective* and Barnes’ (1992) study, *Mount Wellington and the Sense of Place*. This is reflected in the following statement in Stoddart (2004, v & 4) –

"Mount Wellington – the Mountain – has meaning for all Tasmanians, and particularly for those who live in its shadows. ... Indifference to Mount Wellington is rare. Its strong stance on the skyline calls for some sort of response".

Stoddart’s (2004) and Barnes (1992) studies clearly demonstrate that Mount Wellington is a very highly and strongly valued place, and that this strong valuing derives from it being a mountain. McConnell & Handsjuk’s (2010) *Mount Wellington Summit Area Historic Heritage Assessment* supports this.

It is difficult to compare the results from these three studies with the present assessment and to identify individual social values and understand their importance. This is because all three studies are qualitative assessments, and they focus on Mount Wellington rather than Wellington Range or the Park more broadly. Barnes (1992) and Stoddart (2003) were based on a review of the historical appreciation of Mount Wellington and a selection of use and value type interviews with locals. They are concerned primarily with conveying the importance of the Mountain in descriptive terms, rather than understanding how the Mountain is valued by the broad community.

McConnell & Handsjuk (2010) is also not particularly useful for comparative purposes as, although it discusses categories of social value, it undertook no new research into contemporary social values, and the views expressed are based on previous assessments and views expressed in Barnes (1992) and Stoddart (2004). Also, it is focussed specifically on the summit area of Mount Wellington, and does not consider the mountain as a whole, nor the broader Park.

In essence Barnes’ (1992) assessment strongly supports, and provides insights into, the importance of Mount Wellington as a mountain in its own right (ie, because of the inherent/intrinsic qualities of it as a mountain) and in contributing to the sense of place for Hobart. Stoddart’s (2004) study demonstrates that Mount Wellington is valued in a number of ways, and that much of this valuing is very strong.

These findings generally support the findings of the present assessment. Aspects such as height and shape (skyline) and landmark quality, all of which are essential ‘mountain qualities’ and indicated as important values in the present assessment, were found to be important in Barnes 91992) and Stoddart’s (2004) studies, and give rise to values such as variability, snow, atmosphere, general aesthetic quality and ‘scenery’ all of which were also important values indicated in the present assessment. Because mountains are generally natural areas, the naturalness of the mountain also appears to be important, as is also the case in the present study where this is found to be the most important indicated landscape value.
6  ISSUES FOR MANAGEMENT

This section only addresses issues for management arising from the Community Values Survey findings and which relate to how the Park is valued. It does not address specific management comment made in the survey responses (which has been made directly available to the WPMT staff for their consideration). The need for further research due to limitations with this assessment is also briefly discussed.

6.1 Values Related Issues for Management

It is important to note in the following discussion that the issues discussed are the key issues that are considered to arise from the survey results, as the full range of matters raised by the responses are very complex and relate to management on many different levels, and need to be considered along with other values. It is the intent that the results of the Community Values Survey will be available for consideration by the WPMT in the long term to help guide the management of the Park.

Because this project was undertaken primarily to develop an understanding of the landscape values of Wellington Park, the following discussion considers the landscape related values first, then the other social values.

General

- The most overwhelming impression from the social values assessment is that the current Park management in general terms, through the Wellington Park Management Plan (WPMP), recognises well and manages well for the important community values. This is reflected in ‘conservation’ being the most important identified community function, with recreation being the second most important identified community function, then tourism, followed by fresh water provision and education as other identified community functions.

  The main impression gained from the responses therefore (and in specific respondent comment) is that the Park should be managed to ‘keep it as it is’. This means that the management priority for the Park should continue to be the maintenance of the natural values of the Park, but with recreation, tourism and other nature based uses provided for to the extent that they do not compromise the natural values. A similar recommendation – “managers should prioritise values of the natural environment over provision of facilities when making decisions” – was made by Andrusko (2010, 74), who’s use and values assessment of the Fern Tree Bower and Park made similar findings to the present assessment.

- The social values assessment also strongly supports all previous assessments of the community’s views about Wellington Park44, although these previous assessments have not been based on systematically collected values data and have been focussed primarily on management and or use.

44 Starting with the first review (The Lands Department & Wellington Range Management Committee (1981) which derived its information from the small number of community groups that were Committee Representatives. (Note – this does not include specific use or specific location assessments).
It would seem that previous management reviews that have involved public comment, such as that by Pinkard (1991) and that undertaken for the preparation of the first Wellington Park management plan (Hepper & de Gryse 1994), have understood, or at least reflected, the values that underpin the community’s views about the management of the Park. It also appears that commentaries on the Mountain, in particular Stoddart (2004), also have recognised key important values.

The findings from the two small (entry point) area use and value assessments (Ingkhaninan 2004, Andrusko 2010) are also similar. The full findings from these assessments may not however be able to be directly extrapolated to Wellington Park more generally or to other parts of the Park, as these areas are more accessible than many others, and have specific natural and recreational features and histories that may lead them to be valued in a specific way.

- What the present assessment does, though its systematic and broad based approach, is to flesh out the existing framework, and provide a more fine textured appreciation of the values and an indication of the relative importance of these values. It also helps understand the reasons behind community views about management of the Park.

The results from this assessment will therefore be useful in refining the zoning within the Park and the prescriptions for the different zones. It will also help management to recognise specific features, areas and values of importance within the Park (refer Figure 10B) and to provide for their management.

- One of the findings from the Survey was that for a large number of people who value the Park (including strong valuing), it is not what they do in the Park that creates this valuing, but rather that they value it as a place that has strong meaning and associations, aesthetic, sense of place and other landscape values which apply or can derive from outside the Park, including at some distance.

There is a major implication for management in this finding, which is that in making decisions about the use and management of the Park or Mount Wellington, then the ‘community of interest’ cannot be limited to Park visitors and/or neighbouring communities.

**Landscape Values**

- The results indicate that while the whole Park is important to a number of people, the primary value of the Park is Mount Wellington. The whole of the Mountain is valued in a number of ways, not just the summit area. This has been recognised in previous assessments and is relatively well provided for in the Wellington Park Management Plan (WPMP). A better understanding of what is valued and why, will however help in refining the management prescriptions of the different parts of the Park, including the location of the zone boundaries.

- The results show that the ‘Landscape’, ‘Aesthetic’ and ‘Sense of Place’ values are all more important for Wellington Park than the other social values (‘Personal Connection & Meaning’, ‘Personal Function’, and ‘Community Function’) (refer Figure 7). The most highly valued values also reflect this (except for ‘walking in the Park’ which was the most important value).

The most important single values identified by the assessment are (in order of importance)

- the ability to walk in the Park on what is seen as a good track network;
- the naturalness/wilderness quality of the Park;
• the landscape of the Park at a general level;
• the Park’s location next to Hobart, as a natural area next to Hobart, or bookending Hobart with the Derwent on the other side;
• the native biota; and
• the aesthetics of the Park at a general level.

This social values assessment therefore supports the reasons the Park was created and the objectives, and their priority, for management as contained in the WPMP.

• The very high valuing of the natural values and wilderness quality of Wellington Park reinforces the importance of retaining the whole of the Park in an essentially natural state with only limited development (related to the values of the Park). This is not incompatible with the key valued use – walking – which appears to be valued in part because it is in a natural area with strong aesthetic qualities. The same applies to many of its other valued uses.

• In relation to Mount Wellington, the importance of the apparent naturalness of the Mountain, including its flanks, as well its vegetation (special elements such as waratah, orchids, ferneries, its sub-alpine and alpine vegetation, its variety, in particular the vegetation cline), and the strong correlation of enjoyment of being on the Mountain based on this natural context, the importance of Hobart as a backdrop to the city and homes and its proximity to the Park, the importance of the views to the Mountain, and its importance as an iconic feature and Hobart’s most significant landmark (closely matched by the Derwent River), all point very strongly to the importance of maintaining all of Mount Wellington as forested and apparently natural with no unnatural intrusions.

Given the above, clearing within the Park and any reduction of the Park boundary would significantly compromise the landscape values held by the community. A number of comments suggest that people see the whole of the Mountain as important indicating that increasing the extent of the Park, at least in the Hobart area and environs (but possibly not the rural fringes), would be supported by the community; and the obverse – moving the boundary further up the Mountain and away from Hobart – would not be supported by the community.

• Also of major importance is the plateau area of the Wellington Range (ie, from Mount Wellington westward). The values here appear to be primarily the essentially undisturbed alpine environment which is valued as a special feature, as part of the native vegetation, for aesthetic reasons, and as a wilderness area providing a connection to south western Tasmania. This would appear from the very high valuing indicated by the results to be one of the most important environments in the Park to preserve, both with respect to environmental quality and naturalness/wilderness value.

Given this, modifications to this area should be kept to a minimum. In particular, infrastructure which disturbs this environment or has a visual impact (from inside or outside the Park) is not desirable to the community.

There is some interest in the community however in having some visitor infrastructure at the summit, and the challenge will be to design infrastructure that has a minimal environmental and visual impact in this location.

• One of the most important general landscape values identified is the fact that the Park is essentially a mountain range with a highly visible mountain at the Hobart end, with many of the other landscape values (and social values) deriving from this physical characteristic. Although this is unlikely to be impacted by management or human use, it should be kept in mind when considering the nature of the landscape values, as it gives a connection or linkage to many of the community values. It should be noted that some
human induced changes may affect some the related values, the most obvious being the possible loss of snow, a significant value, with global climate change.

- The atmospheric nature of the Mountain (moodiness and changeability due to the weather, light conditions, etc) is also an important landscape value. Again, this is not easily affected by management or human use, but there is some potential to impact on this value because it depends largely on the naturalness of the Mountain and there is a strong focus of this value on the higher parts of the Mountain. Potential impacts will mainly occur from visible human intrusions, likely potential examples of which are highly visible infrastructure and a lot of light at night, particularly near the summit and summit ridge.

- The results also indicate that the importance of Mount Wellington in the ‘sense of place of Hobart’, as an ‘icon’ or ‘symbol’ of Hobart and as one of two highly significant Hobart ‘landmarks’ (the other being the Derwent River), and the relationship of Hobart to the Mountain and the River, are important to take into account in the management both of the Park and of Hobart. Erosion of the values that cause the community to value the Park, and in particular Mount Wellington, in these ways, will erode these values. A core part of the underlying value in this respect is the largely natural slopes rising to a prominent and largely natural summit, and the immediate connection of Hobart suburbs to the forest, with no significant, visible intermediate type land (eg, rural land).

- In considering what the important views are, the results of the assessment indicate that although the most viewed perspective of the Park is the view from the city, Mount Wellington and, to a lesser extent, the whole Park, is viewed, and valued from all around its perimeter (except from the western end), and viewed from a range of distances – from close to the Park to from as far away as Kempton, Dodges Ferry and Huonville.

Social Values

- The results of the assessment indicate that the Park, and particularly Mount Wellington, is valued for a range of diverse values and many areas will have a number of social values. It is important therefore in making management decisions about places within the Park, to ensure these values are well understood, and that no single value is given emphasis above other values unless this can be demonstrated to be appropriate. An example of the need to understand the range of values is the summit area. The present assessment has indicated that the summit has important social values to members of the community, not only for its views, but for its alpine vegetation, as a place to celebrate special events, and is the major place in the Park where the ashes of deceased family members are scattered. Management therefore should seek to respect all these values. It should be recognised that doing this is likely to produce a different outcome to valuing the summit for its views alone.

- Another example of where careful social values assessment is required is the Springs, where it was determined that the former Springs hotel site was not appropriate for a new hotel because two memorial services had been held there (refer McConnell 2007). While not devaluing the importance of the site to those closely involved in the memorial services, the present assessment suggests that the Springs is likely to be valued for a range of reasons, and it may not be appropriate to give conservation precedence to an area on

---

45 This type of approach is also recommended in the Australia ICOMOS (1999) Burra Charter, refer Article 5.1.
the basis of two memorial services alone (noting that in the present assessment these memorial services were not identified as an aspect of social value).  

- Based on the results of the assessment, management also clearly needs to continue to recognise the very strong or deep level of valuing of the Park, primarily Mount Wellington, by members of the community. This is recognised in the current WPMP, and the results demonstrate that this perspective is valid for Wellington Park, at least for Mount Wellington. The identified social values which reflect the very strong personal valuing are ‘strongly defines person/integral to life’, ‘spiritual’ value, ‘memorial’ value and ‘important to be close to’; and to a lesser extent ‘family associations’ which is indicated as an important value for the community.

- The present assessment indicates that the ability to find escape, renewal, solitude, relaxation and peacefulness in the Park is a relatively important set of social values for the greater Hobart community. To ensure these values are preserved for a range of people, Park management needs to continue provide for some solitary walking at a range of levels, and to manage a range of accessible areas as quiet places. Park management also needs to continue to provide for groups of friends and families to undertake activities in the Park as these are also important values, with ‘family associations’ being the most important value related to ‘personal meaning and association’.

- It appears that many of the social values are dependent on the Park being easily accessible, with accessibility being one of the most important social values. This appears to mean that as well as the Park being close to Hobart, the number of entry points (the current entry points) and the ability to access a range of use options or otherwise realise social values from, or near, these entry points is important. The importance of the entry points is indicated by the naming of these areas as ‘places of special importance’ in the Survey results. Although only mentioned by a small number of respondents, free (ie no fee), access also seems to be an important part of this. It therefore appears important to maintain accessibility and non-fee paying access for the maintenance of the social values of the Park.

- It is important in the management of the Park to recognise that many community members live close to the Park and value this connection in a range of ways. As is currently recognised informally by the WPMT, this engenders a community of ‘Park neighbors’ who are likely to have a much more active and deep interest in how the Park is managed, including with respect to maintaining the social values they hold. A strong correlation with management interest and strongly held values by local residents was also noted by Andrusko (2010) for the Fern Tree Park and Bower area.

- It is also important in management to recognise that there is a broader community of interest for the Park, and that the community who is interested is not just neighbouring communities, but people from all over greater Hobart, and extending into the broader region, including as far afield as Sorell and Dodges Ferry, Bruny Island, Huonville and Franklin, New Norfolk, and Brighton.

46 It is important in such cases to clearly understand why such places are valued. In this specific case it may be qualities of the site such as the views and relative isolation that have meant it has been used for memorial purposes as well as other larger personal gatherings, and that these actual uses are of less personal value than the qualities of the site.
Andrusko (2010) found that for the Fern Tree Park and Bower the strength of valuing diminished with distance from the Park. This does not appear to be the case for the present assessment, possibly because it assessed the Park generally and not a small area adjacent a local community known for valuing the natural values (Andrusko 2010).

- A range of valued uses of the Park were identified (refer Figure 12) from the survey. The result indicates that these uses include recreation, social events, nature appreciation in various forms, artistic pursuits and working in the Park. Valued recreation takes a range of forms from highly active (eg, running, skiing, rock climbing and bike riding), through to moderate exercise (eg, walking and exploration) and to more passive recreation (eg, having picnics and barbeques, sleeping out in the Park, and driving the Pinnacle Road). Managing uses of Wellington Park needs to acknowledge this diversity of uses.

Although it was difficult to correlate different values, recreation and its valuing would appear from respondent comments and the level of valuing of other values (eg, exercise fitness function) to be highly dependent on its setting in a ‘beautiful’, ‘scenic’ and ‘natural’ environment. This correlation particularly applies to walking and bike riding, the two most valued recreational activities. This correlation was also suggested in Andrusko’s (2010) study of the Fern Tree Bower and Park. This should not come as a surprise, and the strength of the likely correlation is indicated in this comment from Stratfield (taken from Barnes 1992, 33) – “The mountaineer is not a mere gymnast, but a man who worships the mountains”. This dependence of the importance of recreation on its natural, and in some cases wilderness, setting also needs therefore to be acknowledged in the management of Wellington Park.

- The by far most important use of the Park is walking. This was identified as the most important value of the Park overall, and was more than 2.5 times more important than the next most popular activity, bike riding. A range of levels of walking appears to be important indicating that management needs to continue to provide for a range of walking opportunities. The survey results however indicate that walkers are generally happy with the range and variety of opportunities currently presented, and the quality of the tracks. Although a few respondents noted tracks that needed to be repaired, a large number of respondents congratulated the WPMT on the good condition of the walking tracks and the varied nature of the walks.

- A number of tracks, primarily walking tracks, were noted as important both for recreation and for their natural beauty and/or views. The diverse way in which the tracks are used and valued should be taken into account in management, including in the Walking Track Strategy.

In this context it should also be recognised in management that there are small number of highly valued tracks, especially by walkers, which are not at present recognised as being so highly valued. The Survey results indicate that the most highly valued tracks are –
  - the Pipeline Track (most valued),
  - the Zig Zag Track,
  - the Organ Pipes Track,
  - Jefferies Track, and
  - the East-West Trail.

- The second most important personal use of the Park identified by the responses was bike riding, with about 25% of respondents noting this use as a value. Again there are a range of bike riding interests including for families (with children) as well as for fitness and exercise and the pleasure of being in the bush. Bike riding occurs on, and is valued on, a range of infrastructure including made, rideable tracks (the Pipeline Track and N-S Track.
were most highly valued for this), fire trails, and the Pinnacle Road. Many riders appeared to be happy with the existing track opportunities, but a number of mountain bike riders expressed interest in more tracks, primarily downhill tracks (ie, tracks with major relief difference). As with walking, the variety of ways in which riding is valued should be acknowledged in management.

- Being able to access the snow and play in the snow, was identified as relatively important values. This appears to derived from the fact that the snow (when it falls) is extremely accessible to the greater Hobart community, whereas in other places getting to the snow is a relatively long drive and may require specialised equipment such as snow chains. This valuing presumably underlies community frustration when the Pinnacle Road is closed in unsafe conditions and the public need to walk some distance to the snow from their cars. From a management perspective, the value appears to be in being able to get into the snow with no or only a short walk, and to play. The location of the snow does not appear to be important in relation to this value.

- The history of Wellington Park and Mount Wellington is a moderately valued value, but is reinforced by the relatively high number of respondents who indicated in the ‘other use’ category that they value being able to visit the huts in the Park. This has implications for interpretation (ie, that people are interested to know about the history of the Park) and also for the management of the huts.

- Dog walking was only indicated as a value by a relatively small number of respondents (2.6%). This may have management implications (eg, in where dog walking is allowed and in the level of provision for dog walkers), but this figure may under-represent the proportion of the community who walk dogs in the Park as they may not see this as an ‘important’ value.

### 6.2 Project Limitations and Further Research

The present assessment was more successful in identifying the social, including landscape, values of Wellington Park than expected, both in terms of the number and geographic and age spread of respondents, and in the numbers and types of values that were indicated.

The approach used however has a number of limitations, and there are also considered to be some specific biases arising from the timing of the questionnaire and the way in which it was advertised and distributed.

The following indicates some of the main limitations and/or biases believed to be associated with the Community Values survey, and provides ideas for how these limitations might be addressed.

#### Sampling Limitations and Biases

- **Limited youth responses**: As discussed in Section 3.1, the geographic spread of respondents and the gender balance was considered very good. The age spread was also relatively good except for the youngest age group (0-20 yrs) which is clearly inadequately sampled with this group representing only 2.6% (11) of the total number of respondents (with the other age groups each representing between 22% and 39% of all respondents). This very small sample size is not considered a reliable sample for this age group.
A small sample size for this age group was foreshadowed as a possible issue, and it was proposed in the project design to use some targetted groups in this age range, primarily school groups. This was not undertaken because of staff time constraints on the project. Given the results of the survey, obtaining an additional c.100 - 150 responses from this age group by asking four to five classes, preferably from different schools in the greater Hobart area, to complete the questionnaire would provide reliable sampling of this age group, and would also be an effective and rapid solution.

- **Assessing what proportion of the community value the Park**: Given that the survey was a purely voluntary survey, this biases the responses to those who are strongly motivated to respond. As indicated by the responses, most people who responded were motivated because they value Wellington Park.

Although this allows for useful analysis of how the community value the Park, it does not give any indication of what proportion of the community as a whole values Wellington Park (ie, how widespread this valuing is in the community).

As this is important information to have in making decisions about how the Park landscape is managed, and how the Park is managed more generally, particularly when a significant part of the Park setting is Hobart, which is a major population centre and major tourist destination, consideration should be given to making this assessment. This information could be obtained rapidly and at little cost, by asking a random group of individuals (between c.250 and 500) whether they value Wellington Park or any part of it (ie, asking the first question on the questionnaire). One possible location for this, considered to capture a relatively random sample of people, would be the Elizabeth Street Mall or bus mall.

- **Special interest group bias**: Because of the timing of the Community Values survey, which was coincident with the consultation and preparation of a Mountain Bike Master Plan for greater Hobart, there appears to be more responses from keen mountain bike riders than might have occurred otherwise.

As noted elsewhere, this does not seem to bias the values data, except perhaps in relation to the apparent importance of mountain bike riding. Given the limited apparent bias in this respect, all the mountain bike responses were used as part of the assessment and there appears to be no need to manipulate these responses to eliminate bias.47

No other particular interest group biases were noted although, as noted in Section 3, the use of the Koonya U3A group and Rosny School for Seniors group have inadvertently resulted in a slight bias towards walking as a value (as the majority of respondents in these two groups are keen bushwalkers) and also in a slight emphasis in the geographic spread on the Eastern Shore and Tasman Peninsula. As with the mountain bike rider group, these responses did not appear to otherwise bias the values data and so were all used without any statistical weighting.

Although the cable car issue was prominent during part of the period of the Survey, views on a cable car were treated as management comment and not included in the Survey results. Since in all other respects the values data did not appear to be biased, all pro- and anti-cable car responses were used in the analysis.

In summary then, the biases arising from special group interests do not appear to have created a significant bias (other than perhaps in relation to the importance of mountain biking) in this case, and in fact may have broadened out the Survey results by including

---

47 Only one questionnaire from a mountain bike rider was not used. This was however because the questions had not been properly answered (refer Section 3.1) and not because of apparent bias.
more interest groups. No statistical treatment or other measures are therefore considered to be needed to address interest group bias in the Survey.

Limitations in Values Knowledge

The analysis of the responses has resulted in the identification of a wide range of values for Wellington Park, but a poor or incomplete understanding of what of a number of the values mean. This is largely a consequence of the Community Values survey being an open question type survey. Although an open type survey has the advantages of not constraining responses, of allowing people to express the full range of values, and allowing values to be expressed in a more nuanced way, it has the disadvantage of not being easy to use in a semi quantitative fashion, and of there being no common understanding (or view) of particular ways of valuing attributes.

The key areas where this has presented problems for the Wellington Park analysis are as follow:

- **Poorly understood values**: There are a small number of identified values that are not well understood, but have important management implications. These include how snow is valued, what specific landscape attributes are valued, what are the aesthetic elements that are valued, and what are the important aspects of the ‘variability’ and ‘variety’ offered by Wellington Park that are valued.

  A better understanding of what specific values mean, particularly values that are poorly understood, is probably most easily obtained by means of a more complex, detailed questionnaire survey (using the same respondents).

  One particular area that was felt to not be well covered by the present assessment was an understanding of how the views and viewscapes to and from Wellington Park, in particular Mount Wellington, are valued. The responses from the Community Values survey were often ambiguous about what views were being valued, and the overall relatively low valuing of views was unexpected and is felt to require testing. This assessment is likely to be best achieved as a separate focussed study. As it should attempt to sample a similar population, it could be in the form of a specialised questionnaire, and sent to all respondents to the Community Values survey who indicated they were willing to complete a longer questionnaire.

- **Not understanding the strength of valuing**: In some cases people indicated whether they strongly or slightly valued aspects of Wellington Park, but in general the focus of the responses was on the nature of the valuing not the degree of valuing. Although in the analysis, the number of respondents has been used as the measure of ‘strength’ of valuing, this is a measure for how strongly the community generally value something, and it does not indicate how important particular values are to individuals.

  As with understanding specific values better, achieving a better understanding of how important individual values are to respondents is also probably most easily obtained by means of a more complex, detailed questionnaire survey which asks respondents to indicate the importance of individual values to them.

- **Correlation of values**: The analysis indicates that some values correlate with other values. Given the complexity of the data, it is very difficult to clearly establish the correlations between the range of values with the basic level of analysis carried out for this assessment.

  A better appreciation of the correlation between the various values could be achieved 1. by undertaking a multivariate analysis of the tabulated Survey data, or 2. by asking...
respondents to indicate correlations in a more detailed and less open ended question style questionnaire. The second option is likely to be less effective, but could be easily undertaken as part of a more complex, detailed questionnaire survey. This analysis however is seen as relatively low priority.

- **Identification of Special Features:** Although a map was provided as part of the questionnaire and respondents were encouraged to identify particular places within the Park that were of value to them, the response to this appears to be very variable. This results in confusion and inaccurate data about the geographic specificity of values in a number of ways –
  - although a number of respondents noted that the whole of the Park was important to them, it appears that not all the identified values apply to the whole of the Park;
  - when people do not specify the whole of the Park is important, it cannot be taken to mean that this is not the case, as no other areas are generally specified;
  - in many cases it appears that it is only Mount Wellington that is valued, although in most cases this is not explicit;
  - the approach of the Survey is likely to have engendered under-representation of places of special importance or value (mainly as it did not ‘require’ this information) and this is indicated by the large number of response that did not identify places of special importance, generally or in relation to particular views.

Understanding the importance of the different parts of the Park and of individual areas and features would be very useful for management. This information could be derived from a more detailed questionnaire that asks for the area to which individual identified values apply, and/or by community mapping. Both approaches are seen as useful as they will result in different information. Community mapping is likely to result in more detailed and more accurate location information and a better understanding of the values of particular locations, but only for the communities consulted, and is a time consuming approach. The questionnaire approach is more efficient and will identify the broad range of areas and features valued, but at a more general level, with less understanding of each special area and feature.
7 CONCLUSION

7.1 Conclusions

The present assessment is based on 458 voluntary responses based on a short ‘open question’ style questionnaire designed to elicit information on how Wellington Park, or parts of it, are valued by individuals in order to build up a picture of the social values of Wellington Park for management purposes. A specific aim of the assessment was to understand how the landscape of Wellington Park is valued. This is the first systematic assessment that has been undertaken of the social values of Wellington Park as a whole.

The number of responses is considered to be an adequate sample. The responses come mainly from the greater Hobart region, but also from southern Tasmania more broadly and there are a small number of responses from other parts of Tasmania, interstate an overseas. The assessment is therefore seen to have good geographic representation. There is also a good balance of representation on the basis of gender and age, except for the 0-20 year old range which is very poorly represented.

The results, based on semi-quantitative analysis, indicate that –

- The whole of the Park is valued for a range of reasons, but the strong focus of valuing is Mount Wellington.
- The social values of the Park are very diverse and cover a number of individual values across the categories of ‘landscape value’, ‘aesthetic value’, ‘sense of place value’, ‘personal meaning and association’, ‘personal function’, ‘community function’, ‘scientific value’ and ‘historical value’.
- Overall, the landscape and place values are valued more highly than personal meaning and association and function, or community function.
- Although not considered to be a comprehensive list, a number of places and features within the Park were identified as being of special social value. The most highly valued natural place is the summit of Mount Wellington, but the Springs, the Organ Pipes, Sphinx Rock, the Pipeline Track and the Zig Zag Track are also highly valued.
- Individuals value the Park very differently, but with only minor differences by age or gender. The exception is the 0-20 year age group who appear to value personal and community function more highly than the landscape and place values, and do not value the Park for such a range of reasons as the other age groups.
- Some individuals value Wellington Park and Mount Wellington extremely strongly, to the extent that ‘it defines their lives’.
- For many individuals the Park is extremely important, but this importance is not necessarily related to being in the Park or the ability to visit the Park or live on its edge. The values (sense of place, landscape and personal meaning type values) are those which can be held from without or can be considered from a distance.

The most important single values identified by the assessment (in order of importance) are –

1. the ability to walk in the Park on what is seen as a good track network;
2. the naturalness/wilderness quality of the Park;
3. the landscape of the Park at a general level;
4. the Park’s location next to Hobart, as a natural area next to Hobart, or bookending Hobart with the Derwent on the other side;
5. the native biota; and
6. the aesthetics of the Park at a general level.

Other important values (ie, noted by more than 20% of respondents) include –
- the views to/of Mount Wellington,
- the changeability and variability of the Park,
- the atmospheric nature of the Park (primarily Mount Wellington),
- Mount Wellington and the Park as a backdrop to Hobart,
- the sense/spirit of place of Hobart engendered by Mount Wellington and the Park,
- that Mount Wellington is a landmark (or signature) for Hobart and ‘home’,
- family associations,
- bike riding, and
- the accessibility of the Park.

With respect to ‘essential community function’, conservation was seen as the most important function (by just under 20%) of respondents. Recreation was seen as the next most important function. Tourism, fresh water supply and education were all seen as important, but only by a relatively small proportion of respondents (<10%). These values are considered to be lower than might be expected if a survey was undertaken to specifically establish how people valued these functions. However, it is probable, given the other social values, that the relative importance of the different functions would remain much the same.

Generally, the results support the findings of the previous assessments which have looked at the importance of Wellington Park, or parts of it, to the community.

These findings provide support for the current management policy for Wellington Park, in particular the priorities for management. The way in which the Park is valued by the community indicates that management should aim to –
- manage the Park to ‘keep it as it is’,
- keep the natural values and wilderness quality, particularly on the forested slopes and alpine plateau areas,
- keep the Park big and respect the boundaries,
- maintain the Park essentially as a low intensity use space where people are easily able to have space to enjoy the Park on their own or in small groups,
- continue to provide for family activities as at present,
- allow the current range of recreational activities and keep the Park accessible,
- allow for new compatible recreational activities, but limit infrastructure, and
- infrastructure should be kept to a minimum and be carefully planned to avoid loss of naturalness and to avoid visual impacts.

The findings of this assessment should also be able to contribute to the refining of the zoning within the Park and the prescriptions for the different zones. It should also assist management in recognising specific features, areas and values of importance within the Park and provide for their management.
The present assessment, though its systematic and broad based approach, fleshes out the existing values knowledge framework, and provides a more fine textured appreciation of the values, including the relative importance of these values. It also helps understand the reasons behind community views about management of the Park.

Although the findings from the present assessment contain useful broad based information for management, it is lacking in detail (especially with respect to how particular places are valued) and there is additional values information that would enable better management advice to be provided in relation to managing social values. Key additional values information is seen as being understanding what proportion of the community value Wellington Park, and how strongly the different values are held by individuals, as well as gaining a better understanding of some of the articulated values. Additional sampling of the 0-20 year age group would address the current very small sample size for this age group. Another way in which the social values data could be developed is by broadening the geographic scope of the survey (ie, to include greater representation of Tasmanians from outside the greater Hobart area and of visitors to the state).

7.2 Key Management Recommendations

Because the focus of this assessment has been to identify social values only, and this has occurred at only a general level, and because the assessment has not included consideration of management implications, it is difficult to make direct or highly specific management recommendations in relation to the social values.

Therefore, the following recommendations are 1. of a general nature and reflect the fact that this assessment has shown the social values to be important values for Wellington Park, and in particular Mount Wellington, or are 2. for further research to better understand the social and community values of Wellington Park.

As the findings from the present assessment appear to essentially support current management policy at the general level, no recommendations are made for urgent changes to Wellington Park management policy or processes. Rather, the recommendations are seen as strengthening certain approaches that are contained, implicitly or explicitly, in the management policy.

**Recommendation 1**

*(priority - ongoing)*

Given that this assessment has identified a range of social values, including landscape type values, that attach to Wellington Park, in some cases quite strongly, it is recommended that the findings from this social values assessment, in particular the comment in Section 6 (*Issues for Management*) be used to inform future management of Wellington Park, including in management planning.

**Recommendation 2**

*(priority - ongoing)*

It is recommended that special consideration continue to be given to the maintenance of the landscape values (ie, landscape, aesthetic and sense of place values), in particular the maintenance of the essential naturalness of Wellington Park, the perceived wilderness qualities and the preservation of the native vegetation as, with the exception of using the Park for walking, these are the most important community values indicated by the assessment.
Recommendation 3  (priority - ongoing)
Given that this assessment has clearly established that there are a range of social values, including landscape type values, that attach to Wellington Park, and that some of these views are strongly held and/or indicate strong personal valuing, it is recommended that social values form part of the suite of values that are assessed for all management and new use and development.

Recommendation 4  (priority - ongoing)
In keeping with best practice (including the Burra Charter guidelines (Australia ICOMOS 1999)), it is recommended when social values are considered in relation to making management decisions in relation to Wellington Park, and notwithstanding the above, that –
1. the range of social values are considered,
2. the social values are considered along with other potential values, and
3. no values are given undue emphasis over other values.

Recommendation 5  (priority – immediate to short term)
It is recommended that to address the key issues of bias in the present assessment, the following two supplementary research components be undertaken as a priority –
1. asking four to five school classes in different geographic areas, and of different ages, to complete the existing questionnaire (to address the issue of the very small sample size for the 0-20 yr old category); and
2. undertaking a rapid, random sample survey of Hobart residents on the extent to which they value Wellington Park or parts of it (but not how they value it) to understand the actual proportion of the community that value Wellington Park in some way.

(Both these supplementary projects could be undertaken as University student research projects).

Recommendation 6  (priority – medium to long term)
To further develop the Trust’s understanding of the landscape and other social values of Wellington Park and their geographic specificity, it is recommended that the following broad based, longer term research into the social values of Wellington Park be undertaken –
1. Development of a more detailed and less open ended questionnaire to be completed by a sample of respondents to the present survey (and supplementary survey of young people) who indicated that they were interested in completing such a survey.
2. Undertake additional assessment on the contemporary value of views and viewscapes to and from Wellington Park, including the Mountain.
3. Longer term community mapping (proposed in the broader Landscape Assessment Project as a later stage to gain detailed information).

Consideration should also be given to expanding the geographic scope of the survey (or a similar survey), as the opportunity arises, to include Tasmanians outside the greater Hobart area and visitors from outside Tasmania.
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APPENDICES
Appendix 1
Questionnaire
QUESTIONNAIRE

The Wellington Park Management Trust is interested to know how Tasmanians value Wellington Park. This will help us look after the Park and protect its cultural values.

We invite you to take a few minutes to fill out this brief questionnaire to let us know how you value the Park or places within it. We would also like to know if you do not value the Park or do not have an opinion.

If you prefer an online option for this questionnaire go to: www.wellingtonpark.org.au/landscape

Information provided will be treated as confidential and no names will be used in any future publications.

» Is Wellington Park, or any part of it (including Mount Wellington) important to you in any way?
   ☐ Yes    ☐ No    ☐ Don't care    ☐ Don't know

» Why is Wellington Park important/not important to you?
   Please answer in your own words – we want to know what you think.
   Please comment on places within Wellington Park that are important to you, as well as the whole Park.
   Please use the map overleaf to show us the places you mention.

If you are having difficulty in answering this question, the list of possible values below might be of help.

- the scenery
- the landscape
- places of beauty
- the views (to or from the Park)
- its relationship to Hobart
- family reasons
- what you do there
- other personal associations or reasons
- the bush or other natural values
- its history
- its historic sites
- spiritual reasons
- other meanings
- or any other reason.

» If Mount Wellington and all of Wellington Park were low hills rather than a mountain range, how do you think this would affect your appreciation of Wellington Park, Hobart or even Tasmania?

Answer here:

More space is provided to answer overleaf. Please use additional pages if you need.

Questionnaire continued over page »

Please return your completed form to: Wellington Park Management Trust, GPO Box 503, Hobart, Tasmania, 7001
Please return the completed questionnaire by 31st December 2010 where possible.
Community Values Project

- Are you interested in answering a more detailed questionnaire regarding the value of Wellington park? If so, include your email or postal address here:

- Additional space for writing why Wellington Park is or is not important to you:

To assist with the analysis please complete the following:

Name (optional):

☐ Male ☐ Female

Residential town/suburb:

If you do not live near Wellington Park now, have you in the past? ☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, where?

Age group: ☐ 0-20 years ☐ 21-40 years ☐ 41-60 years ☐ 60 years +

Thank you for completing this questionnaire. General information about Wellington Park can be found on the Trust's website at: www.wellingtonpark.org.au
The Wellington Park Management Trust is conducting a survey to find out how people value Wellington Park; this includes places within it, or other aspects people consider important.

Please take a questionnaire or complete on-line at:
www.wellingtonpark.org.au/survey

Further information:
6238 2176 or info@wellingtonpark.org.au
Appendix 2

Example of Tabulated Results (Values)
Sample of tabulated data in Excel from Community Values Survey questionnaire responses (each row is the tabulated data from 1 respondent).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSE LOCATION DATA</th>
<th>BIO STATS</th>
<th>WP IMIL SCPE O UNSP LANDSCAPE VALUE</th>
<th>NON AESTHETIC VALUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HC001 HOWRAH 7018</td>
<td>1 M Y S</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC002 ROSETTA 7010</td>
<td>1 M Y NC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC003 DUNNYRINE 7005</td>
<td>1 M Y U</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC004 WEST HOBART 7000</td>
<td>1 M Y Y</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC005 AUSTINS FERRY 7011</td>
<td>1 M Y Y</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC006 LENAH VALLEY 7008</td>
<td>1 M Y N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC007 FERN TREE 7054</td>
<td>1 M Y Y</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC008 NEW TOWN 7008</td>
<td>1 F Y Y</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC009 O 7004</td>
<td>1 F Y S</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC010 NEW TOWN 7008</td>
<td>1 F Y Y</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC011 FERN TREE 7054</td>
<td>1 M Y Y</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC012 COLLINSVALE 7012</td>
<td>1 C Y N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC013 MONTROSE 7010</td>
<td>1 F Y Y</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC014 GOTHWOOD 7010</td>
<td>1 F Y Y</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC015 CLAREMONT 7011</td>
<td>1 F Y N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC016 CLAREMONT 7011</td>
<td>1 F Y Y</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC017 SOUTH HOBART 7004</td>
<td>1 M Y Y</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC018 BLACKMANS BA 7052</td>
<td>1 F Y Y</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC019 BLACKMANS BA 7052</td>
<td>1 M Y S</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued on from previous column –

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SENSE OF PLACE</th>
<th>PERSONAL CONNECTION &amp; MEANING</th>
<th>PERSONAL FUNCTION</th>
<th>IMPO ESSENTL COMMUNITY FUNCTION</th>
<th>SCIENTIFIC HISTORICA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix 3

Select Respondent Comment
## COMMUNITY VALUES QUESTIONNAIRE (WP Landscape & Social Values Survey, 2010-2011)

### DETAILED COMMENTS

Note: The colouring of the Response No. boxes indicates how Wellington Park is valued by the respondent:
Clear = valued; pale blue = don’t care; dark blue = don’t value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response No.</th>
<th>How Would Low Hills Affect Valuing</th>
<th>Specific Places/Areas noted as being of Value</th>
<th>Specific Comments About Valuing (not comprehensive)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HC001</td>
<td>• Still better than flat land</td>
<td>• Myrtle Forest –Collins Cap (recn)</td>
<td>Mt Wellington encompasses one major part of the twin ribbon of ambient joy that embraces our city – the other major part being the Hobart harbour/Derwent River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Pipeline Track (recn)</td>
<td>it is the soul of the mountain that draws us to its majesty of vista</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• track network eastern face (recn)</td>
<td>people all over the world want to come and ascend [to the summit] in a manner that provides modernity with sensitivity for locality; we need to improve our facilities upon this pinnacle – so that we show good grace and respect for what it offers in a sensitive manner, rather than what we have done at present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC002</td>
<td>• summit</td>
<td>• summit</td>
<td>The Mountain is the mark of the Park. The Heart. It should be embraced, included to the Hobart and Tasmania experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC003</td>
<td>• Summit views would be less significant</td>
<td>• summit/mountain</td>
<td>specifically mentions importance to birds during travel as a conservation, hence ‘safe’ zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC004</td>
<td>• Summit views would be less significant</td>
<td>• Summit/mountain</td>
<td>It is a bio-diverse cultural landscape to be kept in perpetuity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Loss of magnificent backdrop to Hobart</td>
<td>• biodiversity would be the same</td>
<td>Wellington Park is not Disneyland. Wellington park is there to be viewed and admired in a holistic and reflective manner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC005</td>
<td>• would not alter the cultural landscape values</td>
<td>• Silver Falls (celebration &amp; memorial)</td>
<td>The mountain is a part of me, I have a great sense of belonging.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• would not alter the cultural landscape values</td>
<td>• Lost World (caving)</td>
<td>I grew up in Fern Tree and back then could draw two lines NW and SW from the summit of Wellington to the S and W coasts not crossed by any road. An inspiring wilderness thus began in my backyard playground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• It would change the nature of my feelings not erase them</td>
<td>• Silver Falls (celebration &amp; memorial)</td>
<td>I feel its loss through road construction since very deeply, and the clutter of structures on the summit and the recent construction of an unnecessary new track (N-S) painfully. The Mountain should remain a sanctuary against all that (modernity and the trappings of today’s commercial lifestyles), its wilderness has been reduced too much already.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• I think the intensity of my attachment emotionally would be much reduced and my belief that it should be kept wild would be more from my head then my heart.</td>
<td>• Silver Falls (celebration &amp; memorial)</td>
<td>The Diversion tank at Silver Falls is an eyesore and a travesty (notes it was meant to be temporary after the 1960 floods).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| HC08   | - Weather difference important, especially freezing cold and snow  
|        | - The mountain is really the big feature of Hobart  
|        | - Sphinx Rock walk  
|        | - Pipeline Track from Fern Tree  
|        | - Organ Pipes (climbing)  
|        | - The Mountain [by its height and presence] connects inhabitants to nature (e.g., checking the weather, going to see the waratah in flower, waiting for the snow, etc).  
|        | - I love it we can go for bushwalks 5 minutes from our inner city house – to me this is an integral positive value about living in Hobart.  
| HC09   | - Would not be so visible but still a great area for recreation  
|        | - Fantastic ‘feel’ having mountain so visible and close to Hobart  
| HC10   | - Would not be the same – I love looking at the Mountain.  
|        | - Zig Zag Track  
|        | - Pipeline Track  
|        | - New Town to Springs  
|        | - Sphinx Rock  
|        | - Rocking Stone  
|        | - The lookout (Pinnacle?)  
|        | - I visit the Sphinx with every visitor to my house.  
|        | - Without Mount Wellington adventures my life in Hobart would be incomplete.  
| HC11   | - The height of Mt Wellington gives Hobart its ‘distinctive character’ among Australian cities and with a profile recognised internationally.  
|        | - boulder strewn slopes  
|        | - dense forests  
|        | - dead stags  
|        | - all that grieves us are the artificial intrusions at the Pinnacle.  
| HC12   | - No different – it’s heritage  
|        | - Collinsvale area  
|        | - eastern part of Park (ie, Collins Cap – Trestle Mtn eastwards)  
|        | - The park is important in all ways due a long term connection (over 70 years living on the edge of the Park  
| HC13   | - Appreciate Mt Wellington as it is  
|        | - I have not been lucky enough to go to see Mount Wellington from the top. I view it from a distance.  
|        | - It is good to preserve this great heritage and historic site and take good care of it.  
| HC14   | - Preferable to suburbia, but not as nature made it  
|        | - Escape from technology and the rat race.  
| HC15   | - Fern Tree area  
|        | - We have a world wide reputation of having one of the most beautiful capital cities with the mountain as a backdrop.  
|        | - I do hope it will remain intact and bring pleasure to future generations  
| HC16   | - Fern Glade area?  
|        | - Keep caring for Mount Wellington as a Range, don’t upset the ecology, it’s too special.  
| HC17   | - It would impact Hobart’s wilderness character  
|        | - It would still be attractive as wilderness, but possibly less awe inspiring or grand  
| HC18   | - We would miss the snow.  
|        | - Collins Cap  
|        | - Summit  
|        | - Fern Tree area  
|        | - It is so close to Hobart and requires so little effort to get there – this is unique for an Australian capital city.  
|        | - Being able to walk in snow is an experience interstate visitors have relished, and often it is a first time snow experience.
| HC019 | • It would still very much enhance the environs of Hobart. | • Fern Glade  
• Longley area  
• New Town Rivulet entrance to the Park  
• The mountain and its environs are unique in Australia, almost in the world. |
|-------|---------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|
| HC020 | • Hobart would be ‘just another hill town!’                  | • Summit  
• It is the heart and soul of Hobart. … It wouldn’t be Hobart without it.  
• I feel it is a must see destination for everyone to overview the city and surrounds. |
| HC021 | • I love climbing for the views and feeling of satisfaction – low hills would not have the same effect | • Myrtle Forest access  
• Collins Cap  
• Collins Cap – Mt Connection area  
• Collins Bonnet – Mountain River route  
• Collins Bonnet – Lachlan route  
• Myrtle Forest - Lenah Valley route  
• The Park is the reason we moved to this house. |
| HC022 | • The views would not be as stunning                         | • I also feel Mt Wellington is not utilised enough – we take it for granted. |
| HC023 | • The park itself is more important than the height of the terrain | • The spring wild flowers are very beautiful. |
| HC024 | • It would be just then a lookout and a reserve with recreational and social values. | • Mt Wellington to me is a huge/significant part of who I am today. |
| HC025 | • We wouldn’t have the snow which we Hobart people get so excited about. | • Thark Ridge  
• Cathedral Rock  
• Upper NW Bay River area  
(whole of park is important)  
• Its rugged grandeur – a constant reminder, for us in Hobart, of the natural environment – not many cities have this.  
• Undoubtedly Mt Wellington is the most remarkable thing about Hobart. |
| HC026 | • Would not be as beautiful.                                 | • Mt Wellington is Hobart.  
• Views are extensive - ‘who needs skyscrapers when our mountain does the job’.  
• ‘It is ours and it belongs to our children and theirs.’  
• A ‘long ago Mountain memory’ – ‘When I was a small child where I lived had a great view of the mountain – I had thought that the snow-covered then Springs hotel was where Father Christmas lived”.  
• The long geological history of the mountain gives a sense of ancient solidness ... Our lives are fleeting but the mountain is always there.  
• Specifically mentions Anaspides - ‘living there for millions of years’; and waratah – ‘evidence of Gondwana’ as natural values.  
• ‘The relatively unspoilt (free of commercialisation) nature of the mountain reminds us that we are capable of appreciating and protecting. We don’t have to turn everything into profit’. |

Wellington Park Social Values & Landscape – An Assessment
McConnell, A. (March 2012)
A Wellington Park Management Trust Report
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HC029</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HC030</td>
<td>● Mt Wellington</td>
<td>● Mt Wellington is the crown jewel of Hobart City/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC031</td>
<td></td>
<td>● Specifically mention orchids as a natural value.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC032</td>
<td>● Would lessen the majesty of the mountains.</td>
<td>● Summit plateau &lt;br&gt; ● E-W Trail area</td>
<td>● Specifically mention the following as landscape values – the view of the Wellington Range from the south, especially when lit up by the setting sun. &lt;br&gt; ● The proximity to Hobart is ‘important’ – ‘it is good for city folk to be reminded of Tasmania’s fantastic natural scenery on a daily basis’. &lt;br&gt; ● I feel privileged to live next so such natural beauty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC033</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC034</td>
<td>● Loss of grandeur possessed by mountains.</td>
<td>● huts (whole of park is important)</td>
<td>● Specifically mention the following as landscape values - sub-alpine places, and waterfalls.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC035</td>
<td>● ‘The Mountain is the focus’ – I couldn’t imagine what the place would be like without it in the background.</td>
<td></td>
<td>● It’s the most important place in the world to me. I can’t imagine living anywhere else in the world.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC036</td>
<td>● ‘Much less impact scenically, spiritually and in its “specialness”’. &lt;br&gt; ● ‘A Tasmanian gem would be diminished’.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC037</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC038</td>
<td>● Hobart would no longer be Hobart.</td>
<td>● Sphinx Rock &lt;br&gt; ● other lookouts</td>
<td>● The views are quite stunning and compare with anywhere in the world.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC039</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Wellington Park is important to me, not for myself, but to know that it is there for my children, grandchildren, etc., also as a clean green area which will always be there for posterity”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC040</td>
<td>● Of course because it is ‘of special value for its mountainous terrain, its delicacy and views – it is unique. (whole Park is important)</td>
<td></td>
<td>● How many cities in this world have a stunningly beautiful sanctuary on their doorstep, so that people can escape from city life’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC041</td>
<td>● It would be more mundane. &lt;br&gt; ● It would produce less adventurous people. &lt;br&gt; ● The rock climbing, eg, Organ Pipes, and scrambling in Lost World are good adventures to start us on bigger things in life, and to forget problems, an escape.</td>
<td></td>
<td>● Specifically mentions the following as landscape values – true alpine and sub-alpine places on the top of Mt Wellington. &lt;br&gt; ● ‘Vital part of the spirit of place of Hobart – sandwiched between Derwent and bush, and height of Mt Wellington. On edge of Southern Ocean, bush of Wellington is the doorstep to the SW that one looks over from the Pinnacle’. &lt;br&gt; ● ‘I like walking away from tracks too’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC042</td>
<td>• The vegetation and scenery would be entirely different and certainly not as spectacular.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC043</td>
<td>• “It would not be part of my daily life” because not visible. • High parts of the mountain • The back of the Mountain towards the SW</td>
<td>• ‘Mt Wellington is a wonderful geographical feature, and Hobart is lucky to have it as its backdrop. • ‘I have given my property conservation status partly because of the education Mt Wellington has given me’.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC044</td>
<td>• Crabtree area • Jeffries Track</td>
<td>• Being on top helps to put everything into perspective when you’re in the midst of things.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC045</td>
<td>• Different plants and animals. • Would change the altitudinal range of plants from top to bottom which is very impressive. • I would miss being able to play in the snow. • Summit (as lookout) • Fern Glade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC046</td>
<td>• As a Mountain Range the Park has a character of its own (which flat hills do not have) • Browns River • Fern Tree area</td>
<td>• Specifically mentions the following as natural values – huge trees.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC047</td>
<td>• I would miss the Mountain. • Summit • Octopus Tree • Springs</td>
<td>• ‘The Mountain is the backdrop to my life’. • I’ve participated in some great community events at the Springs (eg, Mountain Festival). This is an important community space.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC048</td>
<td>• “The Mountain backdrop is dramatic and, combined with the Derwent, makes the city attractive and very special (on a world scale). • ‘Secret places’ • West of summit</td>
<td>• Specifically mentions the following as natural values – rivers, alpine fields, mountains, waterfalls. • ‘So many interesting “secret” places in Wellington Park. • ‘Unique recreational resource, so close to Hobart, for people of all ages, interests, abilities. To have Wellington Park accessible within a few minutes of the city is unique’.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC049</td>
<td>• ‘As Mt Wellington provides a frame for our city, a core part of the beauty of Hobart and environs would be lost’. (whole Park is important)</td>
<td>I am unfailingly in awe of the variations that regular walking in some part of the Park brings me. • ‘While walking in the misty rain my mind considered that I was able to take a walk in heaven’. • ‘When dawn breaks and throws a caste of pink over the Wellington Wonderland – tell me a heart that is not moved.” • “None of her many faces tells us anything but that we are HOME!”.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC050</td>
<td>• “Its elevation and wildness are important. Low hills, etc, would be dull and detract from our appreciation of the Mountain, Hobart and the State”.</td>
<td>• ‘when I see the mountain I know that I am home’. • “When we first arrived in Tasmania we had what for us was an amazing experience with the children. We enjoyed the surf at Clifton Beach and then within 40 minutes or so we were involved in a snowball fight on top of the mountain”.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC052</td>
<td>“If the Park was low hills is significance would diminish slightly as it wouldn’t have the huge change in altitude which would mean less diverse vegetation types and ecosystems”.</td>
<td>“...the mountain that has meant so much to our family and that continues to do so down the generations”.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC053</td>
<td>Part of the wonder of Mt Wellington is as a majestic backdrop to Hobart with a range of environmental values.</td>
<td>Specifically mentions the following as natural values – wildflowers, waratahs, orchid.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC054</td>
<td>’It would not be the same, it is part of Hobart’s allure’.</td>
<td>“Mt Wellington is a magnificent backdrop to Hobart with beautiful views from the top, from the Springs, from Sphinx rock, etc”.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC055</td>
<td>’Loss of big picture view’. ’Loss of feeling significance/ insignificance of the individual.</td>
<td>“Later, I was lucky enough to live at the Springs Hotel”. [NB: Respondent lived at the Springs Hotel as a teenager from 1959 to 1960/61, when her parents took over management of the Springs Hotel]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC056</td>
<td>“The Mountain defines Hobart in many ways.” With the Mountain there are “differing views from different suburbs.”</td>
<td>“I enjoy seeing the many people from Tasmania and overseas who share the Park”.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC057</td>
<td>“It would certainly detract from the ambience”.</td>
<td>“A beautiful mountain at my back door with maintained walking tracks is a luxury not available to many people”.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC058</td>
<td>“Probably not as inspiring”.</td>
<td>“A symbol of home as one drives back from town”.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HC059  • "I doubt if similar variety would be possible, including in the fauna'.
• ‘The seasonal change would be less marked’. Hobart, Tasmania and the nation would be poorer’.

HC060  • "It would change the whole atmosphere of Hobart and its surrounds’.
• ‘I cannot imagine Hobart (MY HOME) without our beautiful mountain and its surrounds.

HC061

HC062  • ‘The hills would have been cleared or grazed and degraded, like everywhere else in Australia. The Mountain, and Tassie’s nature more generally, is the main reason my partner and I moved back here from interstate. We would have otherwise likely been living and working overseas by now’.

HC063  • Loss of naturalness (‘hills would have been subject to real estate development’).
• There is something about there being a mountain towering over a city that does “something” – something good and beneficial’.

HC064  • “Would still appreciate Wellington Park, but possibly not as much, as the scenery and views would be absent or reduced”.

HC065  • "Wellington Range provides a backdrop to our suburbs and a curtain to the wilderness”.
• The mountain tops provide familiar profiles, landmarks, datums for direction, without which I am lost’.

HC066  • “I would miss the height of the mountain’.

• "The Australian bush is the main factor defining our character. Being enveloped within the change of seasons and wildlife is the very expression of my own life”.
• "Nowhere else I know has such a park so close to its city centre”.

HC059  • South Hobart- Fern Tree area
• Fern Tree Bower

HC060  • “I grew up on the mountain in Strickland Ave; [having left a few years ago] I miss living there, it is my HOME – my grandparents, my parents and my children and to me ,
• “I have travelled to many countries in the world, but always come home to our mountain”.
• “My daughter did an assignment for the final part of her university degree on the mountain – the day before my mum died my daughter took the almost completed assignment for Mum to see”.

HC062  • Specifically mentions the following as natural values – alpine and subalpine communities, Tasmanian endemics, birds, mammals.
• ‘the lack of development means that it [the mountain] still belongs to the people’.

HC063  • “Mt Wellington/Wellington Park is a haven … Although we are prone to deny it, humanity needs nature. Our bodies need to exercise, our minds the serenity, and our souls the contact with, and trust in, “creation””.

HC064  • “Natural bushland is important … to allow access to sites and scenic views which are not necessarily available to the motorised tourist”.

HC065  • “Wellington Park is an edge between the city of Hobart/Glenorchy/etc and Tasmanian wilderness”.
• “It is there on my doorstep. It is my doorstep!”
• “The Mountain features so prominently in my life – a compass, a barometer, a backdrop, a doorway’.
• “More than any other landmark, Wellington Range and the mountain remind me of who I am, my place and my home.”

HC066  • “It is always beautiful”.
• “The tracks are terrific”.
• “I love how it always looks different from town every day!”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| HC067| • ‘Loss of – alpine environment, winter snow, low winter cloud/mist, variety of vegetation, fauna and landforms, views’. | • Tracks on E face of mountain  
• Big Bend Track  
• O’Grady’s Falls  
• Huon Road – Fingerpost area  
• Pipe Track & MWSS features (as heritage)  
(whole Park is important)  
• Specifically mentions the following as natural values – alpine environment, currawongs.  
• Important for “Combination of wild area with many bush tracks and archaeology”.  
• “The attraction is that it is highly accessible: You can’ wander’ from track to track as far up or across the mountain as you like”.  
• The Park provides a defined edge of the city - no future sprawl”. |
| HC068|                                                                                                    | • Notes values for respondent are diminished by users who do not respect other users.                          |
| HC069| • Fern Tree area  
• Pipeline Track  
(& Waterworks)                                                                 | • “I look across to Mt Wellington from my home in ... Sandy Bay and if I do not look left or right it is as if there is nothing between me and the mountain except trees”.  
• “The moods and colors of the mountain fascinate me. It really is “the purple-headed mountain, that river running by’ of the old hymn - All things bright and beautiful.”  
• “The peripheral areas of Mt Wellington [areas adjacent] area also important to me and greatly influenced by being adjacent to the Park”. |
| HC070| • “Would miss the snow and upland flora”.                                                          | • Specifically mentions the following as natural values – alpine flora, snow, waratah in bloom”.            |
| HC071| • “Wouldn’t use the Park for Mountain biking or views”.                                               | • Summit (views)                                                                                              |
| OL001| • It wouldn’t have the iconic status it does today.                                                  | • “It’s the showpiece of Hobart.”                                                                             |
| OL002|                                                                                                    |                                                                                                                |
| OL003| • “Mountain ranges deter development somewhat’.                                                       | • (whole Park is important)  
• Specifically mentions the following as natural values – fresh air, waterfalls.  
• “Part of Hobart’s character comes from the Mountain Air”. |
| OL004| • It would not be so important to me - “I love the elevation and the clear air, the mountain pools of water and the alpine plants”.  
• “I would still appreciate the bush and solitude but it would not be the same”. | • “there is such a wonderful array of walking tracks and the beauty is that mostly with a little imagination one can do a circuit walk no matter which level you wish to tackle”.  
• We have a special place with spectacular views where we go to celebrate our birthdays, Christmas and Easter with a sunrise breakfast, weather permitting”.  
• The Mountain – “As I sit here I just need to turn my head to see it, this morning bathed in sunshine with pockets of the remnants of the snow glistening on top”.  
• “I love the Mountain. It stabilises me. ... I cannot imagine life without our mountain”. |
| OL05  | “The mountain is the focal point for Hobart and forms the backdrop”.  
|       | “I think the functionality of the site would remain, but it would probably be more vulnerable to being taken over by property development. The identifiability of the mountain makes it fairly safe in that regard.”  |

| OL06  | “Not as dramatic or singular or original”.  
|       | Notes as a value – “beautiful sweeping views”.  |

| OL07  | “Yes of course it would. The park is only special because of the mountain”.  
|       | Mt Wellington  
|       | Wellington ridge/plateau  
|       | Notes the following as of main importance – “The bushwalking trails and peaks behind the Wellington Summit”.  |

| OL08  | “I think that due to the mountain, it does give the area an added ‘wow’ factor.”  
|       | Myrtle Forest  
|       | “Of course the mountain is just spectacular, particularly in winter with snow”.  
|       | “I had never heard of the forest [Myrtle Forest] and loved how great it was there. When we mentioned it to other people, they had no idea where it was.”  |

| OL09  | “Hobart wouldn’t be much to look at” without Mt Wellington.  
|       | “The idea of Hobart without Mt Wellington is impossible”.  
|       | “As soon as you arrive by air it dominates the landscape. From many of the streets it frowns down at us”.  
|       | “It’s a magnificent piece of real estate far more valuable in so many different ways, to more people, than if it were portioned off and sold off”.  |

| OL10  | “It wouldn’t provide the diversity in landscape and vegetation that you experience as you ascend”.  
|       | “Low hills wouldn’t receive snow like the mountain does – the snow makes the mountain so picturesque.”  
|       | “It’s unique in Australia, (pardon the pun) a point of difference, and I just love it>  |

| OL11  | “We are so lucky to be able to be in the snow and then 40 mins later be at the beach”.  
|       | “I don’t think Wellington Park would have the impact it does if it wasn’t what it is”.  
|       | Specifically mentions the following as natural values – waterfalls, caves.  
|       | Also notes as important the ‘rugged huts and bbqs at the Springs’.  
|       | “It is a free place for families to enjoy the outdoors close to the city, ... Access to the pinnacle for general public by their own vehicle should always remain”.  |
| OL014 | “I love its grandeur, overlooking the city like it is our protector. Low hills would not move me the same way”. | “Love the skyline it creates”. |
| OL015 | “Melbourne has ranges and the Yarra, Adelaide has hills and the Torrens, Hobart has a mountain and the Derwent – gold medal”. | Respondent sees the Mountain as an ‘iconic tourist attraction’, and sees the summit area as “already spoilt by the TV and radio tower as well as the scar (road)”, so comments that a cable car would not detract more if done sympathetically. |
| OL016 | “Hobart without the mountain would be like the Hobart CBD is like without a major department store – wouldn’t have too much in its favour”. | The Mountain is “strong, silent and reliable”.
“It has picturesque walks and breathtaking views”.
“On a clear night, way above the city lights, you can see numerous shooting stars and satellites edging along their orbits”.
“Mt Wellington sets Hobart apart from other harbour-side cities, and gives Hobart and its surrounds soul”.

| OL017 | “The mountain seems to guard over us, low hills would not have the same feel”. | “I feel lucky every time I walk on any of the tracks or drive up there and see a fantastic view – how lucky we are to live in such a beautiful city so close to beautiful bushland”. |
| OL018 | “Hobart would feel entirely different”. | ‘The foothills of Mount Wellington provide an important part of the transition into the montane Wellington Park environment’.
“It’s a place where I have enjoyed lovely BBQs in the stone huts amidst running water and snow”.
Mt Wellington forms ‘the most stunning backdrop to our beautiful city, and is what creates that powerful impression as travellers and residents head towards the city from the airport’.
“It is also an important part of our heritage and the toil of our forefathers in constructing the road to the pinnacle and the harsh conditions in which they worked should never be forgotten”.
“The summit affords one of the best views in the world … It’s a place where all visitors should go, but thankfully many don’t”.
It is a ‘visual gateway to the city of Hobart and our wilderness’> |
| OL019 | “It would not be nearly as attractive” as it would not be a ‘proper mountain’ or have such ‘great views and a different climate’. | |
| OL020 | | The plateau (for walking)
Sphinx Rock lookout
Lone Cabin
Wellington Falls | Notes as being of historic importance the shelters and ice houses – and values being able to visit these.
“Views across to such a large green reserve provide a sense of spaciousness to all residents of Hobart, whether or not they set foot in the park”. |
| OL021 | • Values mainly noted as infrastructure (to pursue recreational activities) – ‘the mountain bike trails, the walking tracks, the roads (road bike riding)’. Also notes other natural and landscape values.  
• “there is no other city in Australia where you can be in the foothills of a Mountain by bike or by car within 5 mins of the CBD”.

| OL022 | • Would continue as now to value Mt Wellington as “a natural, recreational space in close proximity to the city” and to use if for walking.

| OL023 | • Would miss ‘the wildness that can only be experienced when walking in alpine areas’.  
• The Park as it is offers a variety of environments and experiences that low hills do not.

| OL024 | • Mount Wellington (whole Park is important)  
• Notes ‘the wonderful variety of walking tracks’ as being important.  
• “Many people do not realise the extent of the park and there are areas within it where it is possible not to see human influences. It is like having the experience of a proper wilderness right on our doorstep – and there are few cities fortunate enough to be able to claim that”.  
• “I think that ‘the Mountain’ is an integral part of our lives ... It is so precious”.

| OL025 | • The Mountain was “the first major physical feature of my environment. Growing up in Glenorchy, the Mountain’s presence always guided me and watched over me. It was a comforting site”.  
• “I fight every day to protect the park, even if it is just picking up rubbish, saving an injured animal or just checking on any negative use of the park”.

| OL026 | • “The mountains are so beautiful if was one of the main reasons we moved to Tas [from Sydney]. We even waited to buy the house we have now because of its mountain views of Sleeping Beauty”.  
• The mountains make “the feel of the place more rugged, more natural, the weather systems that move in make us feel more alive”.

| OL027 | • Mount Wellington (whole Park is important)  
• “It is so beautiful – I look at the webcam almost daily ... and marvel at its beauty, the seasons, the views and light”.

| OL028 | • As low hills it would be more like living in any of Australia’s other capital cities, not the best and most beautiful capital city in the country”.

| OL029 | Notes as a special value – “the Organ Pipes when they are bathed in the morning sun”.  
• Comments indicate the respondent sees any more development in the Park as not in keeping with maintain the natural values and as violating his personal connection to the place.

| OL030 | • “Being mountainous makes it a bit more wild and a bit more of a feature, especially when it snows”.  
• “If it was just a hill it would be fine as a recreational place, but not as exciting”.

| OL031 | • O’Grady’s Falls  
• Strickland Falls  
• Big Bend  
• Lost World  
• South Hobart area  
• “We live close to the park and love the feel of being in the country, while close to the town”.  

| OL032 | • “It would still be a marvellous asset, due to its proximity to the city”.  
• Mount Wellington  
• Organ Pipes
### Wellington Park Social Values & Landscape – An Assessment

**McConnell, A. (March 2012)**

#### OL029
- "We would still be able to walks, appreciate views, etc.
- "The dramatic mountain environment would not be there – the Organ Pipes and the rock climbers or the snow covered summit."

#### OL030
- "I enjoy walking different tracks from the Springs. Up and down depending on my mood."
- "I loved taking our children up when they were younger and now they have their own relationship and appreciation of the mountain."

#### OL031
- "Yes, I love the height, I appreciate it more because it is higher than the hills."
- "I love taking our children up when they were younger and now they have their own relationship and appreciation of the mountain."

#### OL032
- "The height is significant as is the vegetation."
- "Notes as important the "breathtaking views from the Pinnacle, Sphinx rock and around the Organ Pipes."

#### OL033
- "Notes as specific natural values – ‘the lush ferneries and mosslands."
- "Notes as specific historic/heritage values – the indigenous heritage, Charles Darwin's visit, its historic and ongoing role for water supply, the ‘sandstone viaducts’ of the MWSS."
- "It is notable ... as the state's second largest state reserve – one of our first."

#### OL034
- "I love the personal sense of satisfaction you can get from climbing a 'mountain' – it can be quite metaphoric really."
- "It might be easier for me to grow vegetables in South Hobart with no mountains"
- "Notes as specific historical/heritage values – old huts, monuments."
- "I love the feeling of peace and all’s right with the world when I walk up Fingerpost Track, huffing and puffing, and then come to this wonderful open view over Hobart."

#### OL035
- "Key value is that it is where the respondent was born and raised. Respondent comments - "It would not affect my appreciation of the natural landscape of the area [Crabtree area] a single iota. I was born and brought up in the foothills of Mt Wellington."

#### OL036
- "Maybe it would mean I could take my dog on more walks".
- "Mt Wellington (whole Park is important)"
- "Wellington Park is part of why I moved to Tasmania."
- "Mt Wellington is my happy place. I've had a lot of trauma ... in the past few years, and it is important for me to have somewhere I can either relax or be alone with my thoughts."

#### OL037
- "There would be less plant variation and less dramatic scenery and fewer views in terms of distance, and no Organ Pipes and no snow, which would also affect Hobart’s attractiveness to tourism."

---

**Wellington Park Social Values & Landscape – An Assessment**
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| OL038 | “Not much personally – other than missing the broader landscape values” (eg, prominence in the landscape). | • Respondent strongly believes that more diversity of recreation should be permitted/allowed for in the Park – “I strongly value nature-based recreation opportunities ... [the Park] could offer so much more in the way of sustainable recreation opportunities rather than just the bushwalking and sightseeing focus that currently exists. Mountain biking in particular is very popular ... and the provision needs to be expanded greatly ...” These areas [Hobart and its fringing residential areas] need a better focus of recreation (not just bushwalking) – the community deserves more diverse recreational opportunities/permission. People need more opportunities to have fun and enjoy themselves (as well as exercise”). |
| OL039 | “The sheer size and bulk of a major mountain looming over the city gives it a presence and a kind of subliminal power that would not be conveyed by a range of low hills”. | • “To me Mt Wellington and its range represent the closest example to Hobart of a landscape representative of the unique western Tasmanian wilderness. The fact that it overlooks the city makes it even more significant in this regard – it is less possible to ignore the concept of wilderness when the edge of it is constantly in view from most points of the city”. |
| OL040 | “not the same awareness of “The Mountain” or the variability of the weather.” | |
| OL041 | “Mt Wellington protects us from weather so subliminally has become our guardian. It is a powerful focus point. Our Rock”. | Mt Wellington |
| OL042 | | • “I know nothing about it and don’t particularly like the bush so I have no interest in it” |
| OL43 | “Yes – it would probably feel more like Canberra”. | • “Its [Mt Wellington] shear presence makes us more ‘nature’ aware, ie, where the prevailing winds descend from, the snow and the mountain’s different trees”. |
| OL044 | (whole of Park is important) | • Respondent in noting personal values describes the Park/Mt Wellington as – constant, ever present, and a wonderful natural element. |
| OL045 | “I’d miss the view and I think it [Mt Wellington] would cease to be one of the defining features of Hobart and Southern Tasmania”. | Mt Wellington |
| OL046 | “Visually less impressive, less snow which is very picturesque”. | E-W Trail |
| OL047 | “We won’t get the beautiful view from a distance [driving to work every day from the eastern shore]”. | Mt Wellington |
| OL048 | | • “We also appreciate that there are various walks in the park which cater for people of different abilities”.

Wellington Park Social Values & Landscape – An Assessment
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| OL049 |  |  |
| OL050 |  |  |
| OL051 |  |  |
| **OL052** | • “Hobart's landscape of a city between river estuary and high mountain seems to me to be relatively unique globally – the mountain is the special element in this trio ... the grandeur and drama come from the high mountain backdrop”.  
• “low hills wouldn’t provide the landmark or the ‘touchstone’ that the mountain provides everyday”. | • Part of importance is the multi-generational (family) ability to do the same things (picnic and walk in the Park). |
| **OL053** | • “I don’t think it would have such a strong affect on people’s sense of place and relationship to the natural landscape” | • Mount Wellington  
• “Looking up at the organ pipes from directly beneath them is awe-inspiring”.  
• Notes as a value – ‘cultural heritage (both indigenous and European)’.  
• The Mountain’s “presence is a constant and gives Hobart a cosy, protected feel and also gives you a bearing on where you are (as opposed to flat cities like Melbourne)”. |
| **OL054** | • “Hobart would not be as spectacular or special. It gives the city its individuality – Mountain connected to a city connected to water”. |  |
| **OL055** | • “Hugely”.  
• “It constantly puts our (in)significance into perspective due to its size and the vistas one can appreciate whilst walking the well maintained tracks across the alpine sections”. |  |
| **OL056** |  |  |
| **OL057** |  |  |
| **OL058** | • “The rockclimbing on Mt Wellington, and its [being a] visual backdrop to the city would be much less significant if the Park were low hills”. |  |
| **OL059** | • “It would not be as stunningly beautiful, nor as breath-taking in its presence if it were low hills”. | • Mt Wellington  
• ‘My appreciation is for its [Mt Wellington] beauty, and that is mostly to do with its height, width, the surrounding ranges and its location on the city’s doorstep. I lived with a mountain range for many years in NSW (Mt Warning), ... but it does not have quite the impact as a mountain at the edge of a city – in fact part of the city”.  
• “We always take our interstate/overseas visitors up there – it provides a real “showing off our city’ moment”.” |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OL060</th>
<th>“It would be ‘reasonable but not exciting’, it would be ‘a bit like driving from Hobart to Sorell’.”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| OL061 | “there is something about it being a mountain range that makes it more magical”.

*Organ Pipes* |
| OL062 | “I think it would still be equally as important”.

*“It also provides recreational areas easily accessible to the residents of Hobart – whether it be passive or active pursuits”.* |
| OL063 | “Significantly, it just wouldn’t be the same any more”.

*“It is sooo nice to be close to both sea and mountain with an alpine environment”.* |
| OL064 | “It is important as a place of natural beauty. The landscape should be kept as natural and undeveloped as possible”.

| OL065 | “I look at Mt W range at least a dozen times a day to just see what’s happening – is it clouding over, raining, etc”.

(whole of Park is important) |
| OL066 | “It would spoil it”.

*“It is where we live and have done for many years. We spend a lot of family time walking through the bush and enjoying the natural beauty of it”.* |
| OL067 | In describing how low hills would affect their appreciation, the respondent notes “Other than protecting skyline attributes it would not be as significant or important”.

*a place the community can enjoy by walking, riding, running and driving to/in.* |
| OL068 | “Wellington Park being a Mountain allows for experiences that are unique to Hobart”.

*“Seeing the mountain pink during a sunrise, white after a big snow dump or dark and grey when a storm is rolling in makes your urban life seem a little less urban”.*

*“Having a mountain so accessible from a city is perfect (although a few extra hundred metres in height and some decent downhill snowboarding would be nice, but you can’t have everything”.* |
| OL069 | “Variously it excites, portends, and (most often) soothes the soul”.

*“I like to go to the snow at least once a year - it is a unique and special experience for my children”.* |
| OL070 | Would have less value due to the loss of the alpine environment.

*The Springs (family friendly area)* |
| OL071 | |
| OL072 | “The height and grandeur of the mountain range is an important part of the value it elicits”.

(whole of Park is important) |
| OL073 | “It [the Park] is rather special being so big with snow almost at any time of the year”.

(whole of Park is important) |

*“Fantastic amenity, scenery, sightseeing, montane landscapes – so close to Hobart”.*

*Respondent also notes that they would like to see the Park ‘bigger and a little more accessible (in the far reaches)’.*
| OL074 | • “Less impressive and less interesting” | • “Best recreational get away area of any capital city”. |
| OL075 | • “Same if it still had its rainforests”. | Mt Wellington |
| OL076 | | • Notes as a specific natural value – the run off of storm water. |
| OL077 | • “It might make it more accessible during all weathers”. | • “To know that you have all sorts of interesting things to discover in the Park is fantastic”. |
| OL078 | • “Mt Wellington is a dominant physical feature of Hobart (and southern Tasmania) ... If it weren’t there, one could envisage that Hobart might not be located where it is””. | |
| OL079 | • “The mountain also magnifies the weather”. | Northwest Bay River  
Cathedral – Montagu ridge  
Plateau  
western and southern fringes  
| • “It’s unique to Hobart and must be one of the best places for outdoor recreation”.  
• “I particularly like the sense of remoteness on top and over towards the western and southern fringes of the park. It is a world class remote location which is virtually on Hobart’s doorstep”. |
| OL080 | • “It would mean I would have to drive further to get into the Mountains” | • “It is beautiful, close to home and within 30 mins I can be in a place of rugged wild solitude – a truly unique thing for a city, and for it to be an alpine environment makes it more special”. |
| OL081 | • “For me ... [the mountain] is subject to some pretty wild and inhospitable weather – gives it a sense of “wilderness” and something that cannot be tamed”. | |
| OL082 | • “It’s special because it’s a Mountain!!”. | |
| OL083 | • Mount Wellington  
Wellington Falls  
Octopus Tree  
| “I also value that the mountain is important for the Tasmanian Aboriginal people”.  
• “The mountain is ... intrinsically important to me”. |
| OL084 | • “Having a “high” mountain (> 1000m) so near to a capital city is a fantastic tourist icon and boon for locals with the various recreational activities that are possible without a long commute out of town”. | Pipeline Track  
Remote peaks along the E-W Trail.  
| “Places like the Pipeline Track and the various remote peaks along the East-West trail on the Wellington Range hold a special place in my thoughts and memories”. |
| OL085 | • “No it would not be the same if it weren’t such a big mountain. But that would only change the park – it would no longer be an alpine landscape on top, and get less snow as a result. But it wouldn’t take anything else away from the greater Hobart area as a whole. | Organ Pipes  
Mt Wellington  
| “the uniqueness of it [Mt Wellington] towering over Hobart ...”.
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| OL086 | Wellington Park would not be the same draw card for visitors to the city – would probably be viewed similarly to somewhere like the Meehan Range. | Mt Wellington |
| OL087 | ...it would be different visually but the lower hills are just as beautiful and offer great walks... | Wellington Falls  
Myrtle Forest  
The Springs |
| OL088 | 'over the back'  
Lenah Valley entrance area | The Park “provides a vast range of walks from easy through to more difficult and I have been privileged to have completed a vast number of walks throughout the park”. |
| OL089 | Hobart wouldn’t be Hobart!!! It is Mt Wellington. It is the frame around our lives. Every place I have lived in Hobart it has sat there like a mother with its arms around me – for Hobart not to the mountain is to say we are something else completely.  
The mountain bought a lump to my throat each and every time I returned to Hobart on holidays from uni in Melbourne and came over the crest of that hill from the airport and saw the Tasman Bridge and that beautiful mountain – only when you leave Hobart for a long time and see it all again anew – wow – it is special. | Notes as special natural values – ‘the rocks, the harsh tree landscape near the top in winter, the rainforest/waterfall fern walks. |
| OL090 | Not at all as there would possibly be more rain forest? It would make it easier to disappear into the forest without having to climb some of those lovely and hectic rock trails | “I sometimes think having a view of the mountain rather than living on it is better!”. |
| OL091 | It would change the way Hobart looks and feels. | |
| OL092 | | |
| OL093 | Yes. Because the mountain makes it so interesting and beautiful and visitors wouldn’t be so interested because they come up for the views. | Mount Wellington |
| OL094 | “Because there is such a variety of terrain for mountain biking and it’s hard to find another place to cover so much vertical in such a short space of time”. | |
| OL095 | It wouldn’t have the impact of the mountain on our doorstep. | “It’s one of our most important natural assets. I grew up near Sheffield with Mt Roland being an amazing part of the landscape. Mt Wellington doesn’t have the same impact, but its proximity and access makes it part of our lifestyle and part of what Hobart is (and offers)”. |
| OL096 | “The view from the top would suffer greatly, but since all the riding is from the Springs down, that wouldn’t suffer much”. |  |
| OL097 | “It is a unique natural resource that provides such an amazing backdrop to my beloved home town. There is nothing like it anywhere else in the world”. |  |
| OL098 | “I would still appreciate the area, but we would all be the poorer without the mountain as a magnificent backdrop to our city”. |  |
| OL099 | “Not at all, all nature is good and the more we touch it the more we are destroying it ... just so humans can have some jollies for a few hours”, and respondent notes that in his view tourism is having a significant negative impact on Switzerland. | “I like Wellington Park because of its natural beauty. The rocks are beautiful too and being able to walk on them is fantastic”. |
| OL100 | (whole of Park is important) |  |
| OL101 | “Mt Wellington is fondly known by all locals as ‘the mountain’, it’s part of “Hobartian” culture”. | Organ Pipes  
Lost World  
Remote Zone  
(whole of Park is important)  
Wellington Park is ... “the foundation of Hobart, the shoulder of protection that adorns the city fringes”.  
“For me it’s [a range of outdoor activities], the smell of the changing forests and the clean air that fills my lungs ... The geodiversity that underpins the biodiversity. The smile on my face every time I’m there”. |
| OL102 | “Would provide a slightly different aesthetic experience, but still valuable”. | “... an easily accessible park with a wide range of plant assemblages from rainforest and sclerophyll to alpine”.  
“just taking a look at it from the window improves the mood by several degrees of happiness: such a relaxing and calming sight”. |
| OL103 |  |  |
| OL104 | Described the park as ‘spectacular’, ‘special’, ‘unique’, ‘cool’ and ‘scenic’. | Milles Track (for views)  
Notes as a value a family association with a particular event – the building of NW Bay River Weir.  
Notes Point to Pinnacle Walk as a value. |
| OL105 | “my appreciation would remain the same ... because it would be the only bushland park really close to Hobart. | (whole of Park is important)  
Notes as values various recreational activities – “The bushwalking tracks further behind the mountain. Sports such as mountain biking, climbing and longboarding”. |
| OL106 | “The Mountain sets off the city and its suburbs; were it merely a range of hills it would not have the visceral visual impact it does nor would it give our city and suburbs such character”. | Fern Tree (for BBQs)  
Springs (for BBQs & picnics) |
| OL107 | • “The visibility of the mountain gives Hobart its “mood” and reminds me of the wilderness of much of Tasmania”.<br>  • New Town Falls<br>  • Cathedral Rock<br>  • Pipe Line Track to NW Bay Weir (for cycling)<br>  • Fern Glade Track<br>  • Pinnacle - Zig Zag Track<br>  • Snake Plains Track<br>  • Ice House Track<br>  • Collins Bonnet Track<br>  • Old Farm Track to Junction Cabin. | • “I love the range of vegetation and landscape from the foothills to the summit. It is a beautiful and varied setting for active recreation”.<br>  • “The connection between the suburbs and the mountain are also appreciated. For example being able to walk from Mt Stuart or South Hobart to the top of the mountain and see the transition from city to bush”.<br>  • “The views of the mountain so near to Hobart remind me how close nature is”.<br>  • “The lack of development on the mountain and the bush experience so close to the city make Hobart special amongst other cities and unique amongst Australian cities”. |<br>  • I ‘enjoy the timelessness when I am in the area’.<br>  • I ‘enjoy the innocence of the biological systems on the mountain”. |<br>  • “The Wellington ranges are an overpowering presence in Hobart, and in my hometown of Collinsvale. They’re a source of fascination for locals and tourists”. |<br>  • “A major part of the city I live in…”<br>  • “Few – if any – other population centres in Australia can boast the largely unspoiled bushland walking tracks so near, just 20 mins from the city”. |<br>  • “Natural habitat and breeding site for animals, birds and flora. … the natural bush needs to be maintained …”.<br>  • “Historically the Park has been a quiet haven for walkers”. |<br>  • Mt Wellington and the Wellington Range is a place of natural beauty that defines the city of Hobart”.<br>  • “The Eastern slopes of the mountain are particularly important, but the wild and rugged western range has its own appeal for getting away from it all”.<br>  • “The diversity of landscape is amazing as are the changes in vegetation types and climatic zones as you traverse, climb and move through the Park. … it [the Mountain] has so many faces that change often as you move through the surrounding landscape”.<br>  • It “would make Hobart’s surrounds pretty rather than magnificent. I like looking at the Eastern shore ... it adds interest and character to the landscape but it has no “wow” factor.” |<br>  • “Our kitchen window looks out over Hobart form Bellerive, and the mountain dominates the skyline. The sunsets are unbelievable, with the dark silhouette of the mountain as a backdrop. Summer dawns (we have small children) are fantastic, too, with the “alpenglow” on the Organ Pipes”.
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**OL116**
- “Diminished, the visual impact is important”.
- “There are a lot of low hills anyway for when you don’t want to climb”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>OL117</strong></th>
<th><strong>OL118</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“It would lose its grandness, its majestic beauty and the feeling of excitement that we live directly below a wild and often forbidding mountain”.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I feel that Mt Wellington has almost become a bit of an icon, a symbol of what Tasmania stands for, wild unspoilt beauty”.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“...Now I feel that it [Mt Wellington] is a very important place, for its plants and animal species and also for its grace”.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“It would lose its grandness, its majestic beauty and the feeling of excitement that we live directly below a wild and often forbidding mountain”.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I feel that Mt Wellington has almost become a bit of an icon, a symbol of what Tasmania stands for, wild unspoilt beauty”.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>OL119</strong></th>
<th><strong>OL120</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“…it would be hard to feel as passionately about it.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“…the summit itself is a powerful feature. It wouldn’t be immediately visible from the city. It wouldn’t be an amazing landmark and we would not look for it out of the plane window when returning to Tasmania”.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“The changing light and the moods of the weather on the mountain are refreshing. Sometimes it’s a dull, motionless flat shape, sometimes it’s alive with sweeping rainclouds, rainbows and energy.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>OL121</strong></th>
<th><strong>OL122</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“As an avid bushwalker and 4WD enthusiast I take great pleasure in utilising the many tracks and trails the park has to offer”.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“The enjoyment of the Park is, I think, a right that all visitors should be entitled to”.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“It is just a part of Hobart that defines the seasons with snow and summer colours”.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>OL123</strong></th>
<th><strong>OL124</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jeffreys Track</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wells Track (for 4WD use)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East-West Trail (for 4WD use)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffreys Track (for 4WD use)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Timber Trail (for 4WD use)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-S Track (for MTB use)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenorchy MTB Park (for MTB use)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the context of 4WD use of high value to the respondent, they note “We feel the ability to travel such a short distance from our home and experience the beautiful flora and fauna of the Wellington Park is exceptionally important. Also note that they use the 4WD to help clean up the Park, but would like to see more tracks”.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>OL125</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In the context of 4WD use of high value to the respondent, they note “We feel the ability to travel such a short distance from our home and experience the beautiful flora and fauna of the Wellington Park is exceptionally important. Also note that they use the 4WD to help clean up the Park, but would like to see more tracks”.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| OL126 | • “The Park offers great natural beauty and diversity which is readily accessible to a wide ranging spectrum of the population”.  
• “The park … is a thing of beauty and diversity throughout the year, ranging from summer flower blooms to the winter training ground for our SES and police rescue”. |
| OL127 |  |
| OL128 |  |
| OL129 | • East-West Trail (for 4WD use) (whole of Park is important)  
• “It is a place where all Tasmanians and visitors can go to enjoy the views and nature. It is a multiple use area for all people to enjoy, picnicking/bbq, bushwalking (hard/easy), rock climbing, bike riding, 4WDing, horse riding and vehicle and disabled access”.
  |
| OL130 | • “Scenery, landscape, views, 4x4 tracks which I have experienced over different seasons”.
  |
| OL131 | • “Low hills would have a lesser impact …. Hiking, biking and sight seeing would not be nearly as amazing…”.
  • The park “is very important to me as it reminds me of the amazing landscape Tasmania has to offer at our doorstep”.
  • “It is a very convenient area to explore wilderness and get out into the bush without lots of travel”.
  • I often am able to explore one of my biggest passions of mountain biking right on my doorstep”.
  |
| OL132 | • “The appreciation would remain unchanged. Out of sight is no reason to devalue something!!!!!!!”.
  • “… and because it is a shining example of we, as humans, maintaining a (virtually) untouched environment within plain view, accessible, and right on our back doorstep”.
  |
| OL133 | • “We would miss the mountain mist and rainfall”.
  • Fern Tree area
  • “We are proud to interstate and overseas visitors our backyard”.
  |
| OL134 | • Would affect local level appreciation, not appreciation of Tasmania.
  • “Low hills do not have the same appeal/impact”.
  |
| OL135 |  |
| OL136 | • “Well I suppose the sunsets from my lounge would be different”.
  • “Wellington Park is growing on me as the forests grow back: always liked it for [the] last 32 years but I used to only focus on the top for mountain views and longer walks, etc. Now I find I am getting into the forest racks more”.
  • “Feel I know most of it [the Park?] quite well … but there are still pleasant surprises to find!”.
  • “Proximity is good because long travel to find satisfying Bush is becoming unviable environmentally and cost and time wise”.
  • “the Park is really satisfying aesthetically”.
<p>|
| OL137 | • &quot;... the altitude of the Mountain brings with it special things that cannot be seen on the lower hills, ie, snow, alpine plants, clean water, panoramic views, history (ie, huts), icehouse, potato fields&quot;. | • Ice houses |
| OL138 | • &quot;Would never get to experience the snow so close to home, good facilities to take the kids&quot;. | • Jeffreys Track |
| OL139 | • &quot;No, I don't think so. The bush and all that it has to offer is what is important&quot;. | • &quot;I use the park for 4WD over Jeffreys Track, it is good to get away in the bush and an alternative route to driving the highway&quot;. |
| OL140 | • &quot;It would be completely different&quot;. | • &quot;I also like to go up the mountain in the snow and check out the views over Hobart&quot;. |
| OL141 | • &quot;... it is a significant part of what makes Hobart such a beautiful city; that and the Derwent Estuary&quot;. | • The Springs (for events/gatherings) |
| OL142 | • &quot;Being part of a mountain range makes it special, and it is an added bonus&quot;. | • Pipeline Track (for cycling) |
| OL143 | • Octopus Tree | • &quot;The geology is wonderful, with great examples of columnar jointing&quot;. |
| OL144 | • Trestle Mountain – Sleeping Beauty ridge &amp; southern slopes (whole of Park is important) | • &quot;It is impossible to imagine Hobart without the range, the mountain, its moods and its great gift of natural bush, bush and alpine ecosystems within walking distance of most suburbs. It would not be Hobart and Tasmania would not be Tasmania&quot;. |
| OL145 | • Main fire Trail (for dog walking) | • Respondent notes a range of uses but finishes with this comment - &quot;As a whole I spend lots of time in the park and love everything about the park&quot; |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OL146</th>
<th>Big Bend Trail (for MTB'ing)</th>
<th>&quot;It should be made available to all people, horse riders, bushwalkers and 4WD&quot;.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OL147</td>
<td>E-W Trail (for MTB'ing)</td>
<td>&quot;Wellington Park is an iconic landmark close to the city of Hobart, with its range of flora and fauna it gives the area a healthy reminder of the fragility of this planet and what we must preserve&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OL148</td>
<td>Pipeline Track (for MTB’ing)</td>
<td>&quot;A magical alpine forest environment close to the capital city&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OL149</td>
<td>Junction Cabin (for walking)</td>
<td>&quot;Having such a great park close to Hobart enhances the city&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OL150</td>
<td>Myrtle Gully (for walking)</td>
<td>&quot;As peak oil gets closer to us the importance of a park in such close proximity to Hobart may mean even more for recreation for the citizens of Hobart&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OL151</td>
<td>&quot;I think Mt Wellington with its height and the park make Hobart along with the Derwent River&quot;.</td>
<td>&quot;Wellington Park provides a niche of alpine and forest wilderness close both to Hobart and the Huon Valley&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OL152</td>
<td>Fern Tree area to Zig Zag Track</td>
<td>(whole of Park is important)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OL153</td>
<td>Collins Bonnet</td>
<td>&quot;Keeping as much bush as we can is a necessity to human life ...&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OL154</td>
<td>Fairy Glen</td>
<td>&quot;Wellington Park ... serves as a reminder of the landscape/natural values which are embodied in our reserved natural areas&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OL155</td>
<td>Crabtree area</td>
<td>&quot;Wellington park is a significant part of being and living in Tasmania&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OL156</td>
<td>&quot;I think the rugged landscape of the Wellington Range is unique to Tasmania as a state of Australia&quot;.</td>
<td>&quot;In winter as the snow falls it connects all Hobartians and further afield; to the park and its pristine beauty and value as a living identify.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OL157</td>
<td>Cristian Forest</td>
<td>&quot;Through walking through the Park the respondent appreciates &quot;the significance of the wild and special place that this park has to offer&quot;.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*McConnell, A. (March 2012)*

A Wellington Park Management Trust Report

**Wellington Park Social Values & Landscape – An Assessment**
| OL156 | • “Hobart would not be the same without Mountain Park access, our water would not be as abundant or as good quality, weather would not be as exciting, in fact I wouldn’t live here [S. Tasmania] if there was no Mountain”.

OL157 | • “The mountain environment is particularly what makes it special”.

Crabtree area | • “Living in Crabtree we enjoy easy access to the western end of the park and love the majestic presence of the wild mountains overlooking our valley”.

OL158 | • “It is a site of significance at all altitudes”.

OL159 | • “I think that the mountain range has become one of the defining features of Hobart as a city”.

Sphinx Rock (whole of Park is important) | • “Having Wellington Park as a natural playground and wildlife refuge so close to Hobart is one of the features that make this city unique”.

• “Sphinx Rock is one of my favourite locations, and I love it for the lack of infrastructure – to be able to sit on a piece of the rock, just above the canopy, and look out over Hobart, without the view being obscured by a fence makes it very special”.

• “… the branching out of paths into the foothills, meaning suburbs can be effectively joined through bush trails (ie, Lenah Valley – South Hobart, etc)”.

OL160 | • “Hobart would be another boring city”.

• “The weather would be worse”.

OL161 | • “The Mountain is the soul of the city, with its different moods, weather, light, etc.

OL162 | • “I love being able to drive up there from the city and be in a completely different world…”

• “The natural environment is just so beautiful”.

OL163 | • “It would still be a special place to be managed carefully – we are very privileged to have such a wonderful, natural place on our doorstep…”

The Springs Pinnacle/summit area | • “I was born in Dynnyrne, so I have lived under the mountain ALL my life. As a child, my cousins had the Springs Hotel, so we were up there lots of times.”

In relation to walking to the summit – “you see so much, and the view from the summit is HOME”.

“I have taken a lot of people up the Mountain and have been told it is THE BEST VIEW IN THE WORLD”.

Strong memorial connection – with 2 sons ashes scattered in the summit area (one of whom spent a lot of time on the mountain as a child/youth, and wanting to have their ashes scattered with their children (see also OL185).

• “We lived in North Hobart for 6 months, in that time we could not see the Mountain
| OL165 | “The mountain’s presence above the city is integral to how I feel about it.  
“Seeing the city nesting in the foothills gives the impression both of protection and dominance that is what makes the mountain “the mountain”.  
• Silver Falls  
• Zig Zag Track  
• Lenah Valley Track  
• Organ Pipes Track  
• Walks ‘over the back’ | “The mountain just being what it is important to me ...”. |
| OL166 |  |  |
| OL167 |  |  |
| OL168 | “I love the wild weather the mountain brings as well as the snow. I love walking in the alpine landscape. I also like photographing the trees and landscape in the alpine setting. I also love the fresh mountain air and the different weather from the city below”.  
“Of all the cities and countries I have travelled to, Hobart is by far one of the most beautiful. And this is because of the amphitheatre setting of the city, surrounded by the mountain and lower hills”.  
“I doubt we ... would even want to live here if it were just another flat Australian city”.  
• The Springs  
• St Raphaels Church | “... I am a keen bushwalker and mountain bike rider and there is no better place to bushwalk or ride a mountain bike in Hobart (or even Tasmania as a whole)”.  
“Our home ... contains framed photos and paintings of Mt Wellington ... including historic photos around Fern Tree and the Mountain itself ...”.  
“Whenever I travel overseas I find myself hating ‘flat’ cities that have no mountains or hills. I guess that dislike of flat cities comes from growing up in Hobart and always having eh mountain there”.  
“Would prefer to live closer, but the weather a consideration but “At least we can see the mountain from our house ... and yes this was one of the considerations I took into account when we were looking at buying – the house must have a mountain view!””.  
“...any large park close to the city would have value”.  
“Mt Wellington is better than the other low lying areas because of the cool climate experience, snow, ice, mountain flora”.  
“The rock massive also has an impact which affects the mood, puts people into perspective, absorbs the sounds, etc”.  
• The Springs  
• St Raphaels Church  
• Organ Pipes Track  
• Lost World  
• Ice House Track | “It provides ready access to an area with great natural (almost wilderness) characteristics, ie, it’s the wilderness in our backyard, or natural heritage in bite size pieces”. |
| OL169 |  |  |
| OL170 | “My deep and abiding love of Hobart is intimately linked to the presence of the mountain in its centre. I find it stunningly beautiful in its power, its wildness, and its ever changing weather”.  
• Organ Pipes Track  
• Lost World  
• Ice House Track |  |
| OL171 | • “I doubt it would have the same presence and character. Hobart would be a very different place”. | OL172 | • “I love the atmosphere of the mountain”.  
• “I live there”. |
| OL173 | • Milles Track  
• Zig Zag Track  
• ‘over the back’ – Devils Throne, Thark Ridge, Wellington Falls & Cathedral Rock. | OL174 | • Fern Tree area |
| OL175 | • “I doubt it would have the same presence and character. Hobart would be a very different place”. | OL176 | • “I love the atmosphere of the mountain”.  
• “I live there”. |
| OL176 | • “The backdrop of Mt Wellington and the Derwent obviously creates a unique setting for the city of Hobart.”  
• “Even with low hills the forest/creeks, etc, would still present opportunity for differing recreation”. | OL177 | • “The mountain and its foothills contribute to my sense of place in Hobart, providing a frame for how I live in the city”.  
• “The views from the top are magnificent”.
| OL177 | • “The need for unspoilt/natural locations, especially within close proximity to urban areas”.  
• The freedom to drive to the Pinnacle, take a walk varying in difficulty, cycle, rock climb, snow play ...”. | OL178 | • “The mountain and its foothills contribute to my sense of place in Hobart, providing a frame for how I live in the city”. |
| OL178 | • “The backdrop of Mt Wellington and the Derwent obviously creates a unique setting for the city of Hobart.”  
• “Even with low hills the forest/creeks, etc, would still present opportunity for differing recreation”. | OL179 | • “Because if it wasn’t a park, then we’d have lost control over the mountain ...” and there would be a lot of development/infrastructure”. |
| OL179 | • “The mountain and its foothills contribute to my sense of place in Hobart, providing a frame for how I live in the city”. |
| OL180 | • “It’s just part of the landscape”.  
• “I would probably miss Trestle Mountain but suspect if would be farmland – which I am just as enamoured with watching over the seasons, with patchwork quilting of different crops, haying, etc.” | • Jeffreys Track | • “I love sitting in our front room and watching the weather crash over the skyline.”  
• “the bleak is quite beautiful” (quote).  
• “There’s also a lovely juxtaposition, with a valley of farmland below us, which gradually turns into the wilds of bushland, steep hills and craggy outline.” |
| OL181 | • “Without Mt Wellington Hobart would lose a lot of its individualism”. | | • “It’s a symbol of my home, of serenity.”  
• “I don’t visit Mt Wellington very often but Hobart wouldn’t be the same without her beautiful mountain keeping watch”. |
| OL182 | • “We are so fortunate to have a great mountain in our area”. | | • “I love the magnificent views from the top, but am disappointed with the outlook to the South-West as I find it is not as well marked as to the mountains ...”. |
| OL183 | • “It would still be a wonderful place ... When I am up Mt Wellington I am not there for the views For me it is an escape from the city”. | | • “It is a sanctuary from the city ... the tracks are so nice and peaceful and quiet”.  
• “I think Hobart is such a lucky city to have a mountain and forest on its doorstep”. |
| OL184 | | | • “I love the presence of the mountain. Its visual drama, and its constantly changing moods.  
• “I love climbing to the summit and looking out over south east Tasmania – what a vista!” |
| OL185 | | | • “Because it’s there”.  
• “I think the best view of the mountain is from New Town, but that is where I lived til I was 20, but wherever you live it is a must that you have a good view of it.  
• Have the ashes of two sons scattered on the Mountain and wished to have own ashes scattered on the Mountain as well (see also OL164). |
| OL186 | • “The ability to walk for kilometers across the East West fire trail visiting mountain top after mountain top is very, very special”. | • E-W Trail | • “I lived opposite Wellington Park for 26 years ... and it was my window onto the world”.  
• “It’s a constant in my life and is just wonderful to be on, in and around”. |
| OL187 | | | • “For as long as I remember in my sixty plus years, ‘the mountain’ has, and I’m sure, always will be, the one place I have enjoyed and thought about, on so many levels”.  
• “A few years ago we moved away from Lenah Valley (from the mountain), and I know I would miss the view of the mountain for many reasons .... Living in Hobart is really all about having the mountain in view, and I miss it a lot!!”  
• “Just driving up there [the mountain] again gave me that same ‘spiritual’ feeling of peace, wellbeing and renewal I was privileged to experience so many times before”. |
| OL188 | • “its [Wellington Park] uniqueness and proximity are what makes it special. Hobart as a city would be less appealing without the mountain”. | • Walk from Sandy Bay via Waterworks and Pipeline Track to summit | • “I can walk from Sandy Bay to the Waterworks and from there walk via the pipeline track to the summit or any other area in the park. This gives a walk from sea level to the summit which is special in any capital city”. |
| OL189 | | | • “it is an excellent venue for recreation activities, especially bush walking and mountain biking ...”.  
• “It has awesome potential as a tourist destination ...” |
| OL190 |  | • “It's my backyard! – or was until I moved recently, and I miss it terribly”.<br>• I love it that ... I can be in such a lovely environment, away from traffic noises and smells, exercising and enjoying our native flora, views, etc”.<br>• Nowadays I make special efforts to organise trips – get in some bouldering, see the telopeas and orchids in flower ... I even take a morning off work occasionally to do so”. |
| OL191 |  |  |
| OL192 |  | • “Hobart would lose some of its character”. |
| OL193 |  | • “Mount Wellington and the subsequent hills from the Northern suburbs look like a large hand protecting the people of Hobart”.<br>• “The view from whatever point you are in Hobart and suburbs”.<br>• “The fact that most of the area has not changed and still looks as wild as the day it was discovered”. |
| OL194 |  | • Octopus Tree<br>• Sphinx Rock<br>• “It’s beautiful in winter when covered in snow”.<br>• “I have done many night walks on the mountain”.<br>• “It is a place of wonderful beauty, weather, flora, fauna, geology and interest and provides a superb environment for keeping fit”.<br>• “It is an enriching part of living in Hobart”. |
| OL195 |  |  |
| OL196 |  | • “No! Its foothills are just as interesting to investigate”.<br>• “The uniqueness of some wildlife, the varying weather, colours and temperature in the easy-to-access ancient guardian of Hobart”.<br>• “… it should be maintained as a park for the many uses that it offers from 4WDing to bike riding, horses and walking”. |
| OL197 |  | • Thark Ridge<br>• Mount Montagu<br>• Wellington Falls<br>• Cathedral Rock<br>• Sphinx Rock<br>• South Wellington boulder field<br>• Main Fire Trail and fire trails below (for ...)<br>• “Every place within the park is important to me”, but holds some places ‘especially dear’.<br>• “… the boulder field at South Wellington where a view opens up down the Channel and out to the west”.

Wellington Park Social Values & Landscape – An Assessment  
A Wellington Park Management Trust Report
McConnell, A. (March 2012)
| OL202 | Wellington Park Management Trust Report (whole of Park is important) | “Provides a fantastic picturesque backdrop to Hobart”. “Good extensive near natural environment & habitat”. “A god range of access points ranging from car-based, mountain biking to walking on unformed routes”. |
| OL203 |  | “There would be no view from the top!” “I love looking at the mountain from different aspects of Hobart …. “I know I am home when I see it coming along the Brooker from the West Coast”. |
| OL204 |  | “Our youngest burned up incredible boy energy there, giving the family less stress from an energetic youngster”. The children’s “schools used it constantly for excursions, a privilege not available to all children” “She is an everyday weather advisor to me … and I seek her advice on clothes for work each morning”. |
| OL205 |  | “… it would depreciate Hobart as a city and a tourist destination massively”. “I would not appreciate or use the range anywhere near as much … because of the large amount of gradient that is usable on my downhill mountain bike … [and] the views would be no-where near as spectacular” |
| OL206 |  | “The “Mountain” is part of my life … It is a very unique and special place”. |
| OL207 |  | “The mountain bike trails all through the park are important to me as it provides an extensive area to explore and exercise within close proximity to Hobart”. |
| OL208 |  | “From the top on a clear day one can see the mountains of the SW”. “I enjoy walking through the alpine vegetation”. “The Pipeline Track is great for easy walks. I walk here most often now because the other tracks can be a bit rough underfoot”. |
| OL209 |  | “I have spent 50 years walking, birding and appreciating the botany of Mt Wellington, having climbed it possibly 300 times”. “I have many memories of good times spent on all parts of the mountain”. |
| OL210 | “It would be very boring”.  
|       | “I find [the mountain] very reassuring. It is home. It seems protective.”  
|       | “It provides a myriad of fascinating things to see, do and appreciate, and to learn about” | “I can’t imagine life without referring to the mountain...”.  
|       | Respondent has “helped take children on Outdoor Education up the tracks”...”.  
|       | “One year I took a photo of the mountain every single day at 7am and noted the temperatures. I couldn’t resist some extra photos on some days when there were fronts coming through, bushfires, and amazing sunset colour effects. Quite a record for that year”. |
| OL211 | “There is a certain feeling you get from standing on top of a mountain that really raises the spirit”. | “Bushwalking on the many tracks, one can enjoy fabulous vistas, waterfalls and an interesting variety of natural vegetation throughout the year”.  
|       | “The Organ Pipes track particularly has tremendous views and at certain seasons presents a rock garden more beautiful than any created by man”.  
|       | “A great way of escaping the stresses of daily life and teaching a young family to appreciate nature – and it is free!”. |
| OL212 | | |
| OL213 | | |
| OL214 | “… the shape of the mountain is impressive”.  
|       | “I love the way it overlooks Hobart”. | “Enjoying my daughter make the same connections”.  
|       | “Living in Holland for a while made me realise that mountains are important for my emotional well-being – I would hate to live somewhere flat”. |
| OL215 | “part of its beauty comes from its ever presence overseeing the city and the south of Hobart”.  
|       | There is a different look in many different lights, moons and weather patterns”. | “It’s a place of serenity and beauty, of mystery and romance, of harsh weather and exposure, but ever present calmness overseeing the city.” |
| OL216 | | |
| OL217 | “The mountain is Hobart. Hobart is the mountain”.  
|       | “It’s looking down on us, watching our messy failings with quiet resignation”.  
|       | If you come from interstate and see a bunch of hills and not our mountain, it would be profoundly disappointing”. | “I love the pristine condition of the lower slopes”.  
|       | “It is especially exciting after heavy rain, or cold snaps as well as heavy fog”. |
| OL218 | “the mountain is the backdrop to the place I call home”.  
|       | “I love the many moods the mountain displays and the way you can see it from so many different angles”. | “it is a place that I love to walk and to run. The trails are fantastic and the scenery beautiful”.  
<p>|       | “I also love the park as it is a place of mystery”. |
| OL219 | “Low hills wouldn’t have the visual impact”. | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OL220</th>
<th>OL221</th>
<th>OL222</th>
<th>OL223</th>
<th>OL224</th>
<th>OL225</th>
<th>OL226</th>
<th>OL227</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“The variety of weather due to its height is a big attraction, it can be another world up there compared to Sandy Bay where I live”.</td>
<td>O’Grady’s Falls</td>
<td>“The variety of weather due to its height is a big attraction, it can be another world up there compared to Sandy Bay where I live”.</td>
<td>“It would not be particularly impressive”</td>
<td>“I like the challenge and harshness this mountain provides, it’s our own bit of Europe in Hobart, without ski-able snow in winter”.</td>
<td>Pipeline Track (family association)</td>
<td>“An area of unique beauty providing recreational opportunities beyond any other Australian capital city within minutes of the CBD” and also notes the potential for a range of adventure sports.</td>
<td>“it wouldn’t have the range of temperature or fauna it has now, nor the views”. “Wellington needs to be 1000ft higher!”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Springs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Organ Pipes Track (for views)</td>
<td>“My mountain my rock. I see the mountain by the sea and I see my native land. ... I see the mountain and I see home”.</td>
<td>“It wouldn’t have the range of temperature or fauna it has now, nor the views”. “Wellington needs to be 1000ft higher!”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Myrtle Gully Track</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“I love the power it represents in its wild weather, the peace and tranquility found in its environs in its stillness, and its mystery shrouded in mist”.</td>
<td>“it wouldn’t have the range of temperature or fauna it has now, nor the views”. “Wellington needs to be 1000ft higher!”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N-S Track</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“My family has a special relationship with Wellington Park”.</td>
<td>“it wouldn’t have the range of temperature or fauna it has now, nor the views”. “Wellington needs to be 1000ft higher!”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rivulet Track</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“I believe the walk across the face of the Organ Pipes is one of the most spectacular that one can find anywhere”.</td>
<td>“it wouldn’t have the range of temperature or fauna it has now, nor the views”. “Wellington needs to be 1000ft higher!”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Icehouse Track</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“An area of unique beauty providing recreational opportunities beyond any other Australian capital city within minutes of the CBD” and also notes the potential for a range of adventure sports.</td>
<td>“it wouldn’t have the range of temperature or fauna it has now, nor the views”. “Wellington needs to be 1000ft higher!”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zig Zag Track</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“It is a vast reservoir of local culture and a place of adventure for our youth that is relatively safe and provides a good introduction to the further wilderness reaches of Tasmania”.</td>
<td>“it wouldn’t have the range of temperature or fauna it has now, nor the views”. “Wellington needs to be 1000ft higher!”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Silver Falls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“it wouldn’t have the range of temperature or fauna it has now, nor the views”. “Wellington needs to be 1000ft higher!”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Springs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“it wouldn’t have the range of temperature or fauna it has now, nor the views”. “Wellington needs to be 1000ft higher!”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- “It has an inseparable connection to Hobart”.
- “The flora and fauna on the rock make it such a unique environment”.
- “being up there after a week at work refreshes me”.
- “I enjoy the falls [O’Grady’s Falls], especially after rain”.
- “I enjoy the ‘wet forest’ smell” after rain.
- “I enjoy this [walking to the summit via the Icehouse Track then down the Zig Zag Track] in winter when there is a covering of snow”.
- “The Myrtle [Gully] Track is really special with its ferns, especially after rain”.
- “I love to bushwalk on the various well-maintained tracks with a group of friends. A lot of them are quite challenging, especially the painted Track [New Town Red Paint Track]”.
- “Just to look at Mt Wellington on a clear day with a powdering of snow on the top is one of the best views in the world”.
- “I like the challenge and harshness this mountain provides, it’s our own bit of Europe in Hobart, without ski-able snow in winter”.
- “I ride s cross country mountain bike and a road bike. I ride and train on as many trails and fire roads as I can legally and physically get to in the time I have”.
- “My mountain my rock. I see the mountain by the sea and I see my native land. ... I see the mountain and I see home”.
- “I love the power it represents in its wild weather, the peace and tranquility found in its environs in its stillness, and its mystery shrouded in mist”.
- “My family has a special relationship with Wellington Park”.
- “I believe the walk across the face of the Organ Pipes is one of the most spectacular that one can find anywhere”.
- “An area of unique beauty providing recreational opportunities beyond any other Australian capital city within minutes of the CBD” and also notes the potential for a range of adventure sports.
- “It is a vast reservoir of local culture and a place of adventure for our youth that is relatively safe and provides a good introduction to the further wilderness reaches of Tasmania”.
- “it wouldn’t have the range of temperature or fauna it has now, nor the views”.
- “Wellington needs to be 1000ft higher!”
- “It’s the backbone of the city”.
- “I can ride and cover good distances and experience the changes in flora and fauna ... or I can walk and be in the bush and forget about city life, both are achievable within minutes”.
- “A hill is a hill. A mountain is beautiful”.
- Childhood associations and memories including growing up in Strickland Avenue with views to the Organ Pipes and “taking lunch to grandpa out the Old Log Cabin Track where he was cutting timber”, ‘picnics at the Springs”, coming down the Pinnacle road with her father with the car in ‘angel gear’, being ‘bored teenagers
| OL228 | • Sphinx Rock | • The view from the top is magnificent. | • “I’ve been away for 46 years and I still miss it”.
 | | | • “I’ve been away for 46 years and I still miss it”.
 | OL229 | • “You couldn’t see it from Hobart, you wouldn’t see Hobart from it”. | • Pipeline Track | • “The view from the top is magnificent.”
 | | • T would still be beautiful but it wouldn’t be wilderness and wild”. | | • “When it’s [the Mountain] covered in snow it looks like a big boston bun”.
 | | • “Walking or running to m allover Hobart, you wouldn’t see Hobart from it”. | | | • Participated in an Advent Christian event at 15 yrs (walked up in the night to see the sun rise from the summit).
 | OL230 | • “It would reduce the magnificence of the mountain, the view wouldn’t be as spectacular and it wouldn’t feel like such an achievement when I ride my bike to the top”.
 | | • N-S Track (for riding) | | • “I enjoy bike riding to various points on the mountain including Fern Tree, the Springs, and the Pinnacle when I fancy a challenge. I also enjoy the N-S Track.
 | | • Pinnacle | | OL231 | | | • “Mountain biking would never be as unique or the same ever again”
 | OL232 | | • “Beautiful for mountain biking”. | • “My husband proposed to me on Mt Wellington at the Sphinx Rock lookout”.
 | OL233 | • “clearly Wellington Park would not be as inspiring”. | | OL234 | • Sphinx Rock | | • “My husband proposed to me on Mt Wellington at the Sphinx Rock lookout”.
 | | • “Hobart is very much defined by the mountain behind it”. | | OL235 | (whole of Park is important) | • “I particularly enjoy climbing on boulders and crags throughout the range, both enjoying the physical activities and aesthetic qualities of shape and light”.
 | OL236 | • “Meehan range is also beautiful but not as high as Mt Wellington. I certainly prefer the mountain in winter when it has snow ...”. | | • “Diverse environment that can be enjoyed year round”.
 | OL237 | • “It would feel like my backbone was missing> It towers above me, as I wander in the valleys below; and it holds me tall, to see the world beyond”. | | • “Wellington Park is important to me because of its natural and accessible beauty, expanse and opportunities”.
 | | • “As a teacher, it is a magnificent treasure field of learning opportunities eg, local history, environment, (flora/fauna, weather, geology), art, health and lifestyle”.
 | OL238 | | • “It’s one of the first places I take visitors, summer or winter. Best views of the city and beyond ... and the different environments – lush green at the base to rugged and rocky (or snow) at the top – in such a brief journey is terrific”.

Wellington Park Social Values & Landscape – An Assessment
A Wellington Park Management Trust Report
McConnell, A. (March 2012)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OL239</th>
<th>“It would lessen it. The Organ Pipes, the steep tracks, the changes in vegetation are all crucial to me”.</th>
<th>Organ Pipes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| OL240 | “I guess it would be less of a defining feature of Hobart, and the cliffs and tracks would be necessarily shorter/less steep, which would change the character of the enjoyment”. “I enjoy the foothills of the Mountain almost as much anyway – Knocklofty, Collins Bonnet, etc, are pretty amazing in their own way” | Organ Pipes  
Lost World |

| OL241 | “The fact that you can see it from so many different angles and from so many places (all the way over to Dodges Ferry and down the Channel for instance) is part of its appeal. | It’s fantastic to see such an imposing landmark unsullied (mostly) by built structures.” |

| OL242 | “I believe that everyone should have access to the mountain at all times of the year, not just those who are physically fit and able to climb/walk it. Especially as I age, I am more conscious of this”. | Mt Wellington |

| OL243 | “While in London and Paris I kept feeling that there was something missing and then I realised that I didn’t have anywhere like the mountain to look towards to judge what the weather was doing. It then you realise what a big part of your life it is”. | Mount Wellington |

| OL244 | “Mount Wellington (Welly) in its entirety is extremely important to me, I love it dearly, I find it majestic, sometimes surreal, restoring – a place of never ending fascination”. “… and also the historic sites – memorials, icehouses, the old chalets and huts of the mountain and the history associated with these”. | Mt Wellington  
Mount Wellington |

| OL245 | “Hobart would lose its charm as being a town in a valley look”. “Riding [MTB] would be a lot shorter than it already is”. | “It is an iconic part of Hobart’s landscape, one us locals are all very proud of”. “It is the centre for Mountain Biking in Hobart, we being so lucky there is a tall mountain right next to the city that has a decent amount of tails on it”. |

| OL246 | “I think it would change the entire personality of Hobart. The mountain is omni-present. It is the big hand that Hobart sits in, scooped away from the wilderness”. | Organ Pipes  
The summit  
MT Wellington |

| OL247 | “Mt Wellington is the iconic symbol of Hobart. The profile of the mountain watches over Hobart: a guardian, a temple and – as night closes in – a powerful protector keeping between the “wills” of the south [west] and the gentle evening lights of the town nestled below” | Wellington Park Social Values & Landscape – An Assessment  
A Wellington Park Management Trust Report  
McConnell, A. (March 2012) |
Wellington Park Social Values & Landscape – An Assessment
McConnell, A. (March 2012)
A Wellington Park Management Trust Report

OL248
- “This would increase the number of people within the park and may cause an adverse impact on the environment around the mountain”.
- Pipeline Track
- “Mountain biking trails are used by my family in the Mount Wellington reserve. We also use the Pipeline Track for family walks/cycling”.

OL249
- “The impressive look of Mount Wellington, its imposing presence and rugged outline creates the impression of a wilderness on the doorstep of Hobart city – there are not too many places in the world where you can get this experience so close to an urban area”
- Wellington Park is one of only a few managed parks that has facilities that cater for numerous activities, including walking, mountain biking as well as horse-riding”.
- “the diversity and natural beauty of the park is obvious and gives Hobart a unique position of being a vibrant capital city with natural wilderness next door”.
- “The views from the top of Mount Wellington are the most amazing I have ever seen in my years of travelling in Australia and overseas.”
- “It is a truly magnificent publically accessible park, free for all who wish to explore its beauty”.

OL250
- “May as well go to Mt Nelson. The ‘aloofness’ of the altitude and the road climbing out of the maelstrom below has a special magic”.
- “To me the park is somewhere I can easily get to if I want to be apart from the hustle and bustle of life”.
- “It was a refuge for my son (dec) when he needed time and space to be alone and walk, and look at the beauty of the surroundings, taking lots of close up photographs as well as general scenery”.

OL251
- “It would probably be less attractive, specifically with respect to gravity-fed mtn biking”.
- “Provides a local semi-natural environment for outdoor recreation, notably mtn biking and walking”.

OL252
- “different vegetation, less streams and waterfalls, less diversity as far as types of walks possible”.
- Pipeline Track (for cycling)
- “Wellington Park has a very wide range of values for me. Firstly the sheer geography of a mountain so close to the city is visually uplifting”.
- “Walking tracks – seemingly endless options”.
- “Streams & waterfalls”.

OL253
- Summit
- Springs
- E-W Fire Trail
- Jeffreys Track (whole of park is important)
- Favourite activity (as well as walking and cycling) is “Cross country skiing in the summit area – on those rare clear days after a big snowfall the summit bowl from South Wellington to Thark Ridge can be just magnificent”.
- “There are few parts of the range that I haven’t visited in some way”.
- “although I have often undertaken these endeavours alone, I have seldom failed to meet likeminded people also similarly engaged”.
- “It’s very comforting to have such an impressive piece of the natural environment visible from so many places of man-modified environments. It provides a sort of ‘grounding’ for the soul”.

- “The park is the experience of being “within” the temple – the magnificent walks, wild vistas, the incredible plant life, fern glades, trickling streams and towering trees. Walking through and discovering an old aqueduct, or signpost from 100 years ago connects us with those who have loved the Mountain over the generations”.
- “The magnificence of the Organ Pipes – like standing at the foot of hanging rock, one can easily imagine magic lurks there”.
- “The summit and all its incredible wildness: the city to one side, to the other limitless wild places”.

- “This would increase the number of people within the park and may cause an adverse impact on the environment around the mountain”.
- Pipeline Track
- “Mountain biking trails are used by my family in the Mount Wellington reserve. We also use the Pipeline Track for family walks/cycling”.

- “The impressive look of Mount Wellington, its imposing presence and rugged outline creates the impression of a wilderness on the doorstep of Hobart city – there are not too many places in the world where you can get this experience so close to an urban area”
- Wellington Park is one of only a few managed parks that has facilities that cater for numerous activities, including walking, mountain biking as well as horse-riding”.
- “the diversity and natural beauty of the park is obvious and gives Hobart a unique position of being a vibrant capital city with natural wilderness next door”.
- “The views from the top of Mount Wellington are the most amazing I have ever seen in my years of travelling in Australia and overseas.”
- “It is a truly magnificent publically accessible park, free for all who wish to explore its beauty”.

- “May as well go to Mt Nelson. The ‘aloofness’ of the altitude and the road climbing out of the maelstrom below has a special magic”.
- “To me the park is somewhere I can easily get to if I want to be apart from the hustle and bustle of life”.
- “It was a refuge for my son (dec) when he needed time and space to be alone and walk, and look at the beauty of the surroundings, taking lots of close up photographs as well as general scenery”.

- “It would probably be less attractive, specifically with respect to gravity-fed mtn biking”.
- “Provides a local semi-natural environment for outdoor recreation, notably mtn biking and walking”.

- “different vegetation, less streams and waterfalls, less diversity as far as types of walks possible”.
- Pipeline Track (for cycling)
- “Wellington Park has a very wide range of values for me. Firstly the sheer geography of a mountain so close to the city is visually uplifting”.
- “Walking tracks – seemingly endless options”.
- “Streams & waterfalls”.

- Summit
- Springs
- E-W Fire Trail
- Jeffreys Track (whole of park is important)
- Favourite activity (as well as walking and cycling) is “Cross country skiing in the summit area – on those rare clear days after a big snowfall the summit bowl from South Wellington to Thark Ridge can be just magnificent”.
- “There are few parts of the range that I haven’t visited in some way”.
- “although I have often undertaken these endeavours alone, I have seldom failed to meet likeminded people also similarly engaged”.
- “It’s very comforting to have such an impressive piece of the natural environment visible from so many places of man-modified environments. It provides a sort of ‘grounding’ for the soul”.

- “The park is the experience of being “within” the temple – the magnificent walks, wild vistas, the incredible plant life, fern glades, trickling streams and towering trees. Walking through and discovering an old aqueduct, or signpost from 100 years ago connects us with those who have loved the Mountain over the generations”.
- “The magnificence of the Organ Pipes – like standing at the foot of hanging rock, one can easily imagine magic lurks there”.
- “The summit and all its incredible wildness: the city to one side, to the other limitless wild places”.

- “This would increase the number of people within the park and may cause an adverse impact on the environment around the mountain”.
- Pipeline Track
- “Mountain biking trails are used by my family in the Mount Wellington reserve. We also use the Pipeline Track for family walks/cycling”.

- “The impressive look of Mount Wellington, its imposing presence and rugged outline creates the impression of a wilderness on the doorstep of Hobart city – there are not too many places in the world where you can get this experience so close to an urban area”
- Wellington Park is one of only a few managed parks that has facilities that cater for numerous activities, including walking, mountain biking as well as horse-riding”.
- “the diversity and natural beauty of the park is obvious and gives Hobart a unique position of being a vibrant capital city with natural wilderness next door”.
- “The views from the top of Mount Wellington are the most amazing I have ever seen in my years of travelling in Australia and overseas.”
- “It is a truly magnificent publically accessible park, free for all who wish to explore its beauty”.

- “May as well go to Mt Nelson. The ‘aloofness’ of the altitude and the road climbing out of the maelstrom below has a special magic”.
- “To me the park is somewhere I can easily get to if I want to be apart from the hustle and bustle of life”.
- “It was a refuge for my son (dec) when he needed time and space to be alone and walk, and look at the beauty of the surroundings, taking lots of close up photographs as well as general scenery”.

- “It would probably be less attractive, specifically with respect to gravity-fed mtn biking”.
- “Provides a local semi-natural environment for outdoor recreation, notably mtn biking and walking”.

- “different vegetation, less streams and waterfalls, less diversity as far as types of walks possible”.
- Pipeline Track (for cycling)
- “Wellington Park has a very wide range of values for me. Firstly the sheer geography of a mountain so close to the city is visually uplifting”.
- “Walking tracks – seemingly endless options”.
- “Streams & waterfalls”.

- Summit
- Springs
- E-W Fire Trail
- Jeffreys Track (whole of park is important)
- Favourite activity (as well as walking and cycling) is “Cross country skiing in the summit area – on those rare clear days after a big snowfall the summit bowl from South Wellington to Thark Ridge can be just magnificent”.
- “There are few parts of the range that I haven’t visited in some way”.
- “although I have often undertaken these endeavours alone, I have seldom failed to meet likeminded people also similarly engaged”.
- “It’s very comforting to have such an impressive piece of the natural environment visible from so many places of man-modified environments. It provides a sort of ‘grounding’ for the soul”.
| OL254 | - “The mountain is majestic and imposing, it’s striking, and it dominates the landscape of Hobart.”  
- “There is almost something protective about the large mountain range; with Hobart and surrounds nestled into the foothills”. | - Having grown up in Hobart the respondent notes - “While its role may have evolved as I have grown up, the presence and beauty of the mountain has not”.  
- “As children on hot days we would play in creek beds to cool off ... As teenagers we would walk the trails, asserting our independence, eager for a sense of adventure and exploration. As a young woman, I have enjoyed romantic picnics under the trees ...”.  
- “Now I live in the hills behind Leslie Vale. There are days when the wind and rain lashes down hard, when I feel the raw elements strike hard as if they have bounced right off the mountain. Other days when ... it [the mountain] almost seems close enough to touch. I walk outside after rain, and the smell of the mountain wafts down”. |
| OL255 | - “Would not bother going. Steep is best for my sports of mountain biking & rock climbing”.  
- Organ Pipes (for climbing)  
- “I love rock climbing on the pipes with my mates. They are close enough to duck up after work for a quick climb. Hundreds to choose from”.  
- “Also love trail riding on my mountain bike.” | - “It’s a nice landmark, but it could be a lot more accessible”. |
| OL256 | | - “used to walk, now I ride more. I can ride from Strickland Avenue to the end of the pipeline track and back and do 32 safe kilometres, travelling nearly entirely off the road where cars drive. I am safe on the mountain”. |
| OL257 | - “It would lose some of the majesty and that iconic skyline. The transition from sea-level to alpine-like terrain would also be lost, and those varying terrains that make up the front face of the mountain are what make it such an amazing spot”. | - “The mountain’s location makes it an amazing resource to have so close to the city”.  
- “As a mountain biker and bushwalker, the trails on the mountain are like a second home”. |
| OL258 | | |
| OL259 | | |
| OL260 | - “The view of Mt Wellington is one of the main things that makes Hobart a beautiful place and unique in the world”.  
- “I do not think Hobart or Mt Wellington would be as beautiful or spectacular as they are with it being a mountain”.  
- Organ Pipes  
- Cathedral Rock  
- Pipeline Track  
- Lenah Valley Track (for walking)  
- Big Bend Trail (for cycling)  
- E-W Trail (for cycling)  
- Ringwood Trail (for cycling)  
- Jeffrey’s Track (for cycling)  
(whole of Park is important)  
- “Really enjoy mountain biking on Mt Wellington. ... Also enjoy riding my bike over the Wellington Range including Big Bend Track, East West Trail, and Jeffrey’s Track and Ringwood Trail”.  
- “Really enjoy the bush and views on the Pipeline Track – views to Cathedral Rock are magnificent.” | |
| OL261 | - Summit  
- Organ Pipes  
- Mt Connection | - “I love the imposing shape and enormous size of Mt Wellington”.  
- “I enjoy marvelling at the flowers, the birds, the animals and the insects that find refuge there”.  
- “I find it visually soothing to look at form the city. When I am up on top and look west...” |
- Wellington Park Management Trust Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Features</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Wellingtons</td>
<td>Pipeline Track (for cycling)</td>
<td>I feel as if I am far away from civilisation. I like the way the wilderness meets the city in such a dramatic way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wellington Falls</td>
<td>My favourite places are on the top (I love alpine landscape), the Organ Pipes (they are sculpturally fabulous and smell nice when they’re hot form the sun), Mt connection (I feel far away from anybody), the South Wellingtons (lots of wildflowers especially waratah in summer and boulderfields to play on).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OL262</td>
<td>“while the hills ecosystems are as valuable as any other, there’s no doubt that the sub-alpine areas of the Park are a little more awe inspiring than less-rugged bushland”</td>
<td>I’m a mountain biker, so the value of being able to exercise and have fun virtually on my doorstep is inestimable. There are heaps of loops I can do from my place in Mt Stuart… without seeing traffic – or other people for that matter. … Topping it off with a world-class mountain bike park at Tolosa seals the deal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OL263</td>
<td>“The mountain is a backdrop to where we live. It is a very dramatic image and gives us a strong sense of place”</td>
<td>It brings birds and wildlife near to where I live.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OL264</td>
<td>“Hobart wouldn’t be half as attractive scenery wise, or lifestyle wise, without the mountain towering over it!… , no snow, rock escarpments, waterfalls, ferny gullies, weather warnings. Without the mountain, I would consider living elsewhere”</td>
<td>Old Hobartians Track I’m 54 years old and have been walking on the mountain since I was 13… I go up the Old Hobartians track every week… (up to the Chalet) rain hail or shine, and I never tire of it, it’s different every week.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OL265</td>
<td>South Hobart area</td>
<td>“Our property borders the park. We walk there every week and value this place. We also have a view of the mountain and enjoy seeing it”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OL266</td>
<td>“It would change the whole ‘feel’ of Hobart and one of the things that make it such a beautiful place to live and play”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OL267</td>
<td>“Less vertical for riding ….”</td>
<td>Fern Tree area ‘Having lived in Fern Tree my entire life I have spent a lot of time within Wellington Park, initially walking with my family, and later riding downhill with mates.’ Wellington Park, to me, means the freedom to do what we love, close to home, in a beautiful place’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OL268</td>
<td></td>
<td>I first saw Mt Wellington when my family moved to Hobart in 1966 – I was 13 years old and it was probably the first mountain I had ever seen. We lived in West Hobart and I just loved it – that incredible, comforting presence always there behind the city – its different moods, colours, etc.” It is also the place where I have scattered the ashes of 2 members of my family – because it was always such an integral part of our lives’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OL269</td>
<td>“Its height is awesome and commands respect”.</td>
<td>Mt Wellington ‘It has very special personal significance as it is the place where my 9 day old daughter took her last breath when we took her home from the hospital after being kept on life support machines’. Mt Wellington is the very reason why I chose to study in Hobart…” I am an outdoors country girl, and it is the pinnacle of sanity for me while I live in the city….”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Wellington Park Social Values & Landscape – An Assessment
A Wellington Park Management Trust Report
McConnell, A. (March 2012)
A detailed response which enumerates and/or describes places of importance, landscape values, beautiful places, views, meanings and associations, relationship with Hobart, environmental values, historical values and educational values. Also notes that the ‘character’ of the Park is important.

- “The park provides us with an accessible educational resource for studying geology and the effects of topography on plants and animals”.
- “We enjoy seeing historic sites and memorials, including the history of Hobart’s water supply in the remains of aqueducts and pipelines, and other historic sites such as the Ice Houses”.
- “For my family, the area has been significant for 6 generations …”.
- “The Mountain and its foothills have been important to me for over 70 years. We walked the tacks between the city and the Pinnacle …; we had holidays near Fern Tree and at The Springs; we studied the botany and geology and explored the plateaux and peaks and the sources of streams; and we continue to relish the scenery – trees, cliffs, orchids, mosses, fungi, lichen, streams, pools and waterfalls, rocks, clouds and mists, snow and sun”.

- “The quiet bush environment, so accessible and so close to the city, is a benefit to be treasured”.
- “The Mountain provides a setting for the city”.
- “Hobart is defined by Mt Wellington – and the accessibility of the park improves the quality of life of the people of greater Hobart and settlements nearby”.

- “Yes, because there would be less vertical distance that could be covered in a day’s riding”.
- “it has such a variety of mountain bike trails …”.

- “Hills don’t seem to have the same raw power as a mountain …”.
- “She (Mount Wellington) is such a special place, I view her as a friend. I believe she is more alive than any other place I have ever visited”.

- “The views would be less spectacular, the vegetation less varied, the climate less variable.”
- “I would still enjoy walking low hills but it would feel less stimulating”.
- “I can have a “wilderness experience right in my own back yard”.
- “I value the mountain for the flora, fauna, views, snow experience, rain forest, rock formations, old hut sites and their history, the wildness of the more remote areas, and the accessibility to all these places”.
- “I greatly enjoy the workmanship in the new bike track but … [management comment]”.

- “Lots of varying walking trails and cycling tracks”.
- “beautiful scenery from varying sites on top of Mt Wellington”.
- “enjoy looking at the foliage and the green”.
- “when in the park just love being there – serenity and quietness”.

| OL270 | Mt Wellington  
Silver Falls  
Junction Cabin  
Rocky Whelans Cave  
The Pinnacle  
Dead Island  
Thark Hut site  
Organ Pipes  
Ice Houses  
Hunters Track  
The Springs  
sources of NW Bay River  
Mt Connection  
Myrtle Gully  
Myrtle Valley (Forest?)  
Rock Cabin  
Organ Pipes Track  
Zig Zag Track  
O’Gradys Falls | Wellington Park Social Values & Landscape – An Assessment  
A Wellington Park Management Trust Report  
McConnell, A. (March 2012) |
| OL276 | Low hills ‘don’t have the grandeur of scale of mountains ... [Without mountains] Hobart would not be the same.” | Fingerpost area | “Wellington Park feels home to me and fulfills a strong, deep-seated need for a sense of place, my place. It’s a principal resource for recreation, renewal and something to share with others”.

“I love being able to see Mt Wellington from most areas of Hobart and that it sits like a sentinel above the city. It helps remind me that we are part of the natural world and a bigger environment than just the city and its human activity”.

| OL277 | “Having the mountain dominate Hobart really makes the city. I don’t think Hobart would be as pretty or even impressive, or magical”.

Ice house – South Wellington Track (for walking in winter)
Zig Zag Track (for walking)
N-S Track (for cycling)
Pipeline Track (for walking) | “You can find a beautiful spot in 10 minutes or walk for hours”.

“There is something for everyone”.

“I think having the mountain looking over Hobart just adds [to] the atmosphere of the city”.

| OL278 | “Hobart would be rather dull without our mountain”.

Summit
West Hobart area | “Having the bush so close – almost at our backdoor always reminds me that there is more to life than the daily work routine. Being able to see the mountain from town is a wonderful reminder of nature ...”.

“Being a mountain with alpine environment makes the mountain feel more remote and wild”.

“walking from West Hobart up the bush tracks all the way to the summit is a rite of passage in our house, our girls have felt such a huge sense of achievement ... it changes their view of the town in which they live enormously”.

| OL279 | “It would take away from the scenic views”.

“Mount Wellington is an icon for Hobart”.

| OL280 | “Love to be able to visit on misty days. Like another world”.

‘Always such a treat to see [snow] & visit & I love how locals always talk about ‘snow down to 400’ etc, it is such a part of the community feeling’.

Fern Glade
O’Grady’s Falls
Octopus Tree
Pipeline Track | “Just love its beauty over our city”.

“Love how it is so diverse, always something intriguing to find, from wildflowers in spring to mushrooms in autumn”.

“Love watching and listening to the bird life & inhaling all that fresh air”.

| OL281 | “It would take away from the scenic views”.

“Mount Wellington is an icon for Hobart”.

| OL282 | “Love to be able to visit on misty days. Like another world”.

‘Always such a treat to see [snow] & visit & I love how locals always talk about ‘snow down to 400’ etc, it is such a part of the community feeling’.

Fern Glade
O’Grady’s Falls
Octopus Tree
Pipeline Track | “Just love its beauty over our city”.

“Love how it is so diverse, always something intriguing to find, from wildflowers in spring to mushrooms in autumn”.

“Love watching and listening to the bird life & inhaling all that fresh air”.

|
| OL283   | • “I appreciate the commanding view the mountain offers”. | • “is a valuable ‘wilderness’ area close to Hobart city”. | • “is a great place to mountain bike, walk and road bike ... offers trails to link the north west and south of greater Hobart area”. |
| OL284   | • “I think having a mountain high enough to catch winter snowfall, as a back drop, adds significantly to the character of the city”. | • South Hobart area (whole of Park is important) | • “Living close to and spending time in a scenic bushland area is important to me”. |
| OL285   | • Would “make for better cycling”. |  | • ‘Great for teaching the kids to walk and ride, great to look at but also to use”. |
| OL286   | • “through determination, we have a park protected like Table Mountain in Cape Town and many, many important features”. |  | • “the scenery = amazing; the landscape = unexpected around every corner; places of beauty everywhere; its relationship to Hobart = Hobart’s soul ...”. |
| OL287   |  |  | • “Environmental aesthetics (natural beauty), preservation of natural landscape and biota, ecosystem services, recreation, as a Hobart icon, tourism.” |
| OL288   |  |  | • “The park is a significant asset to Hobart and Tasmania in general”. |
| OL289   | • “Mt Wellington is an icon of Hobart. Without it looming over Hobart, it just wouldn’t be the same”.  • “Secondly (and more importantly to me), I would have to find a new place to ride”. |  | • “it’s an inspirational feature of the city landscape that causes people to say Hobart is prettier than other cities”. |
| OL290   | • N-S Track  • Lost World | • “I am a very keen mountain biker who rides the many styles of mountain biking available on the mountain. I absolutely love the new tracks ...”.  • “I feel completely connected to Mt Wellington and find myself often saying to my kids when driving them to school and the mountain is covered in clouds “Ah looks like old man Wellington hasn’t got out of bed yet”. Such a dad thing to say but I feel this instills a sense of fondness for the mountain and its surrounds” |
| OL291   |  |  |  |
| OL292   | • “Mount Wellington is definitely a landmark, and a beautiful one at that”. | • “to me the mountain is mother earth who has been here for millions of years before us, and will be here millions of years after us, she is one constant. We, on the other hand, are merely grains of sand form all the beaches in the world combined. She lovingly holds the city of Hobart in her bosom. She lovingly allows each generation to climb and play all over and around her”. |
| OL293   |  |  | • “it’s an inspirational feature of the city landscape that causes people to say Hobart is prettier than other cities”. |
| OL294   | • “Low hills can be found anywhere – mountains are special!” |  |  |
| OL295   |  |  | • “People who use the park tend to be like-minded too, friendly, etc ... even on the Pipeline Track everyone is courteous to one another ...”. |
| OL296 | “Do lots of trail running in the park, especially in the summer months – participate in the Tassie Trail running so like to train on the mountain … walking or running in the park so close to nature is fantastic and its free!”. | “Alpine wilderness retreat; good tracks; good hut and fireplace facility”. |
| OL297 | “... biodiversity a place of reference”. | “… it has its own intrinsic values and I can appreciate that”. |
|  | “It remains connected to the city and I can be on a trail running or riding within minutes from home”. | “Personal reasons – special celebrations, announcements, decisions, a peaceful place, a place that energizes you and to share wonderful and memorable experiences”. |
| OL298 | “Part of the attraction [respondent is a mountain biker] is of course the rapid ascent into alpine wilderness so close to the city. If it was a park in low hills, wouldn’t it be much like other low hills around Hobart that are less appreciated and frequented?”. | “The transition from thick forest to high alpine vegetation makes the [mountain] a very special place especially as this gives a diversity of vistas from short distances to the far horizon”. |
| OL299 | “The transition from thick forest to high alpine vegetation makes the [mountain] a very special place especially as this gives a diversity of vistas from short distances to the far horizon”. | “I like the fresh air and the smells and the relatively undeveloped nature of the tracks and trails”. |
| OL300 |  | “I like that it’s part of a range that drops off into the Huon and Upper Derwent valleys”. |
| OL301 | Organ Pipes (for climbing) | “Recreation opportunities, eg, snow play, wilderness, remote walks, etc, would be more limited”. |
| OL302 |  | “Also the panorama of lights from the summit at night would be less impressive”. |
| OL303 |  | “Recycled opportunities, eg, snow play, wilderness, remote walks, etc, would be more limited”. |
| OL304 |  | “I moved to Tasmania partly because you could be on top of a 1200m mountain within half an hour’s drive from the city centre, this took 3-4 hours in my native Melbourne”. |
| OL305 | Sphinx Rock  
Zig Zag Track | “… ran a bike ride to the top of the mountain as a fund raiser for men’s health”. | “I like having natural bush so close, whether it’s riding my road bike up it, having a picnic with interstate friends on Sphinx Rock, or climbing the Zig Zag Track in the snow”. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OL306</th>
<th>• “It’s important that the mountain can be used by runners, walkers, cyclists, etc.”.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| OL307 | • “I value the mountain for its beauty, and as a place to enjoy mountain bike riding ... the tracks are challenging and diverse”.
• “The mountain is a beautify place, with contrasting vegetation and landscape”. |
| OL308 | • “The fact that it is a mountain probably gives people more of a feeling of ownership too – it is an obvious, tangible and definable ‘thing’, rather than an area”. |
| OL309 |                                                                                   |
| OL310 |                                                                                   |
| OL311 | • “There is something extra special in being able to easily experience a Tas alpine landscape that Mt Wellington offers”.
• Mt Wellington
• Pipeline Track (for cycling)
• New Town Track |
| OL312 | • “... go yourself [to an auction] and see what any historic painting of Mt Wellington fetches. We all understand the value of this natural monument and the value that it has held for all those who have been here long before us”.
| OL313 | • Mt Wellington
• Pipeline Track (for cycling)
• New Town Track
• “... the edifice is ingrained in my psyche”.
• “I take visitors up to it to show them Hobart and where it fits in relation to the Derwent, Storm and Norfolk Bay, Slopen Main and the Peninsula.”
• “I love walking from home, Mt Stuart, up the Knocklofty tracks”. |
| OL314 | • “Mtb tracks (particularly cross country single tracks (ie, North=south Track) not downhill or fire trails; access to climbing, walking tracks, scenery, views, solitude; having a ‘wilderness’ area close to Hobart is very special”. |
| OL315 |                                                                                   |
| OL316 | • “Yes, it’s Hobart’s icon ... it’s where the weather comes from!”.
• “Such a great outdoor recreational area so close to the city”. |
| OL317 | • “Love being able to walk there at weekends – just a short distance from the city with such tranquility and beauty”. |
| OL318 | • “Wellington Park is very special to me in that it provides a sanctuary to which I can quickly escape from the city and life stresses. Within 20 minutes I can be walking under the canopies of trees or along a rocky scree face. How good is this!”.
• “Area of which to be justifiably proud to introduce visitors”. |
| OL319 |                                                                                   |
| OL320 | • “It is an integral part of Hobart’s and southern Tasmania’s soul””. |
| OL321 | • “I love walking in the Park, always clean and fresh, variety of plants and huge difference in tracks and outlooks so close to everything”. |
| OL322 |  |
| OL323 | • “The sense of wilderness would be diminished. The beautiful silhouette would not be there. The clouds often present would not be there, or if they were, would not be veiling the dolerite columns and ridgeline you know area here ...”. |
| OL324 | • “Wellington park is of great value for its recreational value, scenery, and as a place to show off to friends and visitors, this is especially so for the Springs, summit, Cathedral rock and Wellington Falls”. |
| OL325 | • “I certainly appreciate the wind block that Mt Wellington provides to the city of Hobart”.
• “... low hills would still be a privilege to have on our doorstep. However the magnitude of Mt Wellington makes it so special because of different experiences you can have the higher up you go – views, changing foliage, snow”. |
| OL326 | • “Wellington par is fundamental in protecting public access and recreational use combined with the protection of fauna and flora.”
• “Mt Wellington’s value and appreciation by the community is greatly enhanced by the surrounds of the mountain being a park area. The Mt Wellington range gives an area that extends beyond the park and gives it a great physical area for recreation and scenery”. |
| OL327 | • “I love visiting the mountain to walk at any time of the year. The snow makes it special in winter”. I particularly love the higher slopes above the treeline. The forested slopes are also very special with tall trees and plentiful wildlife. Spring and summer are great times to see the wildflowers”. |
| OL328 | • “My family and even our interstate grandchildren all use the mountain”. |
| OL329 | - “It’s not its title that is of importance, it is its size.”  
- It's the city’s protection from the weather. It is our rain collector and our rain shadow...”.  
- “It forms part of Hobart’s identity interstate and internationally”. | - “Having grown up in Fern Tree I view the Mountain as my childhood backyard ... since I have married we have lived away from the mountain. Our property had its back to the mountain. Our inability to read the pending weather and mood caused us both concern. We have since moved and read the mountain every day”.  
- “Our three year old already talks of the cliffs he will climb one day like mummy and daddy, he and his younger sister have ridden and walked the tracks I travelled on at their age, and they play in the snow of my old back yard – my parent’s garden and the mountain”. |
| OL330 | | |
| OL331 | - “Enormously ...the pleasure and feeling I get from being on what feels far more mountainous is much greater”.  
- “The dominance of the mountain over the skyline really adds to the sensation of being really connected to the wilderness”.  
- “The feeling of coming in from the airport when I have been away and seeing Mt Wellington on the skyline is super”. | - the plateau  
- “I value how easy it is to access a place which can feel so isolated”.
| OL332 | - “It provides a peaceful escape from the city to a place uncluttered by people and infrastructure”.
- “The undeveloped nature of the park is VERY important to me”.
- “It provides a wide range of walks from gentle strolls to energetic climbs”.
- “I have frequently visited the park all my adult life”.
- “It is less important to me in terms of scenic views from the mountain”.
| OL333 | - “I love the higher altitudes ...”.
| OL334 | - “I feel as though I have a connection to it when I walk there, especially when I am on a walk where there is no noise from the city or cars on the mountain”.
| OL335 | - “I am enticed by the size of the Mountain and its aerial view over Hobart and beyond”.  
- Wellington Falls Track  
- Silver Falls  
- O’Gradys Falls  
- “I also live in the area and love going for walks there. ... I also enjoy smaller walks. For example I just like to go to Silver Falls or O’Gradys Falls and listen to the water as it falls”.
- “I love the ferns of the park and just the natural beauty. Even the craggy rock face at the top of the park overlooking Hobart is stunningly beautiful”.
| OL336 | - Mountains hold a special place in the human psyche; and our Mountain, rising from behind the city provides an important anchor to how we navigate to, from and within the city”  
- “I have a deep sense of place grounded in the Mountain and profound respect for its landscape; however that sense of place is derived from a lifetime of adventure in the folds of the Mountain”.
- “One of the main reasons we wanted to be close to the park was for its recreation value to us and our children”.

Wellington Park Social Values & Landscape – An Assessment
A Wellington Park Management Trust Report
McConnell, A. (March 2012)
<p>| OL337 | “... it would still be a great asset but not so dominating”. | “It forms a wonderful natural backdrop to Hobart and few cities can boast an asset like Mt Wellington so close to the CBD”.&lt;br&gt;“It reminds you that Tasmania has wonderful natural areas and mountainous areas. ... It is a natural barrier that helps break up urban sprawl”. |
| OL338 | “My view of Tasmania wouldn’t be changed tough, just my home”. | “I live next to it. Its presence determines many aspects of my life, weather food I grow, choices I make about my lifestyle and actions”.&lt;br&gt;“Wild, beautiful, bringer of weather, protector of Hobart”.&lt;br&gt;“One of the first things I noticed when I first moved here was the way the Mountain was a reference point for all – I could get on a bus and the driver would say – ‘doesn’t the mountain look beautiful today’ ...”.&lt;br&gt;“I love the fact that such a vast and relatively untouched environment is so close to a capital city”. |
| OL339 | “Hobart would be just another mundane city”.&lt;br&gt;“Arriving in Hobart by sea is an unforgettable experience, the mountain always looks magnificent”. | “It is such a beautiful area, so good to escape the city and wander in the quiet bush.”&lt;br&gt;“I go there to take photos of the birds, wildflowers and landscape”.&lt;br&gt;“I am very grateful to have such a wonderful park so close to the city”.&lt;br&gt;“May diminish its visual inspiration to some extent”.&lt;br&gt;“I don’t think it would reduce my use of it for recreation, as I mainly use tracks below the Springs anyway”.&lt;br&gt;“... an inspiring sight at all times of the year (but particularly in winter with snow). Our home is also on the flanks so looking up to it every day is something special”.&lt;br&gt;“The vistas it offers over the Derwent Estuary, and to surrounding areas (eg, Tasman Peninsula, Bruny Island).” |
| OL340 | Pipeline Track (for running) | “Wellington Park is important to me to preserve wildlife and natural bush near the city”.&lt;br&gt;“I regularly use the mountain bike tracks and run on the Pipeline Track”.&lt;br&gt;“Mt Wellington defines Hobart and even Tasmania – Hobart would be a much less special place without it”:&lt;br&gt;“Mt Wellington and Wellington Park frame Hobart and make it the city it is ...”:&lt;br&gt;“The changing nature of Mount Wellington – wreathed in mists, partly obscured, outlined in sunlit clarity with the arresting vertical structures of the Organ Pipes or capped with snow make Hobart the special place it is”.&lt;br&gt;“The mountain plays an important part in making Hobart unique, but not he bush surrounding it”.&lt;br&gt;“Absolutely. Its spectacular form is one of Southern Tasmania’s treasures”:&lt;br&gt;“... the way it is sometimes so close I could reach out and touch it, yet at other times it feels so distant”. |
| OL342 | Springs to Junction Cabin track&lt;br&gt;Myrtle Gully Track&lt;br&gt;Silver Falls | “... an inspiring sight at all times of the year (but particularly in winter with snow). Our home is also on the flanks so looking up to it every day is something special”.&lt;br&gt;“The vistas it offers over the Derwent Estuary, and to surrounding areas (eg, Tasman Peninsula, Bruny Island).” |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OL348</th>
<th>“Less dramatic in every sense”.</th>
<th>“MY favourite place to walk – such a variety of landscapes and views”. “Such an iconic Hobart view to look to the mountain from my house to see the weather”.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OL349</td>
<td>“The park is more impressive, being a mountain high enough to have alpine vegetation and attract winter snowfalls. It also has the Organ Pipes ...” The height also attracts enough rain for several significant streams to have their catchments up there”.</td>
<td>“Wellington Park is a great place for people with a wide range of interests. Recreational pursuits are too varied to list but include ... and just the joy of being outdoors”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OL350</td>
<td></td>
<td>“Mt Wellington is a landmark to Hobart, it provides a sense of home, it grounds me. It is integral to Hobart’s identity. When I travel the sight of it always brings a sort of proof of journey’s end”. “I think the fact that it is still relatively untouched is one of the mountain’s greatest assets, the fact that it still allows adventure and excitement or contemplation and solitude in equal measure without the prejudice of a designer tourist “drawcard” ....”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OL351</td>
<td>“Mount Wellington is THE landmark that distinguishes Hobart from every other capital city.”</td>
<td>“Whatever I’m doing .... the mountain is my benevolent host. We are truely privileged to have such an ancient monolith standing over us”. Fern Glade Track  Ice House Track  Smiths Monument  Johnsons Knob  Junction Cabin  Zig Zag Track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OL352</td>
<td>“I don’t think it’s the height of the mountain, more the fact of the landscapes and terrain”.</td>
<td>“As an amateur photographer it’s fantastic for different landscapes and different moods of the same landscape”. “As a mountain biker – it’s fantastic for cross country riding”. “As a bushwalker, it’s good to share an afternoon with friends and family in Wellington Park”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OL353</td>
<td>“… but having the elevation gives it something extra”. “Mt Wellington gets relatively infrequent snow cover these days, but that elevation is what gives us this magical show”. “Its size serves as a great reminder of what’s out there in Tasmania beyond the urban environment and serves as a lovely reminder to me of bushwalks done elsewhere”.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OL354</td>
<td></td>
<td>“In my opinion [the park] should be viewed as a whole: the mountain and its surrounds dominate the city below and determine its character”. “Any visible man-made structure weakens the character of the mountain, destroys its pristine quality, destroys the soul of the mountain.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGT01</td>
<td>Explanation of it not being important is that the respondent lives “100kms away”.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGT02</td>
<td>“The mountain, the park, also imply that this is a great gateway opening into the wilderness of the South-West, the beating heart of Tasmania”.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGT03</td>
<td>“Wellington has become my measure of other cities both in Australia and overseas ...”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The lack of commercial destinations means that Wellington remains a place of quiet refuge that I can visit with my mind when physically absent”.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGT04</td>
<td>“Living in Eaglehawk Neck it has no bearing on my life apart from attracting tourists which I class as a ‘nuisance’ because they leave rubbish ...”.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGT05</td>
<td>“The height and sheer bulk of Mt Wellington make it a focal point, visible for great distances. Mankind’s respect for high places is universal ...”.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGT06</td>
<td>“The whole point is to maintain a natural state” although “I think the summit road can be justified (on the grounds of reasonable access for all)”.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGT07</td>
<td>“My wife and I raised our four children at Lindisfarne in constant view of the Mt Wellington”.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGT08</td>
<td>“I’m fairly certain that “Wellington Hill” (!!) would not have generated Wellington Park”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGT09</td>
<td>“It gives a unique background to Hobart”.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“views of Hobart and southern Tasmania are unique and help to orientate visitors”.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“the bush, wildflowers and fauna are unique and need protection”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“it has a unique place in the history of Tasmania”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I believe it is deeply significant to everyone who lives or has lived in Hobart”.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGT11</td>
<td>• “Mount Wellington is a vital part of the setting of Hobart and to a returning traveller means home”.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| FGT12 | • Fern Tree area  
| | • Zig Zag Track  
| | • Silver Falls |
| FGT13 | • “Not at all. It is all beautiful”.
| FGT14 | • Walk from Fern Tree to the summit  
| | • “.... also good easy walks around the lower slopes”.
| | • “the sight of the mountains covered in snow as you drive to Hobart from the airport is stunning ...”.
| FGT15 | • A bush place where you can “gather your thoughts, appreciate nature, wonder!!!, analyse its place in the comparison to other world sites, “food for the soul”, feel rejuvenated and able to tackle and face another 24 hours ..... of life!!”.
| FGR01 | • “From the day I arrived in Tasmania (Hobart) and sighted the Mountain I fell in love with it”.  
| | • “... and while working in an office in Salamanca Place looking out of the window and longing to be there”.  
| | • “Seeing the recovery of the Mountain after the ’67 bushfires”.
| FGR02 | • ‘Thousands of cities have hills, Mt Wellington is a bonus’.
| FGR03 | • “The mountain’s lovely shape brings pleasure to the heart”, it has a ‘pleasing, well-formed, shapeliness’.  
| | • The mountain is a “stalwart backdrop”  
| | • “It is perhaps the most important feature of Hobart”.
| FGR04 | • “I have grand views of Wellington from my house on the hills of Lindisfarne. I could not ask for a better view”.  
| | • Smiths Monument  
| | (whole of Park is important)  
| | • “Smiths Monument is of particular interest – I lead two trips each year and explain the history of the site”.

**Wellington Park Social Values & Landscape – An Assessment**
**McConnell, A. (March 2012)**
**A Wellington Park Management Trust Report**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FGR05</th>
<th>“Greatly – the scale of Mt Wellington is its 1st feature”.</th>
<th>“magnificent wildflowers in spring”.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FGR06</td>
<td>• Pinnacle Lookout</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGR07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGR08</td>
<td>“It is hard to imagine that, but I guess you would just appreciate what you have”</td>
<td>“With o’seas visitors a night time drive to the Pinnacle is a great way to see the local wild life”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGR09</td>
<td>• “Thank goodness it isn’t low hills”</td>
<td>“Any of the tracks when covered in snow, especially if you are the first people to be there that day”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Myrtle Gully</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Organ Pipes Track</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Zig Zag Track</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Panorama Track</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Big Bend to Mt Connection Track</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGR10</td>
<td>“Probably of lesser appeal, but even low hills can be beautiful within a landscape context”.</td>
<td>“It is a people’s park and should always remain so”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The Springs</td>
<td>“Some parts and be threatening in a storm situations, so it should be treated with respect”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Silver Falls</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Myrtle Gully</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Sphinx Rock</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Organ Pipes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Junction Cabin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• O’Gradys Falls</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• South Wellington</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• skyline traverse Sth Wellington - summit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGR11</td>
<td>• Pinnacle – Zig Zag Track walk</td>
<td>“Collins Cap, Bonnet &amp; Montagu, etc, all have their own charms”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ice House Track</td>
<td>“I could write a lot more but feel that I am stating the obvious”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Red Paint Track</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Old Hobartians Track</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Collins Cap</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Collins Bonnet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Mount Montagu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGR12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGR13</td>
<td>• Pinnacle Road</td>
<td>“Main Road to Pinnacle – provides access to retirees unable to walk”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGR14</td>
<td>“It would really affect it adversely. It is integral to the physical aspect of Hobart this beautiful mountain. It defines the city”.</td>
<td>summit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGR15</td>
<td>“to see Mt Wellington from the Easter Shore is quite inspirational at any time of the day – or in any weather conditions. Low hills can’t compare”.</td>
<td>South Wellington plateau area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Circle walk: Fern Tree – Milles Track – Snake Plains – Pipeline Tk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Circle Walk: Springs – Organ Pipes Tk – Hunters Tk – Lenah Valley Tk.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Neika to Wellington Falls</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Andersons Rd – Cathedral Rock</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Collins Cap and Bonnet</td>
<td>“We arrived in Hobart 40 years ago and have spent many years exploring the mountain”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• “Should be promoted [park or walking tracks?] for beautiful views, the flora and bird-life”.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The Pipeline Track from Fern Tree is one place where partner, now in wheelchair, can still enjoy ‘being in the bush’.</td>
<td>(whole of park is important)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGR16</td>
<td></td>
<td>“The mountain &amp; the whole range are integral to Hobart and the surrounding area. ... The whole range though is a beautiful background to many districts of the southern region ... ”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGR17</td>
<td></td>
<td>“It is an identifying icon and immensely valuable to the residents and visitors alike”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Hobartians have grown up with its background and changing moods and it is an important part of everyday life. Visitors recognise its beauty and its changing moods”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGR18</td>
<td>Pinnacle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pipeline Track</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 4

Project Proposal
PROJECT DESCRIPTION & METHODS
WELLINGTON PARK LANDSCAPE COMMUNITY VALUES ASSESSMENT
(COMMUNITY VALUES PROJECT STAGE 1

Background

Wellington Park has acknowledged important landscape values. As a dominant natural feature, the Wellington Range has become “inextricably linked with the community’s sense of identity and self-image” and this results in Mount Wellington having “symbolic value of great importance to the community” (WPMT, 1996, p.139). In some cases this relationship borders on, or becomes, a spiritual attachment.

These community, or social, values have applied since the early days of European settlement of Hobart, hence also have historical validity. They apply to the whole of the Park, not just the Hobart face, although the nature and importance of the values will vary from place to place within Wellington Park.

Given the large number of people living around and within sight of Wellington Park and their use of the Park, understanding the way in which this community values Wellington Park or places within the Park is critical to the successful long term management of the Park, particularly given that one of the goals for the management of the Park is to "retain the essential cultural characteristics of the Park" (WPMP 2005, 14). The social values of the Park however have not been formally assessed to date.

The Wellington Park Community Values Project has been designed as a long term staged project to develop a better understanding of how the local/regional community values Wellington Park. These values are seen as the major component of the social values of Wellington Park. The project as a whole is envisaged as comprising –

Stage 1 Initial community values assessment.
Stage 2 Detailed community values assessment.
Stage 3 Community mapping.

The present project is Stage 1 of the broader Wellington Park Community Values Project. It has been designed and is being initiated now to feed into the major Wellington Park Landscape Values Assessment Project, also being undertaken by the Trust, and is one of three major studies that comprise the landscape project.

The following outlines the aim and methodology of the project. The Stage 2 assessment, which is linked, is also included.

---

48 Note: The values that are being considered here are present day values. The study is not concerned with Aboriginal heritage values, although these potentially apply to Wellington Park.
49 There is a general appreciation of what the community values about Wellington Park, particularly in relation to their use of the Park, which has been able to be developed from a small number of surveys and submissions responding to planning for the Park and a limited amount of anecdotal information. Although these views appear consistent, they to be strongly issue based and represent the views of those who have a very strong attachment to the Wellington Park area or parts of it.
50 The other aspect of the social values of Wellington Park being the values of the broader community.
51 The other two key components are an Historical Landscape Character Assessment and a Landscape & Visual Character and Quality Assessment.
Project Aim
To gain an initial broad based understanding of how the local community values Wellington Park and areas and places within it, and to document these for management purposes and to feed the results into the Wellington Park Landscape Values Assessment Project.

General Project Description
Given timing and cost constraints, the Stage 1 project will be a questionnaire based assessment. Key goals are 1. achieving information on the wide range of social values; 2. achieving wide coverage of the 'local community', and 3. obtaining a response from those who do not have strong attachments as well as those who do.

Originally it was proposed to use a 'postcard' as the basic response medium, with a more detailed questionnaire to be developed for those who wished to provide more detailed responses. The 'postcard' approach had the benefits of not being too onerous to complete and being relatively easy to distribute. Research however established that distributing the postcards was not as easy as originally envisaged and that the cost of producing and distributing the postcard to households was prohibitive. There was also concern that if attractive, people might choose to keep the postcard, rather than use it to respond.

The present approach is modified from the postcard approach. It involves a one page questionnaire with open ended questions, to be distributed in a number of ways, with an option for a more questionnaire (on the website and to be posted to those who request).

Project Management
The project is being undertaken by the Wellington Park Cultural Heritage Coordinator (CHC), and steered by the Manager, WPMT.

Stage 1 Questionnaire Design
The Stage 1 questionnaire (basic questionnaire) is designed as a two page questionnaire on a single A4 sheet.

The questionnaire will be available as a single A4 sheet (ie, hard copy) at various locations (see below) and on the WPMT website.

The questionnaire includes –
- 1 tick box question to establish how positive IS the respondent’s attachment
- 2 open ended questions designed to elicit comment of the range of values held by the respondent (with a slight emphasis on landscape values) (includes prompts)
- 1 question seeking basic demographic information for analysis
- 1 question asking if the respondent is interested in filling out a more detailed questionnaire (to enable respondents who are interested to be notified when and if the Stage 2 questionnaire is initiated)
- background information which includes the purpose of the questionnaire, a map, and the mailing address for returning the completed questionnaire.

It is proposed to forward the draft questionnaire to select individuals for comment (including Michael Easton, Anne Hardy).
### Stage 1 Questionnaire Distribution

The proposed distribution of the questionnaire is via a number of avenues, the aim being to reach as many of the local community as possible as economically as possible.

**Distribution**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Avenue</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Requirements/considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| WPMT Website                                | general / electronic media users | • will require some reformatting (who?)  
• will require putting on the website (who?)  
• low cost                                                                                  |
| Insertion in Mercury                        | regional community          | • major cost unless free as a community service (ME to follow up)  
• most effective if part of a one page spread on WP and the project  
• will require some reformatting – possibly needs to be 1 side only. |
| Insertion in other local newspapers         | regional community / neighbours | • possible significant cost unless free as a community service (ME to follow up)  
• most effective if part of a one page spread on WP and the project  
• will require some reformatting (as for Mercury?). |
| Stand at local government offices (poster and forms) | regional community | • at all council offices - Derwent Valley, Brighton, Clarence, Glenorchy, Hobart, Kingborough, Huon Valley  
• A1 poster with questionnaires  
• will need approvals (ME to follow up)  
• minor cost (printing questionnaires & c. 7 posters, & holders/stands) (AM to follow up) |
| Stand with small poster at select POs and shops near Park | neighbouring communities | • at obvious neighbour shops/POs – eg, Fern Tree store, Sandfly Store, Grove Shop, Skyline Garage, South Hobart PO, Lenah Valley shop?, Tolosa St shop?, Collinsvale shop.  
• A3 poster with questionnaires in plastic sleeve/envelope (AM to follow up)  
• will need approvals (AM to follow up)  
• minor cost (printing questionnaires & c. 7 posters, & holders). |
| Mailout to Glenorchy Precinct Groups        | Glenorchy residents         | • being used because it is an available low cost option to reach a large number of people  
• will create a bias, but this is considered to be only minimal - could be regarded as a large focus group?  
• will need approvals (ME to follow up) |
| Insertion (loose) in HCC mailouts to community groups (eg, Bushcare) | (additional coverage) | • being used because it is an available low cost option to reach a relatively large number of people  
• will create a bias, but this is considered to be only slight  
• will need approvals (ME to follow up) |
| Handouts at Summer Interpretation Events | (additional coverage) | • being used because it is an available low cost option to reach people  
• will create a bias, but this is considered to be only slight |
| Limited age based focus groups | young and old community | • to address concerns that most respondent will be c.mid-20s to mid-60s;  
• use of groups such as School for Seniors and selected schools will provide an opportunity to check the views of younger and older community members (Note – 1 School for Seniors group has already been used)  
• select a small number (c.4) regionally based old and young groups initially (AM to follow up, may need representation from ME)  
• if a very strong bias in respondents from non-focus group responses, consider using more than the 4 groups of each.  
• Cost low, but moderate project officer time input required. |
| Other focus groups | (if required to address imbalances) | • if a very strong bias in respondents from non-focus group responses, consider using more focus groups – nature of groups will depend on biases (eg, age, gender, location, degree of attachment). |

**Notes:**
1. As the emphasis of the project is on local/regional residents, the above opportunities do not target visitors to the region. Visitors however will not be discouraged from responding as this information is also of value. If the Examiner and Advocate were willing to insert the questionnaires as a public service – this should be encouraged to broaden the scope to Tasmanian residents generally.
2. Walking clubs and other special interest use groups (other than community associations) will not be mailed questionnaires as these groups are known to have a keen interest and are likely to respond anyway; and focus on these groups will bias results.
3. Also, handing out of questionnaires within the Park or at key entrance points is not being recommended at this stage due to lack of places to do this and cost of employing people to do this. This option may be considered if responses area low and volunteers can be found to hand out the questionnaires.

**Advertising**

Success of the project will be heavily dependent on advertising the project widely and encouraging people to complete the forms online or otherwise.

The usual advertising opportunities should be used – ie, Mercury, local newspapers, radio, local community, bushwalking, environmental, etc groups (via newsletters, emails).

**Target advertising is –**

1. a one page spread in the Mercury (including the questionnaire) to encourage people to respond, and be clear that we want people to let us know if they don't care;

2. radio opportunities such as Christopher Lawrence, Tim Cox, Andy Muirhead, Country Hour, whatever the young people’s station/s is.

3. TV would be great – news and an obvious possibility is Stateline

As well as advertising at the start (‘launch’), it would be useful to have some reminder advertising (small article paper, radio) towards the end, encouraging those who have not responded to do so – with time frame.
Stage 2 Questionnaire Design & Distribution (optional)

If, after receiving responses to the initial questionnaire, it is felt that more elucidation of the community values is required, a second more detailed questionnaire will be used which will ask more detailed questions about specific values.

This second questionnaire will provided to those respondents to the initial questionnaire who indicated an interest in completing a more detailed questionnaire; and it will also be posted on the Trust website to allow anyone who is interested to complete it.

Consideration was given to having the more detailed questionnaire available at the same time as the basic questionnaire, but it was decided to make it separate stage as it was felt that—

- some respondents might opt to answer the more detailed questionnaire which would reduce the number of completed basic questionnaires and lead to a loss in comparability; and
- it might lead to confusion; and
- it might not be necessary depending on the responses obtained from the basic questionnaire.

It may be useful to have the second questionnaire ready, so it can be sent out to interested respondents soon after their primary questionnaire is received while the matter is still fresh in their minds.

Project Timing

Given the current stage of project development (a draft basic questionnaire and one focus group run), CHC timing constraints, summer holiday considerations, and the current aim to have all components of the Landscape Project completed by 30th June 2009 for analysis in the second half of 2010, the following is the proposed time line for the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nov-Dec 2009</td>
<td>Project development</td>
<td>- finalise proposal,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- finalise questionnaire,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- modify questionnaire for website;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan – Feb 2010</td>
<td>Liaison Materials preparation</td>
<td>- obtain approvals for distribution,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- media liaison &amp; negotiation;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- prepare questionnaire for newspapers,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- prepare displays,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- print questionnaires,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- put questionnaire on website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2010</td>
<td>Launch questionnaires</td>
<td>- media advertising,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- mailouts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- set up focus groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2010</td>
<td>Reminder about project in media</td>
<td>- media advertising,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2010</td>
<td>Run focus groups</td>
<td>(this will use CHC time from July 2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July – Dec 2010</td>
<td>Analysis Possible stage 2 questionnaire (Aug-Sept 2010)</td>
<td>- put stage 2 questionnaire on website &amp; print off copies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- advise those interested that stage 2 questionnaire is available/post out where relevant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- produce project report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>