George Perrin, Conservator of Forests, on Mount Wellington in 1887 -

“the great advantages possessed by this grand recreation-ground, its nearness to the city, and other natural beauties, should make the proper care and supervision of a place so eminently suited to the wants of a large and ever-increasing city the first care of its citizens, and more particularly in a place like Hobart, which is famed all over the world for the natural beauty of its surroundings ...”

(Parliamentary Papers, House of Assembly, No. 61, 1887)

---

**Report history**
- draft policy completed & sent out for agency & other stakeholder review – November 2006;
- draft policy completed and put out for public comment – February 2007;
- policy endorsed by the WPMT & HCC subject to March 2007 comment summary - April/May 2007
- final policy completed – August 2007.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

**Context & Approach**

This document presents an Initial Conservation Policy for the historic heritage of the Springs Precinct, Wellington Park, Tasmania. The Initial Conservation Policy is the first step in assessing the cultural heritage values and providing heritage conservation advice for the Springs as a whole. A more comprehensive Conservation Management Plan is to be developed for the Springs in the longer term.

The aim of the Initial Conservation Policy is to provide guidance in relation to the sound conservation and management of the historic heritage values of the Springs area in the short term as the history of use of the Springs has created significant cultural heritage values in the area. The Initial Conservation Policy is based on currently available information with some additional research having been undertaken in areas for which there was unacceptably limited information (ie, the history, physical remains and social values).

The need for historic heritage conservation policy for the Springs arises from the need to manage the extensive, but previously poorly known, historic heritage values in an area that is also the primary development and use focus in Wellington Park. This is particularly critical given the reserved land management context of the Springs and Mt Wellington more generally for which the primary management objectives are the protection of the natural and cultural values and the maintenance of water quality, with use needing to be consistent with the protective goals.

**Historical Background**

The historic heritage values of the Springs result from its peculiar physical context as a natural bench approximately half way up the Hobart face of Mt Wellington which rises to over 1,200m and forms a dramatic, native forest cloaked backdrop to Hobart. This combination of factors has caused the Springs to have been a focus of European historic activity on the western outskirts of Hobart since settlement as a source of clean water and as a destination and important base for visitors, mainly for recreational and nature appreciation activities.

The first documented European activity in the area was the capture of water from the series of small springs in the area in 1831 as part of Hobart's first water supply and probably the first town water supply development in Australia. The Springs still provides clean drinking water to Hobart. Known recreational use of the Springs began in the 1830s, with the access created by the 1831 diversion appearing to be a catalyst. The recreational use grew steadily to the early 1900s¹ as new tracks were developed to make access to the major scenic features easier, in particular the Wellington Falls Track and the Icehouse Track in the 1840s and a carriageway from Fern Tree to the Springs in the late 1880s. Over its period of use the Springs has continued to be a focus for visitors to the mountain, as a destination, a meeting place or a halfway place. As part of this there has been ongoing development of low-key recreational infrastructure, mainly shelter sheds, the first of which appear to have been erected at Lady Jane Franklin's request in c.1839.

There has also been provision of refreshments and accommodation for visitors for much of the history of recreation at the Springs. In 1859 the Woods family became the first residents of the Springs, providing refreshments and simple accommodation for visitors to the Mountain. In the early 1890s the Gadd family replaced the Woods family at the Springs and continued the tradition of providing refreshments to visitors (but not accommodation). In 1907 the Springs Hotel, designed by

¹ Around 9,500 people were recorded as visiting at the Springs over the summer of 1904-05.
Alan Cameron Walker, was built as a mountain 'resort', to promote tourism to Tasmania, which was at the time being promoted as the 'pre-eminent health resort' in Australia. The Springs Hotel also took over the role of providing refreshments to walkers and other visitors, and operated until it was burnt in the 1967 bushfires which extensively burnt out the Springs area.

With the advent of Henry Woods and Charles Gadd, a tradition of caretaking was created on Mt Wellington, and Gadd's appointment as a Ranger by the Hobart City Council in 1891 was the first such appointment and the start an important management initiative that continued until the mid-1900s. Charles Gadd and a daughter, Edith, also staffed the Springs weather observatory which was one of a pair of stations (the other was at the Pinnacle) which was set up in 1895 by Clement Wragge, a renowned meteorologist, to make more accurate weather forecasts. The Mt Wellington observatory was the first such weather observatory in the southern hemisphere and the second in the world. Weather readings have continued to be an important function at the Springs until recently. The Springs was also used as the site of a cosmic ray observatory from 1956 until recently. This observatory was an integral element in the string of cosmic ray observatories that extended from Papua New Guinea to Antarctica.

The Springs was also important as a focus of Great Depression employment. In c.1925 a government program to cut firewood on the Mountain was established using the Springs as the base, and in c.1928-1929 a substantial amount of track upgrading and construction was undertaken on the Mountain as a government employment scheme, with the Lenah Valley Track being one of the tracks worked on. In 1931 publicly raised funds enabled a stone shelter and the Exhibition Garden, a rare early native garden (also designed by Alan Cameron Walker), to be constructed, while 'susso' workers, many of whom lived at the Springs Depot, built the road from the Springs to Pinnacle between 1934 and 1937.

The use of the Springs changed significantly with the construction of the road from the Springs to the Pinnacle as this enabled visitors to continue with relative ease to the summit. Although the Springs was often bypassed by visitors in cars after the Pinnacle Road was completed, the Springs continued to be used by walkers, sightseers and other visitors, and it is still a popular day use area today for a range of visitors who use the area for sight seeing, picnicking, family parties, performances, bushwalking, snow play, and occasional weddings and memorial services.

This long term history of use has left a considerable legacy of cultural heritage values that are multilayered across the full Springs area.

**Cultural Significance**

The Springs is considered to have high cultural significance, primarily historical and social significance, as a highly visited and valued area of public open space in a natural, sheltered, relatively flat and accessible location part way up Mt Wellington, and with impressive views both up to the mountain and out across southeast Tasmania; and has been valued continuously for these characteristics since the early days of the European establishment of Hobart through to the present day. These qualities have made it an important meeting place and destination which is an aspect of its significance. The symbolic importance of Mt Wellington (from which the Springs is not differentiated at this level) to Hobart residents, and the large scale natural setting of the Springs on the eastern slope of Mt Wellington contribute importantly to the cultural significance of the Springs.

The Springs also contains considerable physical remains relating to its European history of use. Although the physical evidence is largely archaeological and there are no surviving pre-1967 buildings at the Springs, the remains cover the full period and range of use, hence are able to demonstrate the history of the area which is a special part of the history of Mt Wellington. Also, because of the history of continued use primarily for low-key recreation, and the spatially evolving
pattern of use (downwards from the top of the upper Springs) rather than re-use of the same areas, the historic heritage of the Springs has relatively high integrity, which enhances its significance.

A number of the individual sites are considered to have high cultural significance in their own right. Sites considered to have at least state level cultural significance are the 1831 Diversion, the Exhibition Gardens, the Springs Hotel, the Pinnacle Road and the main historical route to the summit (the Fingerpost and Icehouse Tracks).

These strongly interconnected values have created a strong historically and naturally based character of the Springs which is highly socially valued. The retention of this character is seen as the key cultural heritage conservation requirement at the Springs.

Management Analysis

Analysis of the management of the Springs and the issues and opportunities for ongoing use and management of the Springs suggests that the key historic heritage management issues relate to –

- increased levels of use and changed use (in particular new uses that are not related to historical and existing uses and development that will result in significant modification of what has become a familiar place),
- restrictions on low-key recreational use,
- loss of public open space, loss of the natural setting, and
- significant visual and aural impacts.

These arise primarily as the consequence of the strong continuous history of use and the strong social valuing of the Springs and Mt Wellington more generally as an essentially natural environment and for its history and scenic values. The spread of the physical heritage across the Springs however also creates constraints on new uses and development. Related factors are a strongly held view that private development is not appropriate in areas of reserved public land, and the likelihood of increased risks to the physical heritage and the natural environment (in particular water contamination, fire and weeds) with new use and greater development.

There are also issues that are associated directly with the management of historic heritage. Some of these issues, such as the relative invisibility of historic heritage and the lack of heritage data and management advice, are largely addressed by the preparation of the Initial Conservation Policy. Other identified management related issues are the potential for unplanned management actions and infrastructure development (including for heritage interpretation and presentation) to cause significant impacts to the physical heritage, and the limitations of the current local area planning instruments with respect to historic heritage conservation.

Although the historical, social and other heritage values constrain new use and development at the Springs, they also provide opportunities for use and development. There are opportunities that relate to the area being valued and a historical nexus, and there are interpretive and educational opportunities that arise from the concentration of physical heritage at the Springs. The unique location of the Springs and its relationship to Mt Wellington, the views, and the natural environment and its relationship to historical use also provide opportunities at the Springs, mainly in relation to the interpretation of the values of Wellington Park, but also in relation to creating a unique and special public use area which is sympathetic to its environmental setting.

Overall it appears that historic heritage conservation within the Springs area can operate generally within the provisions of the Wellington Park Management Plan 2005 and in-line with the management objectives of the Springs Site Development Plan 2002 and current Springs Local Area Plan, but it will require clear guidance in relation to the management of the historic heritage values to achieve good heritage conservation outcomes.
The Conservation Policy

To provide this guidance, the approach that has been taken in the Initial Conservation Policy is to provide three levels of policy for the Springs Precinct (defined by the present study). The different levels of policy are –

1. general policy for the whole precinct;
2. policy for special heritage management zones within the precinct; and
3. site specific management advice.

Given the nature of the Initial Conservation Policy, this advice is comparatively general and preliminary^2. The general policy (ie, first level of policy) for the full precinct is overarching policy which in effect recognises the Springs Precinct as an area of high cultural significance and recognises and respects the key heritage values, ie –

- the special relationship of the Springs to Mt Wellington,
- the continued historical and contemporary uses of the Springs (for water supply, recreation, scientific work and nature appreciation),
- as a public space in an essentially natural setting,
- the significant physical fabric and its setting, and
- the special landscape setting, views and viewscape.

This general policy also positions the Initial Conservation Policy as the primary basis for historic heritage management at the Springs and promotes the Australia ICOMOS (1999) Burra Charter as the primary standard for heritage management. The general policy also contains more specific policy in relation to the conservation of the physical heritage, the landscape values and the social values of the Springs and also in relation to heritage interpretation and presentation, and general heritage management at the Springs.

The second level of policy recognises five special heritage management zones within the Springs Precinct on the basis of their particular historic heritage and other cultural values, and provides specific heritage conservation policy and advice for each of these zones. This provides for the maintenance of the significant and more specific values in each of the zones. These five heritage management zones^3 are –

1. Early Historic Zone
2. Springs Hotel Zone (upper Springs only)
3. Lower Springs 20th Century Use Zone
4. Exhibition Gardens Zone
5. Springs Precinct General Zone.

The third level of policy is site and feature specific policy and recommended actions. This management advice is only provided where a specific management need has been identified for the retention of cultural significance, or where there is already management advice (eg, in the case of the Former Exhibition Gardens). The site/feature specific management advice should be considered as preliminary (except for the Former Exhibition Gardens). This advice is provided in the Endnotes which is an inventory of those historic heritage sites/features which have been identified in the Springs Precinct.

^2 The Initial Conservation Policy however recognises the more detailed conservation advice provided by the Former Exhibition Gardens Conservation Management Plan (Andrews 2006) for the former Exhibition Gardens site (but not necessarily for area outside the Gardens).

^3 The first four of these zones approximate the four zones recognised in the Springs Site Development Plan 2002.
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1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction

Introduction

This document presents an Initial Conservation Policy for the historic heritage values of the Springs, Wellington Park, Tasmania. This Initial Conservation Policy has been endorsed by the Wellington Park Management Trust and the Hobart City Council.

The area containing the significant historic heritage has been termed the Springs Precinct and approximates the Springs Zone which is a designated management Zone under the Wellington Park Management Plan 2005.

Wellington Park, managed by the Wellington Park Management Trust (WPMT), is an extensive (18,250 ha) area of land, primarily bushland, which is reserved for its natural and cultural values. It is one of the largest protected areas in Tasmania outside of the Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area.

The Park occupies a unique position as an essentially natural, but accessible, buffer between the occupied lower Derwent and Huon River valleys and the rugged, largely unoccupied area of South West Tasmania, and forms a visually significant backdrop to Hobart which, located on the Derwent Estuary, was settled by Europeans in 1804. Mt Wellington, at 1,272m, rises directly behind Hobart and is visible from many parts of Hobart. The Springs (alt. 720m) is a significant area of sandstone bench approximately half way up the eastern face of Mt Wellington and is both visible from Hobart and has views to Hobart (refer Figures 1 & 2).

Because of Wellington Park’s proximity to Hobart, particularly the eastern face, the Park is also important as a water supply, sightseeing, and recreational (primarily day use) area for greater Hobart and other parts of southeastern Tasmania. Hobart residents have developed strong historical connections to the Park and it is also of immense visual and aesthetic importance to the community.

Historical Context

The Springs has long been known as a focus of European historic activity in Wellington Park. The first documented European activity in the area was the capture of water from the Springs to feed into the initial Hobart water supply in 1831 (via the 1831 Diversion), probably the first town water supply development in Australia. The first known recreation appears to have been in the late 1830s, and in c.1839 a shelter shed was erected at the Springs and at the Pinnacle at Lady Franklin's behest for visitors to Mt Wellington. This initial recreational use was consolidated through strong artistic interest in the mountain, the formation of walking tracks from Hobart to the Pinnacle and to North West Bay River Falls from the mid 1840s, the construction of icehouses and a connecting bridle track from 1849, and establishment of a permanent dwelling at the Springs by the Woods family (who provided refreshment and some accommodation for visitors) in the late 1850s.

A permanent presence and hospitality at the Springs was continued through Charles Gadd, and his family, who moved into a newly built cottage at the Springs in 1891 as caretaker. The Gadds also provided refreshments for visitors and staffed the Springs weather observatory set up in 1895 by Clement Wragge. The Springs weather station was one of a pair of stations (the other was at the...
FIGURE 1

LOCATION OF THE SPRINGS

[taken from the Derwent 1:100,000 Land Tenure Map, Tasmmap]
FIGURE 2

PLAN OF THE SPRINGS ZONE

[taken from the Springs Site Development Plan 2002]
Pinnacle) established to provide more accurate local weather forecasting. The Mt Wellington weather observatory was the first such weather observatory in the southern hemisphere and the second in the world. The Springs has continued to operate as a weather station until recently, and still provides some weather readings. From 1956 until recently the Springs has also been the site of a cosmic ray observatory, one of a string of Australian observatories ranging from Papua New Guinea to Antarctica.

By 1888 a carriage road had been built to the Springs and this further contributed to the Springs being a focal point for visitors to Mt Wellington. In 1904 an annual visitation of some 9,500 people, most of whom arrived by vehicle, was recorded. From the late 1800s the eastern face of Mt Wellington was subject to heavy visitation and use, so much so that there was considerable concern to see this face of Mt Wellington better managed and the Springs turned from 'a neglected-looking place' into a 'most pleasant resort'. In 1906 the eastern face became public land vested in the Hobart City Council (HCC) and in 1907 the Springs Hotel was established.

The early-mid 1900s saw further consolidation of visitation and use of the Springs area, including the development of a rare early native plant garden (the Exhibition Garden) and an associated new stone visitor's shelter in the early 1930s. Then in the mid-late 1930s the road to the Springs was extended to the Pinnacle. These and other late 1920s-1930s construction projects were Depression period employment schemes.

Use of the Springs appears to have diminished in the 1940s, the probable result of easy access to the Pinnacle via the new road combined with major bushfires in the mid 1930s and 1940s and external factors such as World War II and the increase in private motor car use. The 1967 bushfire which had a major widespread effect over much of southern Tasmania also had a major effect on the Springs. The fire affected most of the Springs burning down the hotel, the cosmic ray observatory, the Alan Walker Chalet and the Exhibition Gardens and most of the native bushland in the area. The Springs Hotel and Exhibition Gardens were not re-established, but the late 1960s and early 1970s saw considerable cleaning up and re-landscaping of the Springs, including on the lower Springs which has to day become the focus for visitors to the Springs.

The Springs has continued to be a popular day use area for a range of visitors, and today is still the main focus of day use visitors, with the range of activities including sight seeing, picnicking, family parties, performances, bushwalking, snow play, weddings and memorial services. A large part of the reason for the popularity of the Springs is its relatively large area of flat land, the views from the Springs plateau out over the Derwent and to the Mt Wellington summit, and its sheltered position compared to the Pinnacle.

This history of use has left a considerable legacy of cultural heritage values that are multilayered across the full Springs area. Although previous heritage studies of Wellington Park have listed a number of sites in the Springs, apart from the Exhibition Garden, no historic heritage sites in the Springs area have been previously recorded or assessed, and only limited historic background research has been carried out. This is in spite of a number of the sites being considered to have, or potentially have, state or higher level cultural significance.

### 1.2 Background to the Development of this Conservation Policy

The lack of a clear understanding of the historic heritage values of the Springs has been a major impediment to development at the Springs in the last five years. For example, a recent development proposal for a hotel and visitor’s centre complex was significantly modified to avoid impacting the Exhibition Gardens whose significance had not been fully appreciated when development proposals were initially invited. At present there is an approved visitor centre...
development for the lower Springs Plateau, and given that there is still potentially some flexibility with aspects of the final design, then it has been considered desirable to urgently prepare some form of overarching conservation policy for the full Springs area to guide the next stage of decision making (as well as longer term management).

In 2005, in the *Wellington Park Historic Heritage Inventory & Audit*, McConnell & Scripps (2005) identified the Springs area as potentially being a heritage precinct because of the dense, complex and interrelated historic heritage of the area. Because the Springs is also a key development area within Wellington Park, McConnell & Scripps (2005, p70) also recommended that as a matter of priority on-ground survey, assessment and formulation of management policy be undertaken for the Springs (and Pinnacle) prior to any new works or decision making for these areas. In addition, the *Former Exhibition Garden Conservation Management Plan* (Andrews 2006, pp 67 & 76) recommended that the Springs generally be considered as a culturally significant precinct and that a Conservation Management Plan should be prepared for the full Springs area on the basis that there is a complex inter-relationship of the heritage values of the whole Springs area.

Recognising the urgent need for heritage conservation policy for the Springs, the agreed approach\(^4\) has been to prepare an Initial Conservation Policy that is based primarily on currently available information (but which allowed for some additional research in areas for which there is limited information – eg, history, heritage information and social values) which is to be followed in the longer term by the development of a full and fully researched Conservation Management Plan for the Springs Precinct which would include more in depth site recording, historical background research and social values assessment, and which would provide management advice for the individual sites as well as for the precinct as a whole.\(^5\) The Initial Conservation Policy development project proposal is presented in Appendix 1, and the methods used for developing the Initial Conservation Policy are outlined in Section 3.

As noted above, this document presents the Initial Conservation Policy for the Springs Precinct as well as a summary of the history, management context and historic heritage values of the area, and a description of the methods used in preparing this conservation policy.

### 1.3 Aim and Objectives of the Policy

**Aim**

The aim of the Initial Conservation Policy for the Springs Precinct is to provide guidance in relation to the sound conservation and management of the historic heritage values of the Springs area for the major development currently being considered, and other potential developments in the short term, until a comprehensive conservation management policy can be prepared for the precinct.

---

\(^4\) The preparation of an Initial Conservation Policy for the Springs, to be followed at a later date by a more fully researched Conservation Management Plan was agreed to by the WPMT in mid 2006.

\(^5\) It should be noted that for various reasons this Initial Conservation Policy for the Springs considers only the historic heritage values (ie, values related to the post-1804, dominantly European history) and not the Aboriginal heritage values. The Aboriginal heritage values of the Springs have not as yet been assessed, and should be considered as part of the broader management of the area.
Objectives

The major objectives to met by the Initial Conservation Policy for the Springs Precinct are to –

- provide for the sound management of the historic heritage values of the Springs area until a more fully researched conservation policy is prepared;
- provide conservation policy and advice in accordance with the Australia ICOMOS (1999) *Burra Charter* heritage guidelines, the *Wellington Park Management Plan 2005*, and other recognised management plans, guidelines and regulations;
- consider and provide advice for the historic heritage in a holistic manner and recognising the range of cultural heritage values of the Springs area;
- have a long term management perspective;
- ensure the heritage management advice recognises and takes into account the current and permissible uses of the Springs area and other identified values; and
- provide the policy and other advice in a manner which is accessible and usable by the management agencies, developers and the community.

1.4 Study Area

As noted above, the Springs is located on the eastern face of Mt Wellington overlooking Hobart to the east, and is a bench which is approximately midway between the summit and sea level (refer Figure 1).

The study area is the recommended Springs Precinct, which corresponds approximately to the Springs Zone designated under the *Wellington Park Management Plan 2005* (refer Figure 2). The Springs Precinct area is shown in Figure 4.

The Springs Precinct boundary has been established following a review of the historic heritage values and a field inspection. It includes all of the known and likely Springs related historic heritage (identified in the preparation of the Initial Conservation Policy) and is designed to also provide a useful management boundary (refer to Section 5.1 for further discussion on the determination of the Precinct boundary).6

It should be noted that the term 'the Springs area' is used in this report to refer to the Springs generally (ie, when not referring to the specific 'Springs Zone' or 'Springs Precinct').

---

The current knowledge of the historic heritage of the Springs area has been generated through earlier Wellington Park planning, assessment of the recent development proposal for a hotel and visitors centre at the Springs, and the recent historic heritage audit for Wellington Park. None of these previous studies however have assessed the values of the Springs area as a whole, and only a very limited area of the Springs has been subject to systematic archaeological survey.

Studies that have been carried out within the Springs area and have included consideration of historic heritage are summarised below by type.

**Wellington Park Management Plan Studies**

The first documented historic heritage study for the Springs was the assessment that was carried out as part of the inventory work for the preparation of the initial Wellington Park Management Plan by 208 Network. The findings were transferred into the WMPT (1996) *Values, Use & Management Inventory*, and were used as the basis for the first Wellington Park Management Plan (1997).

This study identified the ‘Springs site’ as a significant historical location and identified the following historic heritage sites at the Springs –

- Wragge's weather station
- Wragge’s observatory
- Springs Hotel foundations
- shelter shed ruins
- Rangers House/rest house
- Exhibition Gardens
- inscribed stone, and
- possible child’s grave.

As the review was largely based on documentary research and included very little field survey, individual sites were in general unsubstantiated literature references with little accompanying detail. As a consequence, the Wragge’s Observatory site (which is located at the Pinnacle) is wrongly ascribed to the Springs area, and it is probable, based on McConnell & Scripps (2005), that the inscribed stone is ‘Fooks Memorial Stone’ that was found near Falls or Forrest Hut, both of which are some distance from the Springs. There are also some discrepancies in the site names in these initial, primarily the Pinnacle Road and the several walking tracks that start at, end at, or run through, the area. The preliminary nature of the assessment and the need for more detailed historical and archaeological research is however acknowledged by the study.

The study also assesses aesthetic, landscape and social values, but only at a ‘whole of Park’ level. The study also acknowledges that the heritage values of Wellington Park are complex and require further study.

**Springs Site Development Plan Studies**

An assessment of the historic heritage values of the Springs was undertaken in the preparation of the initial Springs Site Development Plan (draft plan, Tasque 1997). The level of assessment however is difficult to assess as there is no methods statement. Based on what is presented in the document there appears to have been a certain amount of historical background research, but there
appears to have been little survey and assessment of the physical heritage, and only limited assessment of significance (the type of significance is not indicated and social values are not mentioned), with the document noting that only 'the key cultural heritage and architectural issues' have been identified. No additional historic heritage research or assessment appears to have been carried out in the preparation of the Springs Site Development Plan 2002 or in the translation of this document into the Springs Zone Local Area Plan (Schedule P, City of Hobart Planning Scheme 1982 (amendment of 10/11/2004)).

The current Springs Site Development Plan 2002 (and 1997 draft plan) identifies four cultural heritage zones 'based broadly on eras, constructions and topography' and provides descriptions and policy for the four zones. Each zone is represented as a circle approximately centred on each area. The four zones are the –

A Historic Track Junctions Zone – which includes the junctions of old foot and bridle tracks, the Ranger's (Gadds) house, other features (possibly including Woods hut); assessed as being of 'considerable significance' (level 3 - worthy of RNE listing).

B Springs Hotel Zone – which includes the site of the hotel and associated gardens (but not the hotel garden and grazing area on the lower Springs); assessed as being of 'some significance' (level 2 – some restoration or reconstruction desirable).

C Picnic Ground & Toilets Zone – which includes the archaeological and extant remains of various 1930s and later structures; assessed as being of 'modest significance' (level 1).

D Exhibition Garden and Lookout Zone – which includes the former Exhibition Gardens and associated lookout (and the Springs Hotel Garden area although this is not stated); assessed as being of 'modest significance' (level 1).

The policy is labelled 'interim policy' and is clearly considered in the document to be interim recommendations for future use until more detailed heritage assessment is undertaken.

Wellington Park Historic Heritage Audit

The Wellington Park Historic Heritage Inventory and Audit (McConnell & Scripps 2005) was undertaken to implement a key historic heritage related recommendation of the Wellington Park Management Plan. The project was essentially an audit, but because the existing heritage data was very limited and Mountain Park focussed, additional research of the historic resources was carried out to identify and inventory new heritage sites. As no on-ground survey was allowed for in the project the study was unable to provide information on the nature and condition of the sites. The lack of data also precluded assessment of individual sites, although the project did provide indicative assessments for sites (based on known history and type of heritage place).

The audit project resulted in only a few new sites being identified in the Springs area and little new data for the Springs sites. The main new results were the identification of the 1831 Diversion as a significant newly identified site in the Springs area (rather than considering it as a track (Milles Track)), recognition of the Alan Walker Chalet, and the recognition of some features associated with identified sites as separate sites (eg, the lookout which was part of the Exhibition Gardens). The newly identified sites however were mostly more recent sites (eg, Gorbys Corner) identified through the community consultation and historical research. The audit also identified the Springs area as potentially being a heritage precinct as provided for in the Wellington Park Management Plan 2005, and in the light of the relatively high level of use and potential development in the area recommended it as a high priority area for heritage survey and further assessment.

---

7 The historic heritage research and presentation in the Springs Site Development Plans has been critiqued elsewhere (refer to the submissions to the 2004 RPDC review related to the Springs Hotel development and the new Springs Local Area Plan in McConnell (2004) and Sheridan (2004)).
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Hotel Development Related Studies (c.2001-2006)

A small number of heritage studies were undertaken at the Springs in relation to a new Springs hotel development (proposed in c.2000). These included an archaeological and heritage assessment of the levelled grounds of the former Springs Hotel site in relation to the proposed siting of water tanks for the new hotel development in this area (Terry 2001) as part of the environmental impact assessments undertaken by the development proponent in 2000-2001. Terry (2001) identified a number of historical features associated with the grounds (eg the bitumen surface of the tennis court, remnant terrace and other walling, and hotel related rubbish) and some recent features. Terry (2001) recommended that the significance assessment for the Springs Hotel Site should be upgrade to 'of considerable significance' and concludes that this associated development on the former hotel grounds would severely impact on the historical, archaeological and social significance of the hotel site.

A set of studies of the former Exhibition Gardens was also undertaken because there was local and heritage community concern that the Exhibition Gardens were potentially considerably more significant than had been indicated in the Springs Site Development Plan 2002 and required more detailed assessment in the light of the proposed development which would impact this area. This set of studies was commissioned by the HCC, in association with the WPMT.

The first of these studies was a preliminary assessment of the former Exhibition Gardens (Gulson 2003) which undertook historical background research, a site inspection, some limited consultation, and a landscape analysis. This preliminary assessment established an understanding of the history of the gardens, their extent and general nature, and provided some idea of the extant physical remains. The study concluded that a large part of the former gardens was preserved, the non-biological components were largely extant, and that the site was of very high cultural significance for a range of reasons. Gulson (2003, 34) notes that the 'Exhibition Gardens meets multiple criteria for listing on the Tasmanian Heritage Register'. She recommended that the site should be subject to an archaeological assessment and a full conservation policy be developed for the site.

The second study of the site was an archaeological survey (Austral Archaeology 2005) which was aimed at identifying the extent and nature of the remains of the former Exhibition Gardens. Although the survey was restricted by poor ground surface visibility and access due to the vegetation, it identified and mapped approximately 38 features in the former gardens and adjacent areas, most of which were related to the former Exhibition Gardens hard landscaping.

The third study commissioned was the preparation of a Conservation Management Plan for the former Exhibition Gardens as recommend by Gulson (2003). The Conservation Management Plan, which was prepared by Lee Andrews & Associates (2006), built on the previous work and carried out additional historical and comparative research and analysis. The Former Exhibition Gardens Conservation Management Plan assessed the site as being of high state and of national level significance and provides conservation policy and conservation guidelines for the ongoing management of the heritage values of the site. It also acknowledges that the history of the different parts of the Springs is strongly interrelated, and as a result recommended that the Exhibition Gardens site be considered as an integral part of the wider Springs area, and this larger area be considered as a culturally significant precinct. The Conservation Management Plan also recommends that a comprehensive Conservation Management Plan for the entire Springs area be urgently developed. The policy component of this Conservation Management Plan has now been endorsed by the WPMT, however the Plan has yet to be formally endorsed by the HCC.
3 METHODOLOGY & LIMITATIONS

3.1 Project Approach & Methods

Tasks & Methods

The key tasks, and the methods used for each task, are outlined below. The work has been performed to at least the required standards for cultural heritage assessment in Tasmania, and in accordance with the *Burra Charter* (Australia ICOMOS 1999), currently the main guidelines for cultural heritage practice in Australia.

Background Review

To expedite the project strong reliance has been placed on existing information. The background review was therefore a key component and comprised a review of the history, heritage information, and management discussion and advice contained in relevant documents, in particular McConnell & Scripps (2005), Gulson (2003), Lee Andrews & Associates (2006), the *Wellington Park Management Plan 2005*, the *Springs Site Development Plan 2002/Springs Zone Local Area Plan* and submissions relating to the Springs hotel development. This last source was particularly useful for exploring the social values of the Springs.

Historical Research

Although at the start of the present project there was a certain amount of information available from secondary sources (eg, the existing heritage studies (see above), de Quincy (1987) and Buckman (2000)), this information was sketchy for most sites and there was none for some sites. Because historical significance was considered potentially to be a major component of the cultural significance of the Springs, it was considered important to undertake additional research into the primary historical sources to better understand the history of the area. This research targeted key likely sources for the known sites and for the main periods of use and development. The primary archival research was undertaken by Lindy Scripps, an experienced historian with prior experience in researching the history of Mt Wellington.

Although the historical research undertaken for the project has been useful in developing the understanding of the history of the Springs and a number of Springs features, there are still some significant gaps. These include –

- the more recent (20th century) history,
- historical landscape appreciation, and
- the history of most of the specific sites and features (none of which are well understood except for the Exhibition Gardens).

Field Inspection

In order to save time, a detailed survey and recording of sites was not undertaken. However, because the Exhibition Gardens is the only site recorded prior to the present study, field inspection of the full Springs area was undertaken to map the historic heritage of the area to a basic level and to ascertain the extent and nature of the physical heritage. Systematic survey was not carried out.

---

8 It is acknowledged that there will be some bias in the comments given that they relate only to a single issue at the Springs.
9 The Exhibition Gardens were not included in this research as they were comparatively well researched in the lead up to, and for, the conservation management planning.
however (largely because most sites in the precinct are considered likely to have been already identified and the poor ground surface visibility conditions for sites).

Summary data only has been provided for individual sites at this stage. It should also be noted that except where GPS locations have been taken, site and feature locations are not precisely recorded or known.\(^{10}\)

**Community Consultation**

For an area such as the Springs which is strongly socially valued community consultation would normally be a major component of establishing the significance of, and conservation policy for, the area and the sites. Given the community consultation that has already occurred as part of the Wellington Park Historic Heritage Inventory & Audit project (McConnell & Scripps 2005), the community input into the Springs Zone planning, and the community submissions in relation to the proposed hotel development, there is considered to be sufficient existing information available to develop a general appreciation of the social values of the Springs. Given the likelihood of some bias in the comment (refer footnote 8), a small amount of targeted consultation was undertaken to provide broader and more up-to-date comment and to fill information gaps.

This was primarily achieved by talking to community members and groups (eg, the Fern Tree Community Association) known to strongly value the area and/or to have a good knowledge of the area and its history of use, including present day use. The consultation was via one to one meetings (in person or by phone) for individuals and by a letter of invitation to comment (and any requested follow up) for groups/organisations. The views of the heritage community (historic heritage and landscape experts) were also sought via a focus group style meeting\(^{11}\). A draft of the Springs Initial Conservation Policy was also put out for public comment.

Those consulted and the consultation responses are summarised in Appendix 3.

**Assessment of Cultural Heritage Significance**

The assessment of cultural significance has included a preliminary assessment of the individual sites, but the focus has been on preparing a statement of significance for the Springs Precinct\(^{12}\) as a whole. The assessment has used as a basis the Australia ICOMOS (1999) *Burra Charter* criteria for cultural significance, but has also assessed the historic heritage significance of the area as whole in relation to the *Historic Cultural Heritage Act 1995* Tasmanian Heritage Register criteria.

Where a particular level of significance (eg, local, regional, state or national) has been attributed, this is where the place or feature is considered to be of significance in this context. For example, the Exhibition Gardens is considered to have state level significance because it is important historically in the Tasmanian context as a rare and early example of a public native garden, because it is a very rare preserved example in Tasmania, and because it is associated with people who were important figures in Tasmanian history.

**Development of Conservation Policy**

A conservation policy has been prepared for the full Springs Precinct based on assessed cultural significance and taking into account the history of use, existing management and planning

---

\(^{10}\) Mapped locations in this document are approximate. This includes the GPS locations as the mapping has not been related to geodetic data. GPS references are given as AMD 66.

\(^{11}\) One individual meeting was also held with a landscape/heritage expert who was unable to attend the meeting.

\(^{12}\) The heritage assessment undertaken as part of the Initial Conservation Policy has determined that the Springs area constitutes a heritage precinct (as provided for under the WPMP). The significance assessment is therefore for the full precinct and the conservation policy applies to the full precinct. A precinct boundary is also established (refer Section 5.1).
provisions and advice, and desired future uses and constraints. Specific conservation policy has not been prepared for the individual sites/features, however some site specific management advice is given where this is deemed important for achieving or supporting the broader conservation policy. The conservation policy has taken into account the existing heritage conservation policy for the Exhibition Gardens (Andrews 2006), and the Burra Charter process (Australia ICOMOS 1999) and Kerr (1990) have been used as the framework for developing conservation policy.

**Reporting**

This document, together with the appendices constitutes the *Springs Initial Conservation Policy*. The report, as per standard conservation management planning process, outlines the study aims and methodology, documents the history of the precinct and its historic heritage, provides a brief analysis of the significance of the precinct as well as a statement of significance for the precinct, provides a summary analysis of management constraints, interests and opportunities, and presents the overarching conservation policy for the precinct.

A draft Initial Conservation Policy, similar to an exposure draft, was prepared for review by key management stakeholders (ie, the WPMT, HCC, HW) and other individuals and organisations who have been consulted in the preparation of the Policy and who indicated an interest in reviewing the draft policy. The draft Policy was revised on the basis of comment received on the draft document and the revised document, the final draft *Springs Initial Conservation Policy*, was prepared and released for public comment. Comment received on the final draft was summarised and recommended responses prepared. This and the final draft *Springs Initial Conservation Policy* were endorsed by the WPMT to give it status under the *Wellington Park Management Plan 2005* (to be part of the basis for management of the Springs Zone) and by the HCC who are the on-ground managers of the area. The final draft *Springs Initial Conservation Policy* was amended to incorporate the public comment on the draft and the recommended responses to produce the present document, the finalised *Springs Initial Conservation Policy*.

Although this is only an initial policy, the open consultative process that has been adopted is seen as important given the high social significance and heritage significance of the Springs area.

**Personnel**

The Initial Conservation Policy has been prepared in-house by the WPMT Cultural Heritage Coordinator, Anne McConnell.

The primary historical research carried out for the project was undertaken on a contract basis by Hobart based historian Lindy Scripps.

**Timing**

The WPMT endorsed the preparation of the Initial Conservation Policy for the Springs Precinct in June 2006. Preparation of the Initial Conservation Policy commenced in early August 2006, and a draft policy was completed in early November 2006. A final draft policy was completed in early 2007 and was released for public comment on 17th February 2007. This final *Springs Initial Conservation Policy* has been completed following review of the public comment received, and was endorsed (the final draft and review summary) by the WPMT in April 2007.

---

13 Provision of individual site conservation policy and management advice is seen as more appropriately the role of the next stage (ie, preparation of the more detailed Conservation Management Plan for the Springs Precinct) which will be based on more comprehensive information.
3.2 Limitations

The key limitation of the Initial Conservation Policy is the preliminary rather than comprehensive nature of the policy. It has been a deliberate decision to prepare, as a first step, an initial policy using mainly existing data rather than comprehensive research and analysis in order to quickly provide conservation management advice for the site as whole. A major limitation however is the lack of detailed research and analysis to support the policy.

None of the values (ie, historical, archaeological, landscape and social values, and contextual) have been comprehensively researched, and further research and analysis of the Springs' values will be required in the preparation of the Conservation Management Plan. The extent to which these sources have been researched is outlined in Section 3.1.

The information on which the Initial Conservation Policy is based is however considered to have picked up the key information regarding the cultural values of the Springs area, hence to be an adequate basis for developing interim conservation advice that will provide for the protection of the significant cultural heritage values of the Springs. Although more detailed research and analysis should provide a more detailed understanding of the history and heritage of the Springs and the values which attach to it, it is considered unlikely this will result in significantly altered conservation policy, although it may result in some modification of the proposed Springs Precinct boundary and is likely to enable more detailed management prescriptions to be formulated for the individual sites and features. More formal comparative analysis may alter the assessed level of significance of the Springs Precinct and heritage elements within the precinct, but is considered unlikely to significantly alter assessed significance.

The Initial Conservation Policy provides only general level policy and management guidance as a more detailed level of policy and prescription is not considered warranted, nor desirable, until the historic heritage of the Springs is better assessed and other values and issues and opportunities can be considered in more detail.

Given the above, key areas for additional future research, in particular to support the Springs Conservation Management Plan when it is prepared, are seen as being –

- systematic survey in the less historically used areas when visibility conditions permit (refer policy/prescriptions Zone 5) in particular to locate and document the Child’s Grave site, and the Springs Timber Tramway above Grays Fire Trail;
- comprehensive survey of the former Exhibition Gardens (Zone 4) when visibility conditions permit;
- detailed field based recording (including accurate survey) of all identified historic heritage sites and features;
- greater historical analysis of the more recent (20th century) history;
- research into the historical and contemporary landscape values;
- formal social values research which recognises the various communities of interest;
- comparative analysis to assist in assessing the State and National level significance of the Springs; and
- research to ensure the range of natural values area well understood – in particular local flora, geology/geomorphology and water (ground water flow and springs) – as the natural features have a complex relationship to the historic heritage through their historical use and appreciation and as the socially values natural setting.
4 THE SPRINGS – HISTORY & DESCRIPTION

4.1 Physical Description and Natural Values

The Springs area is a relatively large geologically controlled bench situated midway up the southeastern slopes of Mt Wellington. The bench is formed on the surface of the relatively resistant Early Triassic sandstone\(^\text{14}\) which is underlain by various Permian sandstone and mudstone dominated formations which form the lower slopes of Mt Wellington. The Permo-Triassic sediments in the area are horizontally bedded. The upper slopes of Mt Wellington are composed of Jurassic dolerite and more recent slope deposits of mixed colluvium and scree, and the Upper part of the Springs is mainly dolerite colluvium.

The bench is a roughly rectangular and relatively flat area with steep slopes above and below, and with a c.400m length of 20m-30m high intermittent sandstone escarpment on the eastern and northern margin. The bench is in fact a two level bench with a larger (c.300m x 250m) flat bench and a smaller (c.100m x 100m) higher bench that slopes gently to moderately due to the accumulation of slope deposits from above. The full Springs area is approximately 600m x 300m and is situated at between approximately 670m asl and 760m asl.

The Springs area has extensive views to Hobart, Kingston, the Derwent Estuary and North West Bay, and across southeastern Tasmania more generally, from the cliffed eastern margin. From most areas of the Springs there are also views to the Mt Wellington summit and the adjacent vertical columnar dolerite cliffs known as the Organ Pipes, and to the Mt Wellington–South Wellington ridgeline which also has extensive areas of outcrop of columnar dolerite.

The Springs experiences a mean monthly temperature range of 4°C (July) to 22°C (January) and has a significantly cooler climate than in Hobart. It has an average annual rainfall of around 1,400 mm which falls all year round, including as snow. Snowfalls are most common in the winter months, but at the Springs, which is below 800m, snow generally does not lie on the ground for more than a couple of days. Mt Wellington generally experiences relatively strong winds, particularly on the summit where strong and gale force winds are common and winds may be in excess of 100 km/hour. The location of the Springs is such that the area is relatively protected from these predominantly westerly and southwesterly winds.

The Springs is located at the headwaters of the Hobart Rivulet and Browns River, which are located on the northwest and southeast sides of the Springs bench respectively. The rivulets are fed by water stored in the dolerite colluvium and released slowly throughout the year from springs at the base of the colluvium. It is from these springs that ‘the Springs’ takes its name. These springs are considered to be the best known examples of springs in Wellington Park (WPMT 1996, p58). The drainage from these springs has been modified since 1831 when the springs feeding Browns River were diverted into the Hobart Rivulet to augment the growing town of Hobart’s water supply. There are no standing water bodies or watercourses in the Springs area and the springs are evident as areas of moist-wet soils with wet environment plants such as cutting grass (\textit{Gahnia grandis}). The Springs Site Development Plan 2002 identifies 2 main springs, both above Milles Track – Pinnacle Track and one each side of, but within 100m of, the Springs watershed. The large area of cutting grass and ferns and the number of small gullies in the area around the Springs plateau edge however suggest that there is complex subsurface drainage in the Springs area, with a number of small springs and seepages, and with subsurface flow lines possibly crossing the surface divide.

\(^{14}\) Triassic quartz sandstones also form most of the other larger benches on the slopes of Mount Wellington – for example Snake Plains, the Junction Cain area and ‘the Caves’, and at Glen Dhu Rivulet and Illa Brook.
The flatter, central parts of the Springs have been previously cleared and today are mainly open grassed areas with some smaller regrowth native vegetation. The rest of the Springs area is native vegetation – primarily eucalypt forest and heathland. The eucalypt forest is *Eucalyptus johnstonii* wet sclerophyll forest which is rare in Wellington Park, only occurring on the mid-level sandstone benches, and which is of high conservation status as an uncommon community (WPMT 1996, p76). The surround slopes carry *E. delegatensis* dominated forest (above the Springs) and *E. obliqua* forest (below the Springs).

There is very little information on the fauna of the Springs area. It is assumed to have a similar range of fauna as found on the mid-slopes on the eastern and southeastern face of Mt Wellington generally. This fauna is diverse, but a relatively low density of the larger mammals (eg, Bennetts wallaby, wombats and Tasmanian devils) has been noted on the eastern face of Mt Wellington. The *E. johnstonii* forest in the Springs area however is a rare stronghold of the endemic moth *Aenetus paradiseus* (WPMT 1996, p89). The sandstone cliffs in Wellington Park generally are also known to provide a specialised habitat for invertebrates, including the endemic flightless Rhaphidophoroid cricket, and are seen as one of the important specialised fauna habitats in the Park (WPMT 1996, p90 & 93). There is also likely to be a number of introduced (exotic) species at the Springs. Those identified as occurring at the Springs include blackbirds (in the grassy areas) and the snail *Oxychilus cellarius*, also in the cleared areas.

More detailed information on the natural values of Wellington Park, including the Springs area, is provided in the *Wellington Park Values Use and Management Inventory* (WPMT 1996), from which much of the above information has been taken.

### 4.2 History of the Springs

The following presents the history of the Springs area from first known European sighting to the present day. It has been compiled from an amalgam of sources (eg, de Quincey 1987, Crawford 1988, WPMT 1996, Buckman 2000, Gulson 2003, McConnell & Scripps 2005, Andrews 2006, and various archival sources), but draws heavily on de Quincey (1987) and WPMT (1996). More detailed historical summaries are provided for the major sites and themes for the area in Appendix 2.

#### Pre-European Settlement of the Derwent (pre-1804)

According to the WPMT (1996, p110-111), the first recorded sighting of Mt Wellington by Europeans was by William Bligh in 1788. Between 1788 and 1804 Mt Wellington was viewed, described and named by a variety of French and British explorers, including the Bruni D’Entrecasteaux expedition, Peron’s expedition and George Bass and Matthew Flinders.

George Bass is the first European credited with the ascent of Mt Wellington. He did this in 1798 while on his circumnavigation of Tasmania with Flinders, and is understood to have ascended via the New Town Rivulet and Mt Arthur.

The area falls within the territory of the Mouheneer band of the Southeast Tribe, a maritime people whose country was the coasts and the immediate hinterlands of southeast Tasmania. The Mountain was known to Aboriginal people as Kunanyi, Unghanyahletta and Poorantattere. Up until European settlement and for some years after, until the local Aboriginal way of life was severely disrupted by the British settlement on the Derwent, there is likely to have been Aboriginal use of Mt Wellington and the Wellington Range.

---

15 The historical information in this document has also drawn heavily on de Quincey (1987).
This is substantiated by reports of fires (Aboriginal burning) on the lower slopes of Mt Wellington by the late 18th century explorers, and Peron's experience in 1802. Other than fires on the range, the only post-1804 reference to Aboriginal use of the area is by a Bruny Island Aboriginal person who recounted that –

“when the first people [non-Aboriginal] settled they cut down the trees, built houses, dug the ground and planted; that by and by more ships came, then at last plenty ships; that the natives went to the Mountains [Mt Wellington], went and looked down at what the white people did, went and told other natives and they came and looked also ...” (Ryan (1981) based on G.A. Robinson, cited in WPMT 1996, p109).

Aboriginal use of the Park has not been otherwise documented and there has been little research on, or documentation of, Aboriginal sites in the Park and the foothills.

**Early European Use & Interest (1804 – c.1850)**

The first documented European resource exploitation activity in the area was the capture of water from the Springs to feed into the initial development of water supply to Hobart Town in 1831 (1831 Diversion), which together with the system of piped water from a dam in the Cascades area is understood to have been the first town water supply development in Australia, preceding the Busby Bore development in Sydney by about six years (Crawford & Ryan 1987). A channel was cut westwards from the Springs for about 200m (now Milles Track) to take water from the various springs in this area and to redirect it from the Browns River catchment into the Hobart Rivulet catchment. It is assumed that the working party camped at the Springs during the construction and Backhouse (1843) makes reference to using in late 1833 'a path that is nearly obliterated' that was used by the workmen on the scheme. The diversion was later extended into a c.1.5 mile channel as additional major springs were located.

References in the 1840s to the plentiful clear water at the Springs, yet a lack of fresh water in Hobart, indicate that for various reasons including Degraves use of water from the Rivulet, the scheme is not effective. In the c.1860s a new South Wellington - Sandy Bay Rivulet based water supply system was constructed to provide a greater and possibly more independent supply, the water from the diversion channel was turned back near its north end into the Browns River Catchment.

Other resource exploitation such as hunting for skins and timber getting which were common activities in the foothills behind Hobart from early European settlement was also probably occurring in and near the Springs from the early days of settlement, but no such activities have been specifically documented in the Springs area during this period. The Degraves and MacIntosh sawmill on the Hobart Rivulet are known to have taken timber from their 2,000 acre grant on the lower slopes of Mt Wellington, but the closest part of this grant was about 1 km east of the Springs (McConnell 2006).

Although poorly documented, Mt Wellington also attracted many visitors (including scientists such as those in Collins 1804 party (Brown, Harris and Humphrey) and Charles Darwin) from the very early days of settlement. Their route was initially, and through to the early 1840s, via the New Town Rivulet and Mt Arthur. According to the WPMT (1996, p1120 Salome Pitt, daughter of a new town settler was the first European woman known to have climbed Mt Wellington (in 1810). One of the better known ascents was that of a party which included Lady Jane Franklin in 1837. This party and a second party a week later climbed the Mountain via the 'New Town Way' camping overnight on the Mountain. De Quincey (1987) has interpreted the camping place as being at the Springs, but a review of both visits suggests that the 'good encamping ground' which was somewhere in the area of a Crater like Valley, which descends from the Plateau' and which was 'under the lee of a jungul of stunted gums, where the heather was soft, the wood abundant, and the water excellent' and set up by the Surveyor General may in fact have been South Wellington,
and possibly Devil's Gulch. If the camping place was at the Springs then the Lady Franklin party visit is the earliest documented recreational visit to the Springs, although it is likely that there were a number of earlier visits.

Lady Jane Franklin was clearly impressed with the potential for tourism on the Mountain and appears to have urged for shelters to be built. In 1839 Alex Cheyne (Director of Public Works) was instructed to build a hut at the Springs, and a second hut is also known to have been built at the same time at the Pinnacle. The location of the Springs shelter is not known, but is likely to have been in the upper Springs area near to the 1831 Diversion with its abundant water and access. A burgeoning interest in painting from the 1830s also resulted in considerable interest hence exploration of Mt Wellington in search of landscapes and natural features as worthy subjects.

The discovery of Wellington Falls in the early 1840s excited much interest, and by 1845 a track from the Springs to the Falls was (mostly) built by public subscription. This track considerably shortened the time to reach the Falls compared to the difficult route over the summit ridge and out across the plains and was deemed suitable for ladies. It is this event which appears to have formalised the Springs as one of the main track heads on the Mountain, leading to an increasing use of the area as a stopping off point or as a destination by the increasing number of visitors, including artists, to the Mountain. From the early 1840s the Springs is a key focus and the direct route which approximated the present-day Fingerpost Track appears to replace the 'New Town Way' as the preferred route onto Mt Wellington. This shift is probably due to the relatively good access via Degraves Sawmill timber tracks and the 1831 diversion construction track, as well as the interest in Wellington Falls.

Interest in the Springs as a location in the late 1840s is indicated by an 1848 application to rebuild the now 'dilapidated' hut at the Springs by members of the public with the cost (£15) to be met by subscription. The plan is to build a new timber hut of two rooms. The proponent, MacDowell, thinks it will be a 'pleasant situation for a pic nic'.

Initial Settlement & Intensive Use of the Springs (1850 – c.1880)

Until the second half of the 1800s the use of the Springs was limited to day visits or short-term camp camping. In 1859 however Henry (Tommy) Woods applied to lease an area and build a house and to cultivate 'a few acres of land'. The application was approved on the basis that Woods did not interfere with the watercourse. This marked the first known long term occupancy in Wellington Park.

The Wood family lived at the Springs until the late 1880s, growing vegetables, providing refreshment and shelter for visitors to the Mountain, and maintaining the tracks and assisting search parties. Far from interfering with the water supply, Woods also appears to have been employed by the HCC as the caretaker for the water supply infrastructure at the Springs. It is unclear when this was, but the available information suggests that he started in this capacity sometime prior to 1870 and continued full time or intermittently to at least 1882. Woods also earned money from other activities in and around the Springs such as collecting Blue Gum seed (exported in the mid-late 180s to Southern Europe, South Africa, India, America, New Zealand and mainland Australia). From photographs and descriptions, the Woods family's home at the Springs is presumed to have been above the 1831 diversion and at the north end, possibly in the same location as the earlier hut and in the same location or immediately north of Gadd's Cottage (see below).

It is probable that Woods also earned a living carting ice from the ice houses above the Springs, which were established between 1849 and the late 1850s. The first icehouse was built, possibly by prisoners, not far below the South Wellington summit, but the second ice house was built just above the Springs. The ice houses were substantial (c.9m x 5.5m) excavated areas c.2.5m deep
which were built up an additional metre with stone walling then roofed over with timber and a sod covering. In all four ice house were constructed, the other two being located between the first and second, and a bridle track was built, also by prisoners, connecting the ice houses for the cartage of the ice down into Hobart. The probable route for the ice into Hobart was via the Fingerpost Track and then via Hobart Rivulet Track to Degraves sawmill as this is the main mapped route and the Huon Road did not exist in its present location until the late 1850s/early 1860s.

In 1869 timber was still being taken from below the Springs, in this case from along the Fingerpost Track (between the Huon Road and the Springs), and Piguenit writes of the damage being done to the track by skidding the logs down the track. There is however no evidence that there was commercial logging at the Springs, although photographs of Woods Farm at the Springs shows that a substantial area had been cleared in the vicinity of the house and sheds (on slope below house) (McConnell & Scripps 2005).

There was also some access from as early as the 1830s from the south side of the Mountain on the 1830s Huon Road (which ran via Sandy Bay Rivulet via Halls Saddle and Fern Tree at this time) and from Fern Tree. An example is Charles Darwin’s second (and successful) attempt to reach the summit of the Mountain in 1836. Access from this side however appears to have been relatively minor until the more direct and substantial road from Hobart was built in the 1860s and the new extensive Mountain Water Supply System on the south side of the Mountain was also constructed in the 1860s.

The Consolidation of European Use (1880s – early 1920s)

In the late 1800s there was keen public interest in Mount Wellington and lobbying for its improvement. An 1886 report by G.S. Perrin, Conservator of Forests, promotes the Springs as being a place “from whence a splendid view of the City and environs is obtainable” and notes that although “it is a dreary, miserable, neglected-looking place in its present condition” it might be “made one of the most pleasant resorts around the City of Hobart”. Perrin goes on to recommend the reservation and planting of “The Springs" with exotic trees and laying out of the grounds as a pleasure resort.

There was also lobbying for improved ease of access to the Springs. This access to the Springs was realised in 1888 when a carriage road, Pillinger Drive, was built from the Huon Road at Fern Tree to the Springs (approximately the line of the present road). This road was government sponsored and was built by prisoners who were accommodated in a stockade well below the Springs. This road to the Springs, which could accommodate carts and buggys soon became the main access to Mount Wellington with the numerous visitors using the Springs as the stepping off point for various walks and sight seeing, for example to the Mount Wellington summit, the ice houses or to Sphinx Rock (also known at this time as White Rock) c.1 km to the north of the Springs. Many visitors were content to go no further than the Springs.

By 1900 thousands of visitors each year were using the new road to reach the Springs, or were accessing the Springs via the tracks that led up to the Springs from the Hobart Rivulet near Degraves brewery and sawmill. In 1905 it is reported that "9500 people visited the Springs November last to April, 8,000 availed themselves of vehicles to reach the Springs, [and] 7,000 went to the Pinnacle along the new track. From 1899 there were even public stables to accommodate the horse drawn vehicles and cabbies.

Over this period of high use and interest, the HCC maintained a caretaker for the Springs. In late 1890 the HCC "erected at the Springs Mt Wellington a new and substantial cottage, together with a commodious shed for the accommodation of visitors to the Mount". The following year Charles Gadd is appointed caretaker at the Springs with his duty to oversee the public works in the area. Being a caretaker also appears to have entailed carrying out rescues of lost walkers, and in 1903
Charles Gadd played a major role in attempting to rescue the hypothermic Mark Richards in the ill-fated Go-As-You-Please Race to the Summit via the Springs which claimed 2 lives. Charles Gadd also appear to have undertaken additional jobs in the area to supplement his income, such as clearing the land for the Springs Hotel and garden and grazing area and, until c.1907 when Gadd was replaced as caretaker, the Gadd family provided hospitality to visitors. They possibly buried a daughter in the area as a child’s grave is known to occur just above the Gadd’s house site. Gadd and a daughter, Edith, also staffed the Springs weather observatory, which appears to have been at least initially located in their house (and possibly later housed in a separate hut).

The Springs Observatory was set up in 1895 by Clement Wragge with the assistance of H.C. Kingsmill of the State Meteorological Department and later Government Meteorologist. It was one of a pair of stations established to make more accurate weather forecasts. The other weather station was at the Pinnacle. This bi-level observatory allowed for conditions at the different levels to be compared which greatly improved weather forecasting. The Mount Wellington weather forecasting facility was the first such weather observatory in the southern hemisphere and the second in the world, the other being on Ben Nevis in Scotland. Wragge was one of the foremost meteorologists of his time, and is also known for issuing the first weather charts and forecasts in Australasia (in 1887) and beginning the tradition of naming cyclones.

In 1906 the Mountain Park Act 1906 was passed. This Act, which included the Springs area, created a reserve vested in the HCC on the eastern (Hobart) face of the Mountain. Although not a National Park and with only limited powers in relation to conservation, the push for this status was reflected in the reserve name ‘Mountain Park’. The push for public reservation of Mt Wellington had started in 1876, in part due to widespread concern about the extent of logging (and later tree fern removal) in the area, in part to preserve water quality, and in part to retain public access and enjoyment and the scenic qualities of the Mountain. For many the value of the Mountain, so close to Hobart and with such natural beauty, was seen as a ‘grand recreation-ground’ and ‘pleasure grounds for the citizen’. With the continuation of logging, arson, and increasing removal of the tree ferns from the mountain’s ‘many glens and other localities’, George Perrin, the Conservator of Forests, in 1886 made a report to Parliament in which he advocated greater control over activities on the Mountain and made specific recommendations for the Springs. In his report he also recommended the improvement of visitor facilities and removal of ‘unsightly buildings’ – presumably the by now old buildings constructed by Woods and the earlier shelter shed.

The Mountain Park Act 1906 set out in some detail what were allowable activities in the new Mountain Park, and realised many of the conservation measures strongly argued for by proponents of the Park. In addition the Act specified that the Council, who were given responsibility for managing and administering the Park, must expend at least £100 (and up to £200) upon the management of the Park. This forced expenditure may have been a spur to new activities and infrastructure development, and maintenance of existing activities such as the employment of the Springs based ranger (since at least 1891). The Act also provided for the erection of private dwellings and accommodation facilities but restricted the lease area for any one to 2 acres.

The Mountain Park Act 1906, also specified that it did not override the 1905 Mount Wellington Aerial Railway Act that provided for the development of an ‘aerial railway’ (cable car) from the Springs to the Pinnacle. The 1905 Act was however amended to allow the aerial tramway to start at the Cascades near the tram terminus, but appears to still have included a stopping point at the Springs. The aerial tramway was never built due to financial issues. A number of proposals have been made in the mid-late 1900s for a cable car to the Pinnacle, but none of these have included the Springs area and none have come to fruition. These proposals have been generally met by considerable public opposition on grounds of visual impact, dubious financial projections and concern with overdevelopment in the Park.
A hotel at the Springs however was established in 1907 following some years of lobbying by prominent Tasmanians, in particular Henry Dobson. This was a private concern and Dobson had a major interest. There was considerable resistance to the proposal, including by the HCC, largely because of the potential for contamination in drinking water catchments, which had been an ongoing concern with occupation of the Springs. It appears that this concern was resolved by the proposal to link all waste liquid to a septic tank on the north east side of the lower Springs which would avoid contamination of the Browns River upper catchment, the Hobart Rivulet no longer being used for water supply. Contamination of the water supply appears to have been an ongoing issue at the Springs from at least the 1890s with the Ranger's Cottage a source of concern in the late 1890s and Charles Gadd being reprimanded for keeping animals and poultry on the water reserve in 1904.

The hotel was a rustic two storey chalet style building designed by prominent Hobart architect Alan Cameron Walker and its grounds soon contained a croquet lawn and tennis court. The hotel was located on the flattest part of the upper bench, but there was an associated vegetable and fruit garden and grazing paddock with cow shed and stables which took up a large part of the lower Springs bench from at least 1909. The hotel which burnt down in the 1967 bushfires, was a popular focus for walkers and other day visitors to the Springs throughout its history, but it was less favoured by overnight guests and had a chequered history. This included the forced closure of the hotel in 1919 due to lack of funds to continue operating, and its subsequent purchase by the HCC which then leased out the facility.

While the Springs was providing catered accommodation, a tradition of building small rustic timber huts on the Hobart face of Mt Wellington had also emerged from the 1880s, with huts of this type continuing to be built into the 1920s. These huts were built by small groups of individuals for private day use or weekend stays, and were often hidden away from the main tracks in ferny gullies. Although these huts were scattered over the Hobart face of the Mountain, none are known to have been built at the Springs. The permanent residence and presence of so many day visitors is likely to have been a significant disincentive.

The extensive use of the Hobart face of the Mountain from a number of entry points led, by around 1900, to this part of the Mountain having a complex network of tracks. These early tracks primarily started at road heads and tram termini and followed ridges and gullies up to the Pinnacle. Few tracks were constructed across the slopes. The majority of tracks appear to have coalesced part way up into a small number of Pinnacle Tracks. There were two main points where the numerous lower tracks coalesced – Junction Cabin and the Springs. At Junction Cabin several tracks coalesced into the Newtown Red Paint Track to the summit while at the Springs tracks from Fingerpost and various points along the Huon Road to Fern Tree met and connected with the more remote Wellington Falls Track, the Ice House Track (original Pinnacle Track) and the relatively new Panorama Track. It wasn't until the late 1920s and early 1930s that the Springs and the Junction Cabin area were connected by the Lenah Valley Track.

**Depression Period Use (late 1920s & 1930s)**

From the late 1920s to the late 1930s a number Depression employment projects were undertaken in the Mountain Park, with a number of tracks being built and upgraded and a number of shelters for day users constructed. The Springs was the focus of a number of these projects including the Springs Timber Tramway, new and upgraded tracks, the Exhibition Gardens and Alan Walker Chalet, and the Pinnacle Road.

In c.1925 the first known government employment work on the Mountain started with a firewood cutting program on the Hobart face of the Mountain. This appears to have been very short lived, having ceased by early 1927, although the work resulted in the formation of c.44 chains of tramway from the Springs towards Sphinx Rock (now the southern end of the Lenah Valley
Between c.1928 to 1933 the Lenah Valley Track, an extension of the Springs Timber Tramway was one of the tracks upgraded and extended, providing a lower level link with tracks and locations at the Lenah Valley end. Log Cabin (White Rock Cabin) on the Lenah Valley Track near Sphinx Rock (White Rock) was also built at about this time.

In 1931, the Exhibition Garden, was also established at the Springs on the southern part of the Lower Springs, utilising part of the hotel grazing lease area. Although also a Depression employment project, the Exhibition Gardens were unusual in that instead of using government funds, the money to establish the gardens was raised by holding a highly successful Arts and Crafts Exhibition. The Exhibition raised not only enough money for the gardens, but also enough to build a new visitor shelter shed, understood to be at the site of the present visitors shelter on the Lower Springs. At the time the Reserves Committee was very angry that 'a further area of valuable and picturesque bush and undergrowth had been ruthlessly chopped down and burnt out from the site of the new shelter. This shed, termed the Alan Walker Chalet, was built in 1932, following the death of Alan Walker.

Alan Cameron Walker had designed and started laying out the Gardens and after his death Louis Shoobridge took over the development of the Gardens. Both Walker and Shoobridge were major proponents of the Arts & Crafts Tradition in Tasmania and well known Tasmanians and appear to have had a strong design concept for the Gardens. As well as native plants, the Gardens included stone bordered paths, water features and at least one lookout. The Exhibition Garden when established was a rare and early example of a native public garden, not only in Tasmania, but in Australia more generally, where until the influence of the Arts & Crafts Movement native plants in gardens and in craft design were generally passed over for the familiar and nostalgic European plants or exotic Asian and African species.

Although primarily a native garden, the Exhibition Gardens also appears to have featured rhododendrons, at least on the western side or adjacent. The rhododendrons were a gift from Mr Frank Walker, a well known Launceston nursery man who provided 100 rhododendron plants which by 1932 had been 'planted in the same locality and are firmly established'. The Walker Nursery appears to have been a benefactor of urban parks with the nursery also having provided a generous gift of rhododendron plants for the Cataract Gorge Reserve when it was being established in the early 1900s (McConnell & Servant 1999).

In 1934, with the introduction of the Work for the Dole Scheme ('susso') and strongly backed by Ogilvie, the Premier of the time, work started on the construction of the extension of Pillinger Drive from the Springs to the Pinnacle. The road was known formally as the Pinnacle Road or, less formally by those who opposed the road, as Ogilvie's Scar. Thousands of men, mostly locals, worked on the road over the period of its construction, often working in extremely harsh conditions. The main works depot, with storage sheds, crib sheds, accommodation huts and a blacksmiths, was at the Springs. Initially all the workmen lived at the Springs Depot, but by 1936 married men were allowed to live in Hobart and travel to the Springs each day for work. In 1936 up to 69 men were accommodated in some 25 corrugated iron huts at the Springs. The intent was to move the huts up the road to new site as the road progressed. The road was eventually completed in 1937 with a well attended opening ceremony being held at the Pinnacle.

The Pinnacle Road had a major impact on the use of Mountain Park and in particular the use of the Springs. Once completed the road provided the first vehicle access to the summit, and so the Springs once the focus and end of the road was now very much ignored by the many motorists on a quick trip to take in the views from the Pinnacle and then to head back into the city. The Springs was relegated to a position of optional halfway point for the trip to the Pinnacle, a place to stretch ones legs if one had the time. It did however remain an important location for walkers as a halfway resting place and as an important track junction.
The 1930s Depression, which resulted in extensive unemployment and significant food shortages for poorer families, also lead to an increase in resource exploitation in Wellington Park, primarily possum hunting and the use of native animals for food. Given the degree of development at the Springs and a permanent human presence by this time it is unlikely that this ‘informal’ resource utilisation occurred at the Springs.

The Springs Hotel continued but was not the success hoped for. In 1919 it closed down for financial reasons. After considerable urging over a number of years by Dobson, the hotel was purchased by the HCC in 1921 and reopened, and in 1923 major additions were made to the hotel to attract more custom. The Depression appears to have resulted in lower visitor numbers, but the Hotel appears to have survived under the management of Lucy Pitman & her brother between 1927 and 1939, possibly the most stable period of management experienced by the Springs Hotel. The loop road was constructed in 1939.

The Pinnacle Road to the 1967 Bushfire (late 1930s – 1967)

The Springs appears to have continued on in a similar pattern through the mid 1900s, with an even greater downturn in visitors, including at the Springs Hotel, during World War II. The Springs Hotel appears have to survived largely on its day trading, provided refreshments to walkers and other local visitors to Mountain Park and Mt Wellington. At the end of the 1951/52 summer season the hotel closed down as an overnight accommodation venue altogether. Prior to this for some time the hotel had only operated as an accommodation place in the summer season and only the kiosk remained open in the winter. Both the low visitation and the need to upgrade the hotel which had become run down by this time appear to have contributed to its closure for overnight accommodation.

The Lower Springs also appears to have become less maintained by this time with the Exhibition Gardens having been closed for some years. By 1952 the hotel farm area on the lower Springs was no longer in use. This may have been in part due to a number of bushfires in the 1930s and 1940s which burnt out the Springs area, including in 1934 and 1945. From about this time the gardens are remembered as primarily rhododendron beds (alongside Radfords Track). The rhododendron plantings were still visited in the 1950s through to 1967 and had plants that were tree sized, but by at least 1964 the gardens were referred to as the ‘former Exhibition Gardens’.

After the 1967 Bushfire (1967 – present)

The bushfires of February 1967 burnt out most of the Springs area as well as much of the flanks of Mt Wellington and a significant proportion of southern Tasmania. It was a devastating event that saw much loss of native bushland and human property. It dramatically changed the environment of much of southern Tasmania and changed many people's lives. For many Tasmanians it is one of the more significant events of their lives and is key historical marker.

The effect of the 1967 bushfires at the Springs was equally dramatic with the bushland being burnt and with most of the built structures being destroyed or severely damaged. As a result of the fires the Springs Hotel was destroyed, the cosmic ray observatory set up by the Physics Department of the University of Tasmania in c.1956 was destroyed, and the Alan Walker Chalet was largely destroyed.

The hotel was not rebuilt, but the Alan Walker Chalet was rebuilt and the cosmic ray observatory, which was a critical element in a world wide research programme into cosmic ray intensity variations and their connection with sun spot activity, was also rebuilt.

While many local residents could not bear to visit the burnt out remains of Mt Wellington, others still continued to visit, and some were moved to attempt to ameliorate the damage. One such scheme at the Springs was the plan by the Tasmanian Conservation Trust to replant the Upper
Springs with native plants and to create anew at the Springs a native plant garden with local and exotic native species. With the help of other groups, the Tasmanian Conservation Trust planted out the southern half of the area between the Pinnacle Road and the hotel loop road in c.1969. The rest of the planting appear not to have occurred. Today little remains of these plantings which have been shaded out by the regrowth of local species.

Additional works appear to have been carried out in the Springs area by the HCC in the 1970s to improve public access and to re-establish the area as a base for HCC work crews. The 1970s works appear to have been focussed on the Lower Springs area, and included formalising the picnic areas and car parking area, upgrading the existing stone shelter, building a new shelter and toilet block, constructing a snow plough shed in the former hotel paddock along with an overflow car park, also in the paddock, and a new access road which looped through the western half of the former Exhibition Gardens, and possibly formalising the roadside lookout.

In 1993 Mountain Park was incorporated into the newly created Wellington Park through the Wellington Park Act 1993. Management of the Park was further formalised in 1997 by the development of a statutory management plan for the Park, the Wellington Park Management Plan 1997. This did not appear to have a significant effect on the Springs, although the Wellington Park Management Plan 1997 recognised the Springs as a special use zone.

The Springs has continued to be a popular day use area for a range of visitors, and over the last 2-3 decades is still the main focus of day use visitors, with the range of activities including sight seeing, picnicking, family parties, performances, bushwalking, snow play, and weddings and memorial services. It is also used occasionally for major community events such as the Mountain Festival, that seek a more natural, mountain setting than available in urban Hobart. Although the main use is by Hobart residents, the Springs is also used by other visitors to Wellington Park, in particular to Mt Wellington which is the most visited tourist locality after Salamanca Place, the Hobart Waterfront and Port Arthur and the most highly visited conservation area in the State.16

There are no figures available for how many of these visitors stop at the Springs, but it is likely that a significant proportion stop briefly and that substantially more local residents visit the Springs annually than out of state tourists. The Springs also continues to be a base for road works with the snow plough based on the lower Springs Plateau.

4.3 Springs Landscape & Setting

Landscape General

As noted in Section 4.1, the landscape of the Springs is essentially a large rectangular lower sandstone bench with a relatively steep rise then a small sandstone bench above and relatively steep dolerite colluvium slopes above. The lower bench is known as the 'lower Springs' and the area above is known as the 'upper Springs'.

The other key landscape element of the Springs from an historical perspective is the springs themselves, from which the Springs area takes its name, and which is an early historical (European) name (being used at least by the 1830s). From historical references and present day evidence, the springs within the Springs Zone are mainly seepages of water where groundwater in the dolerite colluvium flows out to the surface. They are concentrated in a band along the top side

---

16 This is based on the visitor statistics collected as part of the Tasmanian Visitor Survey by Tourism Tasmania. For example in 2003-40 some 27.5% (203,700) of visitors to Tasmania visited Mt Wellington, and the pattern and numbers are similar from year to year around this time (Tourism Tasmania 2004).
and above the Springs Zone, but there are scattered springs or seepages throughout the Springs area. A number of springs in the Springs area appear to have been modified historically for human use (refer Section 4.4).

This landscape has strongly influenced the historic use of and interest in the Springs area. Springs have been captured for clean water for Hobart, and the benches with steep slopes adjacent have provided convenient stopping, camping and dwelling sites with excellent views down to the Derwent Estuary and up to the Mt Wellington summit ridge. The landscape has also to some extent constrained and focussed the historic and present day use and appreciation to the area between the cliffs of the lower Springs bench and the main area of springs at the top of the Springs area.

The native bush has also been particularly valued by visitors to the area over its history of European visitation, with artists painting scenes at the Springs, the picking of wildflowers, and a general appreciation of the native vegetation. The general appreciation of the native vegetation was highlighted in 1831 when the Reserves Committee expressed anger when 'a further area of valuable and picturesque bush and undergrowth' was removed for a shelter shed. The native vegetation of the Springs has also been celebrated through the establishment of native plant gardens, and is the only area of Wellington Park known to have had native plant gardens. The first was the Exhibition Gardens, one of the earliest native plant public gardens in Australia, which celebrated the local vegetation, in particular the heathland vegetation. The other garden was the post-1967 bushfire planting of a native species garden at the upper Springs.

**Specific Natural Features**

In the 1800s, visitors commented frequently on the clear flowing creek at the Springs. From the context of the references this appears to be the 1831 Diversion water race which is being described and not a natural creek. Earlier

Known natural features of more recent interest include the unusual sandstone formation (feature x) at the north end of the road lookout. Although essentially natural (it appears to be a collapse or humanly moved cliff edge feature), it appears to be of some local and visitor interest hence of social significance.

The sandstone cliff on the south edge of the lower Springs appears to have been a focus for rock climbing since at least the 1970s. There is some climbing activity at the southeast corner, and the cliff below the former Exhibition Gardens lookout (feature x) was a popular rock climbing location, termed Gorbys Corner, in the 1970s. The cliffs appear to be essentially unmodified by the climbing, although there are access pads to the climbing locations.

**Setting**

The Springs is located on the southeastern flank of Mt Wellington and approximately half way up the mountain. The lower bench is a prominent landscape feature that is therefore visible from the Derwent from its mouth to Bridgewater.

As a consequence of its location the Springs is not only highly visible from outside, but has a magnificent outlook in a number of directions. From most locations in the Springs area there are clear views of the upper slopes and full summit ridge from the Pinnacle to South Wellington. The Springs appears to nestle in a hollow at the base of this ridge, made more imposing by the extensive band of exposed dolerite columns and dolerite scree along the ridge. The Springs area also provides good views of the Organ Pipes. An important element of the Springs setting in relation to the views of Mt Wellington is the closeness of the view, with the dolerite columns and scree boulders being clearly visible from this vantage point. Although views down and out are not possible from all parts of the Springs, there area a number of locations in the Springs area,
primarily the upper Springs, the lower bench cliffs and the road lookout, where there are extensive views of southeastern Tasmania, including of Hobart and the Derwent estuary.

The setting of the Springs directly behind Hobart, roughly half way up the mountain, at the headwaters of the Hobart Rivulet and Browns River, and with its freshwater springs and sheltered location, appears to have been a key factor in its early visitation and use, in having been the mountain road end for almost 50 years, in having remained on the only public road to the pinnacle, and in having continued to the present day as a key day use area in Wellington Park.

4.4 Historic Heritage of the Springs

Sites and features relating to most known activities at the Springs survive today and comprise the historic heritage of the Springs. The historic heritage of the Springs area is today largely archaeological.

Most sites and features can be related to known historical features or activities, but there are a small number of features that could not be confidently interpreted and a small number of known or expected features that have not been located (or re-located) on the ground. The latter include the child's grave and evidence relating to the Springs Depot.

The following outlines the known historic heritage of the Springs based on previous historic heritage work and a detailed survey of the core area of known historic activity by the present study. The discussion is thematically based. Identified heritage sites and features are listed in a tabulated summary of heritage features (refer Endnotes) and the location of these sites and features is presented in Figure 3.

Water Supply & Springs

The oldest known historic heritage at the Springs is the 1831 Diversion (Springs Water Race). This is the oldest known, preserved historic heritage feature in Wellington Park with the possible exception of the Kings Sawpits in the Junction Cabin area. The channel is well preserved along Milles Track and the re-diversion under the track and into the headwaters of Browns River is also preserved and evident below the track as a deep vertical walled gully, possibly partly excavated immediately below the track. Until the re-diversion in the 1860s the channel is understood to have been an earthen channel\(^\text{17}\), and the sandstone collector pits and sandstone lining relate to the later Browns River augmentation period of use.

No maps or other documentary evidence have been identified which clearly describe the location and nature of the northern end of the race and the existing documentation indicates that the race emptied onto the slopes in the upper Hobart Rivulet catchment rather than being channelled or piped into the Rivulet bed. There is no evidence of the continuation of the race from the point of the re-diversion, although there is a level benched alignment on the same level which continues across the current track and curves back to the northwest which is a probable former continuation of the water race. There is no evidence of this beyond the track up from the Springs Hotel car park to the Milles Track/Pinnacle Track intersection, but there is a possible spring or collection point (feature 55) with a gully below and on the inside the corner of Grays Fire Trail below Gadds House which may mark the original north end of the race. It is probable that the original northern section of channel has been largely destroyed by post-1860s activity, including by Woods, Gadd, later rangers and most recently by the construction of Grays Fire Trail.

\(^{17}\) There was a proposal to line the channel with timber troughing in the 1840s to reduce leakage, but it is unclear if this work was carried out.
It is also unclear just where the various springs were in the area, what they were like and how they were used. There are clearly a number of small springs along the upper boundary of the Springs Zone, which manifest as damp areas with abundant cutting grass below which the water has created shallow to deeply entrenched gullies, while to the north, there appears to be a zone of surface water flow over shallow sandstone bedrock with associated tea tree and mossy ground cover. A small number of features were however identified in the present study survey that suggests there has been some modification of the springs in the Springs Zone to collect or drain water away. Modifications include excavation of the spring area to create a vertical head wall that is circular or irregular in plan (features 34, 55, 64, 65 and possibly 72), the excavation of a rectangular pit which is partially stone lined (feature 13) and possible underground piping of water from uphill in the area of Woods House.18

**General Visitation & Recreation**

There is little evidence of the very early visitation to the Springs area. This early visitation however is unlikely to have left any physical evidence. The first known recreational structure to be built at the Springs was a hut, erected some time between 1839 and 1843 and understood to have been recommended by Lady Jane Franklin. It is not known where this hut was erected, but the known history of Springs, the limited number of tracks (only the access track to the water race) and repeated descriptions of a clear creek (also the way in which the water race was described) suggest this early hut was probably built near the water race. It is probable that the hut site was the site later occupied by Henry Woods.

All later shelter sheds known to have been built still have extant evidence. These include two shelter sheds above the water race and a series of shelters on the site of the present stone shelter on the lower Springs. The initial shelter shed above the water race and immediately south of Gadds House was built in 1890 by the Council, and a second shelter built adjacent later. The present day remains (feature 61) include a wide levelled platform with two substantial brick and stone chimney bases, some stone foundations, and a section of drystone walling. There is what appears to be a small spring on the south side and also a foot track which heads off above the spring and rises gently around the slope in a southwesterly direction. These shelters (or one) are understood to have survived until the 1967 bushfires.

The stone shelter shed in the lower Springs picnic area (feature 27) is understood to have been rebuilt, at least partially a number of times, but is believed to be the site of the 1931/-32 Alan Walker Memorial shed, also a stone shed. This is supported by the concrete foundations and apron beside the present shed that indicate that the present shed has a different configuration, and by the 1932 commemorative stone tablet that is today fixed to the back of the BBQ beside the stone shelter. It is difficult to understand precisely what the sequence of construction has been here as a c.1939 plan has a T-shaped building shown in this location marked 'garage' and a similar T-shaped building arrangement is shown in a 1944 air photograph, although the garage may be an elongate building fronting onto the road with a circular driveway behind it to the front of the smaller shed (the chalet?).

Based on the available maps and photographs, although there has been a shed here since the early 1930s, the current grassed picnic area on the east side of the road is thought not to have been created until after the mid-1940s. The western picnic area also appears to be later (mid 1940s or later) as an open public area. Although the historic maps suggest Pillinger Drive originally ran through (curved into) this area, there is no obvious on-ground evidence of the original formation.

18 Water was observed running just under the surface in this area with some pooling on the formed surface in the present study survey, but it is possible that the underground flow is natural.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ftr No.</th>
<th>Place Name</th>
<th>Period of Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F 1</td>
<td>Gorbys Corner</td>
<td>c.1970s-?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 2</td>
<td>Road Lookout</td>
<td>c.1967+ present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 3</td>
<td>Sandstone Feature 1</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 4</td>
<td>Gardens Lookout</td>
<td>c.1931-present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 5</td>
<td>Loop Track</td>
<td>mid 1900s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 6</td>
<td>Former Exhibition Gardens</td>
<td>1933-?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 7</td>
<td>stone feature 1</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 8</td>
<td>cleared area 1</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 9</td>
<td>lookout rocks 1</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 10</td>
<td>rock climbing site 1</td>
<td>modern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 11</td>
<td>Springs Hotel Garden</td>
<td>c.1909 – c.early 1950s?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 12</td>
<td>drystone wall</td>
<td>c.1909 - c.early 1950s?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 13</td>
<td>water tank?</td>
<td>? (20C?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 14</td>
<td>spruce tree</td>
<td>? (20C?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 15</td>
<td>snowplough shed</td>
<td>modern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 16</td>
<td>hotel garden artefact scatter 1</td>
<td>c.1909 - c.early 1950s?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 17</td>
<td>hotel garden artefact scatter 1</td>
<td>c.1909 - c.early 1950s?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 18</td>
<td>lookout rocks 2</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 19</td>
<td>drain 1</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 20</td>
<td>walking track 1</td>
<td>modern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 21</td>
<td>mound 1</td>
<td>? (late 19C/early 20C?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 22</td>
<td>foundations 1</td>
<td>? (late 19C/early 20C?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 23</td>
<td>foundations 2</td>
<td>? (late 19C/Early 20C?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 24</td>
<td>Lower Springs artefact scatter 1</td>
<td>? (late 19C/early 20C?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 25</td>
<td>L Springs Work Shed</td>
<td>modern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 26</td>
<td>L Springs Picnic Area (eastern)</td>
<td>mid 1900s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 27</td>
<td>L Springs Stone Shelter</td>
<td>mid 1900s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 28</td>
<td>L Springs Toilets</td>
<td>c.1907s?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 29</td>
<td>L Springs Picnic Area (western)</td>
<td>mid 1900s?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 30</td>
<td>L Springs Open Shelter</td>
<td>c.1980s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 31</td>
<td>Fingerpost Track</td>
<td>c.1831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 32</td>
<td>Lenah Valley Connector Track</td>
<td>modern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 33</td>
<td>concrete platform 1</td>
<td>c.1934?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 34</td>
<td>excavated spring? 1</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 35</td>
<td>Grays Fire Trail</td>
<td>modern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 36</td>
<td>Springs Hotel Loop Track</td>
<td>c.1936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 37</td>
<td>landslip</td>
<td>c.1929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 38</td>
<td>Fingerpost Track (upper central)</td>
<td>c.1831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 39</td>
<td>quarry 1</td>
<td>c.1880s?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 40</td>
<td>L Springs building foundation 1</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 41</td>
<td>Radfords Track</td>
<td>mid-late 19C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 42</td>
<td>Springs Hotel Lower Road Edge Garden</td>
<td>c.1907 +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 43</td>
<td>Springs Timber Tramway Formation</td>
<td>c.1925-c.1927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 44</td>
<td>Springs Hotel &amp; Grounds Site</td>
<td>1907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 45</td>
<td>Cosmic Ray Observatory</td>
<td>1936 (1970s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 46</td>
<td>Springs Hotel Zigzag Track</td>
<td>c.1907+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 47</td>
<td>U Springs building platform 1</td>
<td>19C?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 48</td>
<td>U Spring track 1</td>
<td>19C?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 49</td>
<td>U Springs track 2</td>
<td>19C? (or 1970s?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 50</td>
<td>Woods Cottage Site</td>
<td>c.1859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 51</td>
<td>Milles Track (Wellington Falls track)</td>
<td>1845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 52</td>
<td>1831 Diversion</td>
<td>1831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 53</td>
<td>U Springs track 3</td>
<td>c.late 19C?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 54</td>
<td>U Springs building platform 2</td>
<td>c.late 19C?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 55</td>
<td>excavated spring 2</td>
<td>c.late 19C?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 56</td>
<td>U. Springs track 4</td>
<td>c.late 19C?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Only one other site has been located (features 21-24) that may have been an early shelter. This set of features comprises of a low partial foundation of stone and bricks, a mound which may have been a chimney base, and a scatter of handmade bricks. It is not possible at present from the historical information or surface evidence to determine the nature and origin of this set of features on the lower Springs, but they could be a late 1800s shelter or possibly the public stables, also known to be in this general area.

The known walking tracks that end and start at the Springs are all still extant (features 31, 41, 51, 85 & 86). These include the Fingerpost Track and Radfords Track (initially named the New Fingerpost Track) from below the Springs and the Wellington Falls Track (now Milles Track) and the Ice House Track (former Pinnacle Track) and present Pinnacle Track. The route of the track cut for access to construct the 1831 Diversion is unknown, but given the early mapped routes is essentially the Fingerpost Track, originally from the Hobart Rivulet near Degraves Sawmill, it is likely that the minor 1831 track evolved into the more substantial Fingerpost Track.

Comparing the present mapped routes with historically mapped routes demonstrates that the routes have changed little. What appears most likely to have changed are the track terminations in the Springs area, with newer developments such as the Springs Hotel and post-1967 connector tracks resulting in some modification or minor re-routing of the earlier tracks. Overall however the pattern of the tracks linking up and dispersing from the upper Springs in the vicinity of the 1831 Diversion has been maintained, particularly in relation to Radfords Track, the Fingerpost Track, Milles Track and the Pinnacle Track.

The tracks in the vicinity of the Springs are also mostly in good condition, having been used and maintained since their establishment. There has been some damage however. For example Grays Fire Trail and the excavation for the cosmic ray observatory appear to have partly destroyed and truncated two tracks from the hotel (features 43 & 67), while more recent work on the Lenah Valley Track has largely obscured the sleepers that were visible on the 1920s timber tramway (now part of the Lenah Valley Track). There is also a section of relatively gentle grade track (feature 46) with a hairpin bend and drystone walling to the north of the hotel which appears from analysis of the historical maps and photographs to be a graded hairpin walking track from the hotels to the start of Milles Track and the Pinnacle/Panorama Track. The section is extremely well preserved.

Other more recent features on the lower Springs such as the toilet block (feature 28), the shelter in the western picnic area on the lower Springs (feature 308) and the BBQs and picnic tables are relatively recent and, although they do contribute to the social and amenity value of the area, they are not considered historic heritage.

There are other recreational and visitor heritage features which are dealt with below (eg, Springs Hotel, Exhibition Gardens and Lookout, Pillinger Drive and the Pinnacle Road).

A Permanent Presence

Based on correlation with historical plans, descriptions and photographs, the remains of Gadd's house and Woods establishment have been identified on the terraced benches between Grays Fires Trail and the Pinnacle Track.

The remains of Gadd's house (feature 60) are extensive and correlate well with the historical evidence. They include chimney bases, and remnant flooring, wall bases and foundations set on a large flat terrace immediately north of the walking tracks junction. There is a set of drystone terraces in front of the house remains, and below Grays Fire Trail is a wide dry stone fence base.

---

10 The map location of the stables however suggests the stables may have been slightly further west and probably demolished when the Pinnacle Road was re-aligned, presumably in the 1930s).
which is the remains of the front garden boundary fence of Gadds House. Inside the boundary fence are daffodils and traces of path.

Woods cottage also appears to have been on the terraces that Gadd's house is located on, but there are no remains that can be confidently related to Woods occupation. Wood's cottage is considered most likely to have been in approximately the same location as Gadds house, above the north termination of the 1831 Diversion and at the track junction and could well have been removed prior to the construction of Gadd's house in 1890. The terraces however extend north beyond Gadd's house to the edge of a boulder scree, and Woods cottage could alternatively have been in the centre or at the north end of this set of terraces. The historical information indicates that there were at least 2 cottages built along this terrace in Wood's time, one of which was used for guest accommodation. Physical remains that may be related other than the terraces is a mound of large stone blocks with at least 1 laid edge (feature 60A) and some pathways between the central and northern terrace. There is also a scatter of domestic fragmented artefacts on the north edge of the northern terrace, but the material suggests this is more likely to date to Gadd's period of occupation than Woods. Given that the Woods lived at the Springs for over 20 years, a quite substantial rubbish dump(s) could be expected.

There were also outbuildings associated with Wood's and Gadd's occupation and there are a small number of approximately rectangular flat (terraced) areas and benched tracks sections below the main house terrace that are considered likely to be the archaeological remains of these outbuildings and access paths. The historical documentation indicates that during Wood's occupation there was a small barn or stable and a second small shed below the barn, downslope and slightly south of Wood's cottage. Just below the front yard of Gadds house are two small level areas (features 76 & 77). These are in the approximate correct relative position to the house terraces and are considered highly likely to be the barn and shed site. There is also a possible cross-slope track above and another (feature 67), now truncated by the terracing for the cosmic ray observatory, below. The historical information also indicates that there was a stables associated with Gadd's occupation in the late 1890s, presumably at the upper Springs as the lower Springs does not appear to be developed at this time. Wood's barn and shed may have been used by Gadd, or a feature (47) at about the same level may be the site of Gadd's stable or other outbuilding, or may be the site of an earlier structure.

There is also understood to be grave (feature 89, unlocated), described as a low mound of stones which originally had a cross and which is known as the 'child's grave', upslope and south of Gadd's house. Given that the only permanent occupation prior to good transport to and from the site was by the Wood's family and the Gadd family, then this grave has been considered to have been related to one of these families. This grave has not been relocated by the present study, but there is a small benched cross-slope path (feature 62) above the Pinnacle Track that leads south from the rear of the house terraces and which may lead to the grave and or a spring, and/or be the back path to the shelter sheds to the south of Gadds house.

The Springs Hotel

The archaeological remains of the Springs Hotel are substantial and diverse and, while the function of some features is clearly identifiable from their location and form, a number are difficult to interpret.

The main hotel area is a large L-shaped terrace immediately above the Spring Hotel loop road. The north end of the 'L' is the hotel building site and there are remains of concrete and brick rear walls, concrete stairs and concrete flooring in the vertical bank at the back of this area. In front of this is a grassed area that includes a terraced bank (with dry stone walls) and flight of concrete steps each side down to the road. Slightly to the south a vehicle track is cut up onto the terrace in the area where the croquet lawn was and a slightly raised formation continues west to a slightly raised
terrace area with remnant area of bitumen surfacing that is the remains of the hotel tennis court. At present there is a fenced off area with weather station instruments and a HEC power pole on the former tennis court. A drain (which appears to take water from the slopes above and behind the hotel) flows between the tennis court and croquet lawn to what appears to be a small dam across a gully. The dam is a brick and stone wall (remains only) across the enlarged drain and there is a north-south wall on the east side. The only introduced vegetation noted are daffodils which are scattered in the grassed area of the croquet lawn and in front of the hotel building.

Above the main terrace behind the hotel is a series of small terraces with earth banks, a small number of connecting dirt paths and at least 3 small building platforms and foundations, mostly of concrete. One platform is immediately above the terrace and southwest of the building and is interpreted as the foundation for the single storey extension to the rear (south end of the main building), and one of the platforms in the northwest corner is interpreted as the water tank stand. The function of the other small building is unknown, but it one has steel beams uprights within the footprint and appears to be fetors in a c.1907-10 postcard. It is difficult to determine how far uphill the hotel related features extended, particularly on the southern uphill side, but plans and photographs suggest it extended up to approximately the location of the cosmic ray observatory in the northwest corner. The extent on the south side appears to be marked by the ring of domestic rubbish (including china teapots and other domestic crockery, toilet bowl remains and tins) immediately below the terrace on the south side and on the banks above and west of the tennis court, which is assumed to be post-1967 bushfires accumulations. There are however a small number of features slightly further upslope which include track formations (features 67 & 70), 2 stone accumulations (modified by construction of the powerlines easement) (feature 69) and a semi-circular excavation (former spring?) (feature 72) which may be associated with the hotel. They are however close to features considered to relate to 19th century use, including the Woods' and Gadd's family occupation, and may also relate to this period.

A 1937 oblique air photograph suggests that feature 67 may be the remains of a track which looped around from west end of the tennis court (and possibly the bend in the loop road below) uphill then north, becoming the rear access track to the hotel. This track crossed the direct uphill track which is the main foot track today and also crosses a zig zag track which runs uphill from the north side of the hotel to the upper track junction. Today this approximated in part by Grays Fire Trail, but the lower third is intact and is a narrow benched track with a lower drystone walling embankment (feature 46).

The hotel grazing area and garden has been maintained as an open grassy area. Based on a 1909 plan the extant open area is the original hotel garden area, with the grazing area having been taken over for the Exhibition Gardens in the early 1930s. The eastern boundary is marked by the remains of a substantial drystone fence. Breaks in the fence suggest former gateways and tracks beyond but the on-ground evidence is not conclusive. The southern boundary approximates the original boundary with the former Exhibition Gardens in this area and is evident from remnant fencing (post & wire). The exact boundary of the south side and the west side however has been obscured by post-1967 native vegetation regrowth and the 1970s clearing and levelling of the area for car parking areas. The northern boundary appears to have been extended in the late 1930s to include the full cleared area of 1937 (including the present day picnic area on the east side of the road). Today it is unclear how well the northern boundary of the present grassed area correlates with the pre late 1930s boundary, but its irregular nature suggests that there has been some encroachment of native vegetation into the former hotel garden paddock.

There is no evidence for the former fowl house and stables shown on the 1909 plan or for other structures. There is however a pile of stone, broken concrete slab and metal (features 16 & 17) bulldozed onto the edge of the grassed area in the southwest corner. This feature is interpreted as the remains of former hotel garden outbuildings which were bulldozed in the post-1967 re-
landscaping. The only other possibly historical features noted within the paddock are east-west running drains, and a raised formation, presumed to be a former track, running east across the paddock (and possibly bending north near the eastern boundary). Outside, and on the north side, is a drain (feature 19) which may be associated with the gardens, and on the eastern margin there is a pit and associated mound (feature 13) which have been interpreted as a modified spring, but may have been constructed as a water source for the hotel garden and grazing area.

**Gardens & Plantings**

The most significant and extensive garden or area of planting at the Springs is the former Exhibition Gardens. Although these have not been subject to 100% survey (due to poor visibility and access) they have been subject to a detailed archaeological survey (Austral Archaeology 2005). Although nothing survives of the plantings other than some ligno-tubers, much of the layout still survives in the form of the stone edged tracks, stone hedging generally and stone features such as bird baths, and these features are in relatively good condition. A perimeter track appears to survive on the south and east sides, and possibly along part of the north side, and appears to still get occasional use by curious visitors. The former Exhibition Gardens layout and made-features are intact except for the damage sustained by the construction of the loop road to the former hotel grazing area and garden and associated modifications in the c.1970s which have cut across features at the western end of the former gardens and appear to have destroyed in part the south western margin of the former gardens.

The lookout at the southwestern corner of the former Exhibition Gardens and thought to have been constructed as part of the Gardens is also extant and intact. This lookout is a steel fenced area, perched on top of the sandstone cliff and the floor features a natural outcrop with a built up floor on the outer edge. The natural outcrop is c. 0.5-1m high above the lookout floor and forms informal seating. The steel fencing is of a style that suggests it is the original fencing. The rear of the lookout is defined by a screening of native vegetation. The lookout is accessed by gravel paths which date to the 1970s and which cross cut the earlier Exhibition Gardens paths in this area.

No rhododendron plants or other exotic species have been identified in the former Exhibition Gardens area. Two or more large spreading rhododendrons and at least one other exotic tree have however been identified at the north end of the western picnic area (feature 29). This suggests that the 100 rhododendron plants were planted in this general area (which is consistent with accounts of the rhododendrons being on the west side of the gardens), although they could have been transplanted locally after the 1967-bushfires at the time most of the surviving rhododendron plants were removed to the park at the intersection of Pillinger Drive and the Huon Road. These however are considered the only surviving plant evidence at the Springs of the rhododendrons planted in association with the former Exhibition Gardens.

Other than the daffodils in the former Springs Hotel grounds and former front yard of Gadd's house, the only other exotic planting located at the Springs is a small spruce just outside the eastern stone wall of the former hotel grazing area and garden. The origin of the spruce is unknown. Although it appears to be a young plant, it is likely that it dates to the Springs Hotel period of use of the area, but it's growth has been stunted by the surrounding higher native vegetation and shading from this vegetation.

**Roads & Road Construction**

Although a single road today, the road through the Springs is regarded as two roads, the road to the Springs which is termed Pillinger Drive and the road from the Springs (Hobart Rivulet drainage line) to the Pinnacle which is termed the Pinnacle Road. Both roads are extant and appear to follow their original alignment with little modification. It appears however from a comparison of various age maps that Pillinger Drive has been slightly straightened as it crosses the lower
Springs, originally having a curve to the west in the vicinity of the western picnic area. Originally
dirty roads, these roads are now sealed roads and have been widened slightly and concrete gutters
constructed [including in the 1980s]. No obvious evidence of the former alignment in this area was
noted. There is little in the way of roadside features in the Springs area, and little is known
historically.

Pillinger Drive was modified slightly in 1907 to double back and up to the Springs Hotel with a
later (late 1930s) southern extension to create a loop off Pillinger Drive. The loop road is extant
and also appears to be the original alignment, although sections are also likely to have been
widened to improve vehicle access to the Springs Hotel. This is currently a sealed road, but
originally was a dirt road. A section of the drystone wall built to stabilise the upper bank in 1929
after a landslip in the area survives near the north end of the loop road. There is an extant, obvious
landslip (feature 37) along the road just to the south of the walling that may have been the c.1929
landslip.

No definite evidence of the 1930s Springs Depot has been located. This is puzzling considering
the Depot operated for some 3 years and various equipment and up to 69 men were housed there
over this time in around 25 buildings. Although no historical plans or photographs have been
located which show the Depot and its location, a 1937 photograph shows a large cleared area on
the lower Springs which approximates the present main picnic area (which is a large bare levelled
area in the photo and which is known not to have been cleared prior to 1931 when a small area
was cleared for the construction of the Alan Walker Chalet) and extending to the south side of the
former hotel garden paddock. This cleared area is therefore interpreted as the location of the
Springs Depot. Although there are no definitely related features, there are a small number of pre-
1967 features that have no known origin and may be related to the Springs Depot. These include
two raised rectangular concrete slabs (features 26B & 33) that are probable hut or shed
foundations; one, possibly two, flat rectangular areas (hut/shed footprints?) on the west side of
Pillingers Drive (features 40 & 82); and a drain (feature 19) that may relate to the Springs Depot.
Features 26D, 34 and 21-24 may also be related to the Springs Depot, but the nature of the features
suggests they are earlier.

The roadside lookout at the southern end of the lower Springs appears to be a later feature and the
current lookout with low stone wall is understood to be a post-1967 feature built out on debris
from the Springs Hotel after it was destroyed in the fire. The material in the base of the lookout,
which includes fragmented building material and domestic artefacts, supports this.

**HCC Management**

Extant Council management features identified are all post-1967 and appear to be new rather than
post-fire replacement facilities, hence are not considered to be historic heritage. There are only a
small number of these more recent features.

The features include the snowplough shed in the former Springs Hotel garden and grazing area
(feature 15), and the small stone shed in the bushes on the south side of the main lower Springs
picnic area (feature 25). Both sheds are in relatively good condition and are still in use.

The other recent Council made and used features are the Grays Fire Trail and the alternative loop
access track from Pillinger Drive to the former hotel garden and grazing area and associated
lookout and overflow car parks. The loop track is maintained but appears to get little use. The
gravel car parking area adjacent to Pillinger Drive is used as overflow from the picnic area car
park and by people visiting the lookout. The large gravelled car parking area which is edged by
large dolerite stones set in concrete is not used apart for occasional major events. The construction
of the loop road and car parks appears to have substantially impacted on, and to some extent
destroyed historic features.
Grays Fire Trail is a post-1967 zig zag bulldozed track from the Pinnacle Road to Milles Track on the north side of the upper Springs. The zig zag section appears to approximate a zig zag path from the hotel to the upper track junction shown in a 1937 photograph, but given its width, on the ground it appears to have totally overprinted this section of zig zag path and to have damaged some of the other historic heritage features, reducing the integrity of some of the older sites, primarily the 1831 Diversion and Gadds House and Woods House, and obscuring the relationship of some of these earlier sites.

**Other**

There are a small number of additional features that are difficult to relate to the known historical use of the Springs. These include a stone line (feature 7) on the northwest edge of the former Exhibition Garden which has the appearance of remnant building foundations. This may be part of the public stables or may be related to the Exhibition Gardens. There are also some pits excavated into the fill on the east edge of the main picnic area on the lower Springs next to septic tank for the present day toilets. These may be the remains of pit toilets for the 1930s Springs Depot or the remains of septic systems for the Springs Hotel. There is also a small, elongate, and unusual cleared area (feature 8) in the heath near the southeast corner of the lower Springs plateau that is possibly not natural but is an historically cleared area for a hut or campsite.
5 THE CULTURAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE SPRINGS PRECINCT

5.1 Introduction

Context - the Cultural Significance of Wellington Park

The following summary of the statement of cultural significance for Wellington Park as a whole (taken from the Wellington Park Management Plan 2005) is provided as context for the following discussion of the cultural significance of the Springs area and the formulation of a conservation policy –

“The Park is more than a biophysical reserve, and more than the historical parts that make it up. It is in fact part of the community’s “extended sense of self” ... it is inextricably linked into the psyche and perhaps the being of the community of southern Tasmanians who live in its shadow ...

The visual beauty of Wellington Park is one of the most important factors shaping people's perception of it [the Park]. The geology, striking landform, cultural history, running waters, and diverse vegetation all contribute to its aesthetic beauty. Temporal changes of lighting and atmospheric effects further reinforce the visual qualities of the Park ...

Since European settlement, the Park has been a source of clean water, food, timber, recreational pursuits and tourism, amongst other things. Much evidence of these past uses remains. These sites and artefacts, together with memories of their use, provide some understanding of the activities which have shaped the Park”.

“... One of the most distinctive features of the Wellington Range is that, after 200 years of European settlement and 40,000 years of Aboriginal occupation, the area is a cultural landscape as well as a biophysical one” (WPMT 2005, 11-12).

The Wellington Park Management Plan 2005 also notes as part of this discussion that the ‘Springs site’ is one of the significant reminders of the Park’s history.

Defining the Springs Precinct

The history and heritage of the Springs area is such that the Springs warrants being considered as a historic heritage precinct as provided for in the Wellington Park Management Plan 2005 –it is a locality that has been the focus of ongoing historical use which has resulted in a concentration of historic heritage features in the area (many of which are strongly related historically) and the development of community attachment historically and to the present day. As will be shown in Sections 5.2-5.4, the area has cultural significance as a whole and many individual sites and features also have cultural significance in their own right.

Before discussing the cultural significance of the Springs, it is useful to determine the boundary of the area being considered, in this case the Springs Precinct. It is not a simple matter to determine an appropriate boundary for the Springs Precinct given the various values, including the extended heritage site and landscape values. Some of the difficulty also arises from the fact that only the core area of the Springs has been surveyed to date and there may be Springs related heritage features outside the area surveyed.

This Initial Conservation Policy has therefore used the Spring Zone boundary as a starting point, recognising that the same boundary for the precinct would be convenient from a management perspective.
perspective as this encapsulates most of the known and likely heritage values. Adopting a precautionary approach however, the proposed Springs Precinct boundary has been extended to take in that area between Radfords Track and Pillinger Drive which may have contained earlier features (eg, garden plantings and an older road alignment and the full area of the roadside lookout and associated Springs Hotel debris). It has also been extended on the northwestern margin to include the full length of Grays Fire Trail to the Pinnacle Road which is understood to have originally been, at least in part (or to parallel), the rear access to the Springs Hotel and the Springs Timber Tramway. To create a simpler boundary and include the upper part of the Hobart Rivulet which was the part of the early Hobart water supply system into which the 1831 Diversion fed, a straight line boundary has been used from the new northermost point to the existing northeastern boundary on the Pinnacle Road. The boundary is otherwise unmodified.

The proposed Springs Precinct boundary is shown in Figure 4. The following discussion uses this precinct boundary.

5.2 Cultural Significance of the Springs Precinct as Whole

The cultural significance of the Springs Precinct as a whole is discussed below by type of significance. Background data on which the following assessment is based are contained in Section 4 and Appendices 2 – 4.

The cultural significance of sites and features with high level significance as individual sites and features is discussed in Section 5.3, and a statement of significance for the precinct as whole is provided in Section 5.4.

Historical

The historical values are considered the key aspect of the cultural significance of the Springs Precinct. The area is historically significant as the first place on Mt Wellington proper to be significantly developed and for its continued use since that time for a specific range of functions. This historical significance is enhanced by the interconnected evolution of the two key uses - water supply and recreation/tourism, which resulted in the progressive development from the upper end of the Springs area from 1831, downwards to the south end of the lower Springs by the 1930s.

The Springs role in the history of urban water supply to Hobart is highly significant at least at the local level and possibly at the state level given the integral role of the 1831 Diversion (which was fed by the springs which give the area its name) in the first urban water supply system constructed in Tasmania, and its continuing use in the later Mountain Water Supply System from 1866.

The Springs as a whole is considered to have historical significance at the state level as one of Tasmania's 'premier resorts' with accommodation (Springs Hotel) and visitor attractions (native vegetation, natural scenery and outlooks, gardens, refreshments, shelters/picnic areas and paths) from the c.1890s to c.1920s. The Springs typified the key Tasmanian and Australian tourist resorts of the period that provided comfortable facilities in an essentially natural (healthy and attractive) setting which allowed visitors to experience spectacular natural features, generally scenic mountain views.

20 It is however likely that there will be few heritage values in the area north of the Fingerpost Track below the Pinnacle Road, and consideration should be given to removing this area from the Springs Precinct when the full Conservation Management Plan is prepared.
The Springs is also highly historically significant at the local and regional level as the most long
term focus of visitation and recreation on Mt Wellington and in Wellington Park more generally.
Although probably periodically visited or passed through since the European settlement of Hobart
in 1804, from the early 1830s it has been the focus of visitors to Mt Wellington or a significant
stop en route to more remote destinations such as the summit or Wellington Falls. Its significance
in this respect in part lies in it having been (and still being) a very popular visitor location as
demonstrated by the high level of visitation it has experienced historically, in particular until the
late 1930s when the Pinnacle Road was constructed. The Springs possibly has historical
significance at the state level as a very long term and highly visited tourist and recreational
destination in Tasmania, possibly unparalleled in its longevity of use in this respect by any other
site in Tasmania other than the Cataract Gorge and Sarah Island (and possibly Russell Falls).

The Springs also has state level significance as a site of, and base for, Great Depression
employment public works. Some of these works (the Exhibition Gardens and Alan Walker Chalet
on the lower Springs, 1931-32) were unusual depression employment schemes in that the funds
were generated from a public exhibition rather than being government funded. The construction of
the Pinnacle Road (1934-37) was a work for the dole or 'susso' project and more typical of the
government funded public works employment schemes undertaken throughout Australia during
the Depression. The construction of the road employed large numbers of single and married men
from the Hobart area, and was one of the largest Depression employment schemes in Tasmania.
There was also a small scale government sponsored firewood cutting program (c.1925-1927). The
Springs is particularly significant for the number of Depression employment works undertaken at
any one site and as a works and residential base.

The Springs is also considered to have some significance in relation to the history of the HCC and
its management of bushland areas and utilities as it has been managed over its full history of
management (ie, since 1831) by the Council, and is the site at which a number of historical
management initiatives took effect, for example the employment of the first Ranger for the Mt
Wellington area, the first managed bushland recreational area, and the purchase and management
of the Springs Hotel.

Historic Heritage (Physical Fabric)

The historical heritage of the Springs is primarily archaeological, although most of the walking
tracks and roads, and the 1831 Diversion water race, survive relatively intact and are in use. There
is no built historic heritage however. Although there are a small number of buildings in the
Springs area, these all post-date the 1967 bushfires and are not considered to be part of the historic
heritage or to have particular heritage significance.21

These historic sites and features of the Springs are significant as an interrelated complex because
they allow us to interpret and better understand the European history of the Springs as an
historically significant site. As a complex they also demonstrate the evolution of the Springs as a
rustic, relatively undeveloped, tourist location though to an early twentieth century Tasmanian
'resort', through to a modern, car and nature based recreational focus.

The ability to demonstrate this evolution, as well as the specific relationship between tourism and
water supply at the Springs, is enhanced by the relatively high integrity of the historic heritage
sites and features individually and as a complex. This is due in some measure to the progressive
historical development of the area from the 1831 Diversion at the top of the upper Springs,

21 The two extant shelters and the toilet block do have utilitarian value and may have some architectural
significance (not assessed by the present project). The stone shelter has some historic heritage significance as it is
understood to be built on the site of the Alan Walker Chalet and to possibly incorporate elements of this earlier
significant shelter.
downwards to the lower Springs which is the focus of visitation today, and to the lack of more recent overprinting of the main use areas. The physical remains of the upper Springs (ie the 19th century and very early 20th century sites) have the highest integrity as they have only been impacted by Grays Fires Trail and the cosmic ray laboratory, whereas the lower Springs area has been somewhat more impacted by new works since the 1967 bush fires.

Some aspects of the patterning and interrelationship of sites and features are considered to be particularly significant. These include –

- the way in which the sites reflect the progressive downslope development of the Springs over time;
- the relationship of the early dwellings and tourist related sites to the 1831 Diversion; and
- the meeting of tracks at the Springs and the pattern of this.

As noted above, the preservation of the range of sites and features (which decrease with age and change in nature downslope across the Springs site) is of considerable importance in the historic heritage of the Springs as a whole being able to demonstrate the history of evolution of the site.

The complex of sites and features related to the 19th century water supply, tourism and permanent occupation is also significant as it clearly demonstrates the significance of the water supply as the event which precipitated a broader interest in the Springs and a node around which this interest developed. This has not been evident until putting the historical evolution of the Springs together for the present study, and challenges the previous assumption that the early tourism and recreation interest was focussed on the lower Springs because it was flatter and therefore was a more suitable site for dwellings and recreational activities. The significance of the heritage in the upper Springs area is strengthened because of the relationship of this early development to the natural springs in the area, which were the initial point of European interest in the Springs. In this sense the natural springs in the area are considered to have historic heritage significance in their own right (collectively).

The patterning of the tracks and roads is also considered to have heritage significance because the access tracks are arguably the second most important factor in the development of the Springs as a tourism and recreational site. The Springs became a point of interest only after access was constructed, interest was spurred by the development of the Wellington Falls track from the Springs, and was significantly spurred again a short time later when a bridle track to the upper ice house was constructed, which also made the Mt Wellington summit considerably more accessible. Then in the late 1880s visitation at the Springs increased dramatically when the carriageway was completed to the Springs. The Springs has therefore historically been important as a track and road head and junction, and the patterning that results from the joining of the various tracks and roads up until c.1920, is seen as being extremely important in demonstrating the historical evolution of recreational use of the Springs and the importance of this use, in particular since the track and road routes and junctions are essentially the original routes and junctions and the tracks are well preserved. The extant pre late-1920s track pattern at the Springs is also considered to be significant as part of the significant primarily 19th century network of walking tracks on the Hobart face of Mt Wellington (refer discussion of Tracks in Section 5.3).

A number of individual historic heritage sites and features have cultural significance in their own right, including high state, regional and local significance (refer to Section 5.3 for a discussion of individual site significance).

It is difficult to ascribe a particular level of significance to the historic heritage of the Springs as a whole. Although individual sites have state (and more rarely national) level significance, as a collection that demonstrates the evolution of tourism at the Springs, the significance is considered

---

22 Although Pillingers Drive has been significantly upgraded by sealing it, it has not been substantially widened and is essentially the same alignment.
to be primarily local and regional level as this is the level at which the Springs as a whole has been mainly used in the past. If more of the constructed elements had survived intact (eg, a combination of the Exhibition Gardens, the Alan Walker Chalet, the Springs Hotels, Gadds House and Woods House), not only the spaces, access routes and water supply features, then the Springs heritage is considered likely to have had state level significance. This may be the case even with the lack of intactness of many of the historic heritage elements as the collection does have relatively high integrity and a range of sites of different periods, and may be one of the better preserved historic tourism sites in Tasmania. Comparative analysis will be required to better assess the level of significance of the historic heritage of the Springs as a whole.

**Landscape & Aesthetic Values**

The Springs has landscape and aesthetic significance at two levels – as part of Mt Wellington and for the particular qualities of the Springs area only. These values have applied since the early days of European settlement of Hobart (hence also have historical validity) and are largely humanly ascribed, therefore can be considered as a subset of the social values of the Springs, and contributing to the social values.

The *Values, Use & Management Inventory* (WPMT 1996, 130) comments that “Landscape is one of the most important factors shaping people’s conception of the Mountain”, and notes that the Mountain “has a powerful natural character at the macro level and that at the micro level its fine textures, colour and detail all further contribute to its beauty and ambience”. Although no assessment has been made of the Springs area, it is clear from an understanding of the landscape character and values of Mt Wellington as a whole that the same values apply to the Springs as an integral and undistinguished part of the mountain. The shared landscape and aesthetic values are the essentially natural character, especially as a highly prominent backdrop to Hobart; the dramatic scenic backdrop that the mountain provides; and the changing nature of the mountain in different light and weather conditions – accentuated by the height and proximity of the mountain to the viewer (Hobart residents). These values have been explicitly stated for the Hobart (eastern) face which includes the Springs (refer Appendix 3). These are essentially 'looking in' values of the Springs.

Although often seen as an undistinguished part of the eastern face of Mt Wellington, the Springs is also recognised as a distinct landscape element. The sandstone bench on which the Springs occurs and which is located approximately half way up the Mountain, well above the lower ridges, is a moderately prominent landscape feature when viewed from the eastern and southern sides of the Mountain. Although the primary view is to the Pinnacle and the Organ Pipes, the Springs bench can be considered a secondary view. In this respect the Springs can be considered a satellite landscape element with the Pinnacle as the centre of the constellation. In a landscape sense as well as in relation to access, the Springs is a place that is on the way to the summit.

The Springs as a discrete location also has some of the same landscape values it has as part of the eastern face of Mt Wellington. The most significant aspect in this respect is the essentially natural setting. Other important landscape setting values are its location in a relatively elevated location (for views and access), its position half way up the Mountain (for views and recreational use), and the relative flatness of the area. Its sheltered position and relatively large area of flatness make the Springs a unique location on Mt Wellington. The Springs bench is highly visible from the Mt Wellington summit and from tracks above the Springs on the eastern face of Mt Wellington and, as a result, the view down to the Springs with its natural landscape setting values also appears to be important.

The most significant landscape related value of the Springs is its viewscape. The Springs is highly valued for its views both up and down. The views up to the Pinnacle and upper slopes are unusual
close views which reveal the summit ridge detail of columnar dolerite ramparts with the visually prominent associated boulder scree fields. This intimate view presents a high clarity and highly textured landscape perspective not available from other accessible vantage points. In addition, the viewfield from most areas of the Springs is wide, revealing the full summit ridge from the Pinnacle to South Wellington, as well as strong views of the Pinnacle and the Organ Pipes. There are also highly valued expansive and extensive views down and outwards across Hobart, the Derwent Estuary and across a large part of southeast Tasmania (which extend panoramically from Pittwater and beyond in the east, across Frederick Henry Bay and the Tasman Peninsula, South Arm, North West Bay, and Bruny Island to the Snug Tier in the south). The Upper Springs area has been described as having an 'incredible view over the world' (refer Appendix 3). These views cannot be seen from all areas of the Springs however, and are restricted to the upper Springs, and the two lookout sites, with patchy views only being visible along the edge of the sandstone cliff on the south edge of the Springs. The significance of these views is enhanced by the relative ease of their accessibility and because they are often the only far views available on the Mountain given the frequency with which cloud around the summit obscures the views.

The views both up and down from the Springs have been described as 'spectacular' and 'great', and those to the mountain also as 'intimate', and 'unique', close views. The Springs is also described as having 'significant vantage points'. The appreciation of the views to and from the Springs and of the other landscape values has been part of a continuing aesthetic appreciation of Mt Wellington and the Springs since the early 1800s, initially through the landscape ideals of the 'Sublime', in which mountains and naturalness were key elements. As Sheridan (2004, 28) notes of this period, 'Mountains were places of grandeur, of awe, of fear – wild places – that became revered by artists, writers and poets'. In the late 1800s/early 1900s this aesthetic was replaced by a less awed, but nevertheless still enthusiastic interest in 'wild places' which has continued to the present day (evident in Tasmania, including on Mt Wellington, in the battles for natural area and wilderness conservation).

The Springs clearly has landscape and aesthetic values that apply at the local/regional level. The Springs is also considered to have significance in respect of these values at a State level as an integral part of Mt Wellington, but it is difficult to determine whether this level of significance attaches to the Springs on its own in this respect. A more detailed analysis of the landscape and aesthetic values of the Springs is required to assess this as well as more explicitly articulate the nature of the landscape and aesthetic values today and historically.

Social Values

The Springs is considered to have very high social value. In large part this derives from being part of Mt Wellington and the strong affinity that local residents have with Mt Wellington (and which leads them to have strong views about its management and use) (WPMT 1996, 117). This is seen as being largely the result of this dominant natural feature becoming ‘inextricably linked with the community’s sense of identity and self-image’ and results in Mt Wellington having ‘symbolic value of great importance to the community’ (WPMT, 1996, 139). In some cases this relationship borders on, or becomes, a spiritual attachment. The symbolic importance and its derivation in the unique/unusual strong and close relationship between Hobart as a city and the natural and imposing environment of the Mountain is acknowledged by the local community, is celebrated in various ways, including through events such as the Mountain Festival (components of which are held at the Springs), and gives strong emphasis to a desire to retain the natural qualities of the mountain and components. The Mountain is also considered iconic and a significant landmark by

---

23 The weather at the Springs can also obscure the views out, but this is not a common occurrence.
the local and broader community, hence is a valued place, and these values also attach to elements such as the Springs.

In relation to the Springs area specifically, the prime social values are as an accessible, public space in a natural setting. These values of the Springs derive from its location in an environment that contrasts strongly with the busy and built, consumer oriented environment with limited natural environment in which most of the local community live. The Springs is valued as a space that is accessible to a range of people and for the equity of access – most people can afford to get to the Springs by some form of transport and can enjoy equally the facilities and natural and scenic values of the place. This attachment is enhanced by the fact that these values are values which have continued from the earliest historical use to the present day, including with the use of the area for public works (eg, water supply) and with commercial development (the Springs Hotel).

The Springs is also valued as being a relatively quiet area generally which supports only passive recreation, and an area in which these types of activities are relatively unconstrained and uncontrolled by management, commercial influences or infrastructure. Some members of the community support the use of an area of the Springs for a visitor information centre, where the emphasis is on providing interpretation and educational material (about Wellington Park) not commercial opportunities (eg, cafes), and where the visitor centre infrastructure is sympathetic to the other values of the Springs. The limited infrastructure for day use (shelters, toilet, open grassed areas, picnic tables, wood barbeques, lookouts and paths) is all seen as providing a more usable and ‘comfortable’ space for passive recreation and hence as appropriate. The ability to recreate in this way in all seasons is important, and the Springs has special value as a snow play area in winter, again because it is accessible, relatively safe, and sheltered.

The above values are seen to be important in the Springs area recently developing new meaning for some groups in the local community as a site for group gatherings. Gatherings are being held for a range of reasons – for parties, celebratory events, weddings, memorial services and large family events. The Springs appears to be important in this respect to groups that are very locally based (eg, in Fern Tree) or strongly value natural environments. Key attributes that contribute to this group use value are the availability of close, accessible, quiet, private open space in a natural setting. The broader social values and the outlooks from the Springs also result in parts of the Springs (the lookouts and the Springs Hotel site) being used by families, hence socially valued, for ash scattering and other memorial purposes.

The Springs also has important meaning for the local community as a nexus by virtue of the several tracks that start or end there, as well as by virtue of having car access, and for many years being the road head on the most heavily used part of Mt Wellington. This significance is historical and contemporary. As a key track junction, and in fact the most accessible major track junction on the Hobart face of the Mountain, the Springs (and its various facilities) has been used for some 150 years as a way point to meet others or to rest, as a base (when the Springs Hotel operated) and as a starting and end point of a walk. This use has created a considerable body of strong associations with the Springs and particular elements (eg, Springs Hotels, shelter sheds, and the walking tracks) for regular walkers on the mountain.

For some members of the community the Springs has special meaning and associations because of family links – through continued intergenerational use, through intergenerational work associations, or past family members having visited or lived at the site. This aspect of social; value is thought to apply to a relatively small part of the community, but is none-the-less a strongly held value.

---

24 Refer Glossary for an explanation of the term ‘passive’ as used here.
There are also specific community groups for which the Springs has particular meanings through long term use and other associations. The Hobart Bushwalking Club is an example of this type of group, and for this group the Springs is significant at a number of levels – ‘as an open space for recreation, as a meeting place with ample parking and available water for the commencement of walks and for its historic remains’ (Hobart Bushwalking Club, 29/1/2007).

A number of specific heritage sites and features at the Springs have been identified as having strong social value for members of the local community, primarily because of continued use, their historical values, and to a lesser extent because of the aesthetic value of ruins. Heritage sites that appear to be particularly strongly valued in this respect are the Springs Hotel site, the former Exhibition Gardens, the lookout, the main walking tracks, and the area of the track junction, former shelter shed and Gadd's and Woods' dwelling at the top end of the Springs.

Water quality is also socially valued.

Educational Values

The Springs has educational value in relation to its natural values and historic heritage. The natural values are relatively rare and special values in a Wellington Park context – the specific flora and fauna of the sandstone benches, the sandstone benches themselves, and the springs which occur at the junction of the dolerite scree and sandstone bedrock. The outlooks are also useful for interpreting the geography of southeastern Tasmania. The historic heritage is seen as particularly valuable as there is a multi-age complex which demonstrates the nature of Hobart's use of its backyard mountainous environment, and the ruins create opportunities for reflection, analysis and historical reconstruction. The educational value is enhanced by the accessibility of the site for school and large groups, the relatively large and safe open spaces, and the relatively sheltered setting of the Springs.

Other

The Springs as a whole also has cultural heritage significance because of its authenticity and integrity. The authenticity results primarily from the long term continued set of uses (recreation and water supply) at the site which have continued to the present day without significant modification in an essentially natural setting (even though the nature of this has changed with successive bushfires and periodic clearing) and with essentially unchanging primary views. The integrity is primarily due to the particular historical evolution of development of the Springs which saw the development shift with time from the top of the Springs down to the lower Springs. This combined with the continued similar uses has meant that there has been little significant overprinting of earlier sites and features. The authenticity and integrity of the site are important contributing values to the historic heritage, social and educational values of the Springs and to its overall cultural significance.

The Springs also has natural values (eg, geology, flora and fauna) which have significance outside the cultural heritage framework, although the natural values are socially valued. It is beyond the scope of the present study to assess these values and integrate them, but it is important to acknowledge that there are other values in the area. There is a strong view that the natural values are not well assessed for the Springs site. The Aboriginal heritage values of the Springs also have not been previously assessed.
5.3 Cultural Significance of Precinct Elements

A number of elements of the Springs historic heritage have significance in their own right. All identified historic heritage features in the precinct have been assessed (refer to the Endnotes tabulated summary of the historic heritage of the Springs Precinct). It should be noted however that, given the limitations of this study, these assessment may require review in the future in the light of new information.

The more significant individual historic heritage elements are discussed below by site.

Exhibition Gardens

The Exhibition Gardens is the only historic heritage site to have been studied in detail and assessed (Gulson 2003, Sheridan 2004, Austral Archaeology 2005, Andrews 2006). The former Gardens have been found to be highly significant –

- as a unique, early example of a public garden specifically designed to display native flora when an appreciation of Australian flora in such a setting was not yet fashionable;
- as a garden developed as part of the government response to the Great Depression, thus part of a nationwide collection of significant Depression employment public works;
- as an integral part of the Springs and Mt Wellington - the earliest tourist attractions in Tasmania based on natural themes – and for its resultant ability to demonstrate the rise of tourism in Australia;
- for its associations with leading Tasmanian public figures and visionaries such as Alan Cameron Walker and Louis Manton Shoobridge;
- for its outstanding evocation of a sense of place and its ability to convey defining elements of the 'Sublime' landscape philosophy;
- for its ability to demonstrate essential elements of gardens inspired by the Arts & Crafts Movement in the 1920s and 1930s in Australia, including an overall design complementary to the wider landscape;
- for its inextricable associations with the Springs and Mt Wellington and the strong attraction these places hold for the people of Hobart;
- for its function as a repository for botanical information regarding both indigenous and exotic species; and
- for its potential to educate about techniques associated with the Garden's construction.

Andrews (2006, 52) has assessed the site as having national and state level significance in relation to a number of the above aspects of significance at a level that would warrant listing of the site on the National Heritage List, Register of the National Estate and Tasmanian Heritage Register. It is clear from the nature and history of the gardens that they also have very high level significance at the local and regional level.

The nearby lookout on the sandstone cliff is regarded as part of the former Exhibition Gardens and is significant as such. Andrews (2006) has assessed the primary significance of the lookout as being the expansive view out from the lookout and the early built fabric of the lookout. Although the approach to the lookout has been modified (in the 1970s) the views and fabric appear to be largely original which enhances the significance of the lookout as it is able to demonstrate the nature of lookouts of the period and allows us to experience in part the intended nature of the Exhibition Gardens. The lookout is also of high local social significance as a well used lookout point with panoramic views of the southeast coast of Tasmania, and is of significance to the present day local (Hobart) community as a memorial site (for family members and as an ash scattering location).
1831 Diversion

The 1831 Diversion is also considered to have national, state and local level significance as part of the 1830s Hobart town water supply which was the first urban water supply system to be constructed and used in Australia, and which was essential to the continuity and growth of Hobart. While not a highly technological achievement it was a relatively cheap, efficient, local solution which could also, like the later Mountain Water Supply System (which is also of state and local level significance, and of which the 1831 Diversion is also a part), be called an elegant solution. The use of the 1831 Diversion to augment the otherwise limited local catchment makes the 1831 Diversion itself a highly significant element of the system. The good preservation of the 1831 Diversion (except at the north end) enables it to demonstrate how it operated historically. It is also significant as it represents the only extant and visible remains of Hobart's first water supply system (Crawford & Ryan 1988).

The 1831 Diversion is also an extremely significant historic heritage feature of Wellington Park and the Springs because it is the earliest known historic, made feature in Wellington Park, and appears to be have been the catalyst for regular tourism to the Springs and the nucleus around which the early tourism infrastructure developed. It also had aesthetic value to the historical visitor of the mid-1800s.

Pillinger Drive & the Pinnacle Road (& associated features)

The Pillinger Drive and Pinnacle Road (ie, from the Springs) have significance as the only public road constructed to the summit of Mt Wellington. Both roads also have social significance as excellent vantage points for viewing the Derwent Estuary and beyond and parts of Mt Wellington, as well as a winter walking and skiing route, and today as long exhilarating downhill bicycle ride.

Pillinger Drive is also significant as an 19th century feature constructed by prisoners (other than convicts) and the continued use of the original route also means the road is significant as it can demonstrate at least in part the engineering knowledge of the late 1800s. The most significant aspect of the road however it is historical role in providing easier access to the Springs, hence the Mountain more generally, for almost 50 years for the local community and also in the rapid growth of local tourism of which Mt Wellington was a key attraction. In this respect it was also a necessary precursor to ongoing development, including other significant sites at the Springs and elsewhere (eg, the Springs Hotel, the Exhibition Gardens, and the Pinnacle Road). Pillinger Drive therefore is regarded as having high local significance and some State level significance, primarily for its associations with the Springs as a major Tasmanian tourism destination.

The Pinnacle Road is also of high local historical significance for its role in promoting tourism to Mt Wellington, hence in the local region more generally; for its essential supporting role in later telecommunications development on the summit; and for the role it has played in relation to the lack of development of a cable car. It is however most significant as a major Depression public works employment scheme, and the main Hobart based scheme that employed large numbers of local men, hence provided work and sustenance during the Depression for a large number of Hobart based families. It is also of significance because it has high integrity and retains the original route and much of its original construction, hence is able to demonstrate well the nature of road building in the early-mid 1900s when much of the work was still undertaken by hand. As a well preserved major Depression public work (and the idea of the State Premier of the time – Ogilvie) the Pinnacle Road is regarded as having not just local level significance, but also high State and probably some national level significance.

The Springs Depot, which is associated with the construction of the Pinnacle Road is therefore considered as having historical significance as an integral part of the Pinnacle Road construction.
Because it was a temporary establishment and minimal physical evidence survives it is considered to have limited other cultural significance.

**Nineteenth Century Occupation Sites (Woods Cottage and Gadds House and related features)**

Both Woods Cottage site and Gadd's house site are considered to have high local significance and some regional level significance. The sites are both significant historically as early and rare permanent dwellings on Mt Wellington; as the dwellings of the first caretakers and rangers in Wellington Park; and as the focus of mid-late 19th century visitation to the Springs, and Mt Wellington and the Wellington Range more generally, and for the highly used and appreciated services they provided. The sites are also significant as, although the associated buildings have not survived, the sites have relatively high integrity, hence are able to demonstrate many characteristics of isolated rural dwellings of their period. The sites are also significant in that their location (near the 1831 Diversion and the historical upper track junction) is important in understanding and demonstrating the evolution of the Springs area as a focus for visitation and use and the critical role played by the 1831 Diversion water race.

Woods Cottage and associated features as a site is also considered to have state level significance because of the long time period over which the Woods provided an important service to tourists at that location (including overnight accommodation) and the wide range of tourists from elsewhere in Tasmania (and out of Tasmania) that experienced that hospitality. The site exemplifies and is a rare example with surviving evidence of mid-late 19th century overnight tourist accommodation that operated prior to the late 1800s/early 1900s development of resort style accommodation (typified by the later Springs Hotel).

Gadds House site is also of state and higher level significance because of its association with Wragge's Spring Observatory (see below).

**Wragge's Springs Observatory**

Wragge's Observatory is highly significant as one half of the observatory set up on Mt Wellington by Clement Wragge to provide improved weather forecasting. It is considered historically significant at the local, state and international level as a technologically innovative experimental weather station that was only the second of its kind in the world and the first in the southern hemisphere; and for its association with Scotsman Clement Wragge who worked extensively in Australia and was an internationally renowned meteorologist for his innovative ideas that became established world wide (and some of which are still used today, including the development of weather charts and the naming of cyclones). The observatory is also highly significant at the local and state level because the bi-level observation system significantly improved weather forecasting as intended, hence was extremely important to shipping in southern Tasmanian waters at a time when shipping was the main form of long distance transport for Tasmania.

Unfortunately there appears to be no physical evidence of the Springs Observatory, which means that the cultural significance of the Springs Observatory remains largely historical. The Springs Observatory however is understood to have been housed in Gadd's house or in a small nearby structure, with the readings taken by Charles Gadd and his daughter Edith. As such the cultural significance ascribed to Wragge's Observatory attaches to the Gadd's house site.

**Springs Hotel (including the hotel garden/grazing area & associated features)**

The Springs Hotel site has historical significance at the local and state level: At a state level it was one of the premier natural area resorts in Tasmania in the early 1900s, a period when tourism was important, with the natural beauty and climate of Tasmania making it a prime tourist attraction and
a 'premier health resort'. The Springs Hotel also typified the natural area resorts of this period, being set in an essentially natural setting with spectacular scenery and/or other natural assets of interest to tourists, yet being accessible by vehicle, and being of a rustic style but comfortable and with a range of facilities for guests including indoor reading and other recreation rooms and outdoor amusements such as tennis and walking tracks. The best known resorts of this period (late 1800s to mid-1900s) were mountain based. Tasmanian examples include Waldheim at Cradle Mountain and Lake St Clair House at Derwent Bridge, and interstate examples include Mount Buffalo Chalet in Victoria and the Hydro-Majestic Hotel and Carrington Hotel in the Blue Mountains.

The significance that attaches to the physical remains is relatively low. Given the limited physical evidence, the site is unable to demonstrate (other than by its setting) the principal characteristics of a typical resort of the period which are considered to reside in the hotel buildings and furnishings and in the associated attractions, none of which survive in the case of the Springs Hotel. The archaeological remains however have high integrity and are considered to have some scientific significance as they can to some degree illustrate and inform us about the layout and nature of construction of the former Springs Hotel. Their significance in this respect is considered to be medium-low as the hotel was not of unusual design or construction for the period and was not a rare, early example.

The Springs Hotel is also significant at the local and state level for its associations with Henry Dobson and Alan Cameron Walker, both prominent Tasmanians.

When it operated, the Springs Hotel had high social value for the many Tasmanians who used it either for refreshments on day trips to Mt Wellington or for overnight accommodation. The Springs Hotel (as an historical fact) is still of importance to this community of Tasmanians for whom the Hotel has retained special meanings and associations. The Springs Hotel site also has present day social significance for part of the local community as a place where they can gather as a group for celebration or commemoration. The groups who use the Spring Hotel site in this way are mainly groups who value the natural environment or have a close local association (eg, are Fern Tree residents) and they appear to value the site for essentially the same reasons that it was selected for a hotel (ie, its accessible, but isolated, natural setting and its scenic outlook).

The Springs hotel garden and grazing area is also of high historical significance given that it was an integral part of the Springs Hotel for many years, including when the hotel was established. It is considered to have less historical significance than the hotel proper given that it appears not to have been an essential part of the hotel enterprise during the history of the hotel (ie, it suffered a significant reduction in size in 1931 for the construction of the Exhibition Gardens which appears not to have significantly affected the operation of the hotel, and it had fallen out of use entirely by the early 1950s). It is however also historically significant as the first area to be cleared on the lower Springs bench. The limited related physical remains that have survived, in particular the drystone fence and the road alignment, are considered to have medium-high local scientific significance, particularly given there are comparatively few other sources of information on the garden and grazing site.

Although the original garden and grazing area has not survived as such and the boundary and part of the internal area of the former hotel garden have been modified to some extent by later development, the open grassed nature of the former garden area has maintained a visually similar landscape to that of the 1930s and 1940s (and possibly 1950s) while still associated with the hotel, and as such the continuing open nature of the area has some landscape significance. Andrews (2006) also notes that the open nature of the former hotel garden area, the spacious nature of which contrasts strongly to the intricate patterning of the Exhibition Gardens, makes an important contribution to the aesthetic cultural significance of the former Exhibition Gardens. In the view of the present study the relationship of the gardens to the former Exhibition Gardens is important, but
more so in relationship to the evolved landscape of the Springs than to the aesthetics of the former Exhibition Gardens25.

The Hotel garden and grazing area is not known to have particular social significance as such or for other meanings or associations.

**Alan Walker Chalet**

The former Alan Walker Chalet has historical significance as part of the complex of public works built in the Springs area and Mountain Park more generally using Depression period labour, and as one of the public works built using funds from the Arts & Crafts Exhibition in Hobart and held specifically to raise money to assist in Depression period employment. It also has historical significance as the first development in this part of the lower Springs.

The former chalet is of cultural significance for its relationship with the former Exhibition Gardens, including through being constructed using the same funds and labour source; being built in a rustic (possibly also Arts & Crafts Movement inspired26) style using local materials; as one of two new 'distinctive points of interest' at the Springs in the late 1920s/early 1930s period of infrastructure renewal by the HCC to encourage tourism in the Mountain Park (as reflected in the surviving commemorative stone tablet); and, given its name, as a memorial to Alan Cameron Walker who designed and started the establishment of the Exhibition Gardens, but who also had connections with the Springs as the designer of the Springs Hotel. Its level of historical and associational significance is high local, and possibly state level, although more analysis is warranted to establish state level significance.

The former chalet does not appear to have present day social significance and its contemporary social significance is unknown. Given the former chalet's high historical significance and association with the Exhibition Gardens, any physical remains are considered to be of significance as the only surviving evidence of the structure, as well as being of some scientific significance. The construction of the present rustic stone shelter on the same site27 particularly given that some original elements have been retained (eg, the commemorative stone tablet, probably the concrete floor and other foundation features, and possibly the lower walls) is seen as contributing to the significance of the chalet as an important visitor facility at the Springs and in the Mountain Park and Wellington Park more generally.

**Lower Springs Picnic Area**

As an open, roadside public picnic area with some low-key facilities (eg, BBQs, picnic tables, shelters and toilet) the lower Springs picnic area (both sides of the road) is seen as being of extremely high social value for the local community and tourists at least over the last c.30-40 years. The area is the most heavily publicly used area in Wellington Park other than the summit, and is used in a variety of ways including as a brief stop on the way up and down the Mountain to explore and use the toilets, as a meeting point, simply as a rest point, or to have a picnic; and as a destination in its own right at the end of a walk, for picnics with family or friends, to play music or for snow play. It is used for gatherings from breakfast time through the day and into the evening, including for celebratory and memorial purposes, and is used to a limited extent for overnight

25 The present study does not disagree that the hotel garden open space contributes to the aesthetic values of the former Exhibition Gardens, but believes that this significance is not particularly high either in relation to either garden area as it appears from the available information to be more accidental than designed.

26 There is no information on who designed this shelter but it is possible it was also Alan Walker and probable that the design was strongly Arts & Crafts Movement influenced in order to complement the associated Exhibition Gardens.

27 This is assumed from the available information, but not conclusively demonstrated at this time.
stays by campervans. None of the individual facilities in the picnic area however are known to have particular social significance.

The physical conditions and setting contribute strongly to the social significance of the area and also gives the area aesthetic significance. Environmental and setting factors that are important contributors the social significance are the relative flatness of the area, the surrounding native vegetation which provides a comfortable and defined space, and its location on a key access road into the Park, and its closeness yet apparent remoteness to Hobart. Like other parts of the Springs, aesthetic values of the picnic area derive from the adjacent native vegetation, the open grassed use area surrounded by the contrasting native vegetation, and the views to the upper slopes and summit ridge of Mt Wellington.

The picnic area, primarily the eastern side has some historical significance as part of the site of the Springs Depot, having been cleared and levelled for this purpose.

Other Shelter Sheds

The public hut established in c.1839 is considered to be of high local and state level significance as the first hut known to be established on Mt Wellington and (along with the pinnacle shelter) one of the earliest public recreation huts to be erected in Tasmania (and possibly the earliest?). It is also of state level significance for its associations with Lady Jane Franklin (who is understood to have recommended its erection) and highly significant as one element in the body of public works which were established due to Lady Franklin’s interest and energy. At this stage the location of this hut is not known, but any identified remains would be highly significant given the high assessed historical and associational significance of the shelter.

The other known public shelter sheds (the two adjacent shelters above Milles Track and south of Gadd's house in the upper Springs) are considered to have medium local historical significance as relatively early and long-term public shelters on Mt Wellington. They however are of strong social significance for those members of the present day community that used one or other of the two shelters between 1890 and 1967 as useful half way meeting points providing shelter and a means to cook as well as the associations generated by use. They are likely to have been of strong contemporary significance for the same reasons. The social value of the shelters has been captured to some extent by a former user and local resident who provided the following comment about the last shelter to survive - 'it was commodious and able to shelter an number of walking parties bothered by difficult weather conditions; it was particularly important in the era of few private motor cars; and there were far reaching views of the Derwent Estuary and distant ranges on a clear day through the open side'.

The physical remains of these shelters also have significance as they are imbued with these meanings and associations, and they also have some scientific significance, as they allow us to at least partly understand the nature of the shelters. The setting, in particular its placement, its location by a spring and the surrounding native vegetation is also of importance in understanding the function of the shelters and their social values.

Walking Tracks

The walking tracks that occur in the Springs Precinct have not been specifically researched and assessed. McConnell & Scripps (2005) ascribed an indicative high local and regional significance to the major 19th century tracks in Wellington Park and medium-high state level significance to a small number of these, including the Fingerpost Track, Milles Track and the Icehouse Track, that had other significant associations or historical significance. This assessment is still considered essentially valid, although the present study considers the 1831 Diversion and Milles Track (former Wellington Falls Track) as two separate sites, which means that Milles track is unlikely to,
but may still, have state level significance. The Fingerpost and Icehouse Tracks (formerly the Pinnacle Track) are considered to have state level historical significance as very early Tasmanian walking tracks as well as being the first formalised route to the Mt Wellington summit and heavily used 19th century walking tracks. The Icehouse Track is also considered to have significance as the route used to cart the materials for the construction of Wragge's Summit Observatory.

Although not formally assessed, these individual tracks are also considered to have high social and aesthetic significance. The social significance rests in the meanings and associations the tracks have for the numerous Tasmanians who use these track regularly to recreate in Wellington Park - to reach remote and scenic points, to enjoy the natural beauty of the Mountain and the frequent extensive views up to the Mountain summit ridge or down over the Derwent and beyond, or for social or health reasons. The aesthetic significance, and to a lesser extent, the social significance derives from the mountain-side setting and the narrow rustic benched formations that climb (or descend) through changing native vegetation which mostly encloses the tracks and in some cases overarches the tracks, creating a tunnel of filtered light along track sections.

The tracks constructed prior to the 1920s have significance not only as individual historic entities, but part of a complex or network of historic tracks on the Hobart face of Mt Wellington, are considered to be of historical heritage significance (McConnell 2006). Together with the private huts, public use foci and track junctions such as the Springs and Junction Cabin area, they demonstrate the evolution and pattern of historical recreation and use on Mt Wellington. The nature and form of the network, the location of tracks and the largely natural forested setting are important contributing factors. The complex of historic tracks, huts and junctions can be considered as a unique historical, recreational and mountain exploitation landscape that reflects the significant role that Mt Wellington has played in the history of the development of Hobart. The later tracks (late 1920s onwards) created by the Council, the Pinnacle Road and the post-1967 fire trails have impacted on the intactness of this historic landscape, but it is still considered to be sufficiently intact as to be a significant historical complex and landscape.

5.4 Statement of Cultural Significance for the Springs Precinct

Statement of Significance

The Springs Precinct is of high cultural significance, primarily historical and social significance, as a highly visited and valued area of public open space in a natural, sheltered, relatively flat and accessible location part way up Mt Wellington with impressive views both up to the Mountain and out across southeast Tasmania; and has been valued continuously for these characteristics since the early days of the European establishment of Hobart through to the present day. Although the accessibility is valued, the isolated feel of the location given by the distance from urban Hobart, the natural setting and the extensive natural environment that is travelled through on foot or by car to get to and from the Springs contribute importantly to the social value of the Springs. The contrast between the minimally developed Springs with its emphasis on low key passive recreation\(^{28}\) and the lack of visible regulation of public use of the area also contribute strongly. In addition the existence of relatively private large areas of open space have created additional meaning for some local community members as a special place for family, celebratory and commemorative group gatherings.

As the history of the Springs demonstrates, it is the place and its position in the landscape, rather than infrastructure, that historically and to the present has been of key importance in attracting

\(^{28}\) Refer Glossary for an explanation of the term ‘passive’ as used here.
people to the Springs. The call and drawcard has been the natural setting and the special views, and a general desire to experience the natural offerings of Mt Wellington. The infrastructure has enriched this essentially natural experience and has made it easier to achieve, without detracting from the experience.

In many ways the Springs is a satellite of Mt Wellington, and in part the cultural significance of the Springs derives from this relationship: It is a place that one can get close to view the more magnificent and harder to gain Mt Wellington and it is a convenient way station in pursuit of the summit, the ultimate goal. Mt Wellington has considerable symbolic meaning to Hobartians, and the Springs has associated significance as an important related place, albeit lacking the grandeur and degree of symbolic meaning held by Mt Wellington. At the same time the Springs also is regarded as an integral and undifferentiated part of Mt Wellington and derives strong social value from this intuitive relationship.

The landscape and landscape setting are also of primary importance in giving the Springs Precinct aesthetic significance. The elements which contribute most strongly to the aesthetic (and social) significance of the Springs are the natural setting and the viewscapes from the Springs. Given its location half way up Mt Wellington, the Springs has significant and expansive views east and southeast across Hobart, the Derwent Estuary and beyond to the southeastern coastline of Tasmania, as well as rare close views to Mt Wellington which allow the summit ridge, Pinnacle and the Organ Pipes to be viewed in detail. The views to Mt Wellington are obtainable from most parts of the Springs. The close association of the Springs with Mt Wellington has also meant that the Springs has been included in the sequence of historical aesthetic interest from the 'Sublime' (in which mountains were a key element) to the rustic focussed Arts & Craft Movement and to the strong interest in wildness and natural area preservation which continues to the present day. The ruinous nature of the historical physical evidence also contributes to a 'Romantic' aesthetic, which is closely related to the appreciation of the 'Sublime'.

The Springs is historically significant as the location of the first permanent public work on Mt Wellington and as the location of the supply component of Hobart's first constructed water supply system, which was the first urban water supply system constructed in Australia.

The Springs has also been from the early 1800s to the present day a pre-eminent focus of recreation in a natural area in Tasmania, with this use and focus evolving around the 1831 Diversion water race and access at a convenient location half way up the Mountain, and spurred by a fascination for, curiosity in, and love of, the spectacular natural backdrop to Hobart that is Mt Wellington and its natural qualities, in particular its native vegetation, scree slopes and views. While the pre-eminent focus of recreation has been Mt Wellington itself, the Springs has been an integral part of this as a halfway place, as an achievable endpoint close to the summit, and as a nexus for walkers, as well as a destination in its own right. The longevity of this use also contributes to the significance of the Springs Precinct.

The historical importance of the Springs is reflected in the complex of archaeological remains that cover a large part of the Springs. These remains, which represent most of the key historical uses and events at the Springs and which are strongly interrelated and have relatively high integrity, are significant as a complex because of their ability to interpret and demonstrate the history of the Springs. The two track junctions (above and below the Springs Hotel) and the concentration of physical evidence around the north end of the 1831 Diversion race are seen as particularly important elements in demonstrating the historical evolution of the Springs and its important role as a recreational focus in the region. A number of individual sites and features are highly significant in their own right (eg, the former Exhibition Gardens, the 1831 Diversion, the Springs Hotel, the Fingerpost Track and the Pinnacle Road), and this significance is enhanced by the preservation of other associated elements.
The combination of the above values also results in the Springs as having educational significance (for cultural heritage and natural values interpretation).

**Assessment against the Tasmanian Heritage Register Criteria**

The Springs Precinct as an entity is considered to have local, regional and state level significance. The following assesses the significance of the Springs against the Tasmanian Heritage Register criteria.

*Criteria (a) – importance in demonstrating the evolution or pattern of Tasmania's history*

- The Springs Precinct is important in Tasmania's history as a long term (1830s to present) recreational and tourism service venue for local residents and visitors to Hobart who sought to experience the natural attractions of Mt Wellington. The services provided (which have included public open space, a variety of access, shelters, toilets, picnic area and facilities (eg, barbeques), points of interest such as lookouts and formal gardens, refreshments and accommodation) changed over time, reflecting the expectations of the period, with some services (Woods cottage and hut, the Springs Hotel and Exhibition Gardens) providing facilities renowned throughout and beyond Tasmania, and some facilities which were specifically designed (in the case of the Exhibition Gardens and Springs Hotel) to increase tourism to Tasmania, and were part of a state-wide campaign in this respect. The setting and complex of archaeological remains contribute strongly to the Springs significance in demonstrating this recreational history.

*Criteria (b) – demonstrates rare, uncommon or endangered aspects of Tasmania's heritage*

(Although individual sites at the Springs meet this criterion, the Springs Precinct as a whole is not considered to meet this criterion (have relevance) at the State level).

*Criteria (c) – potential to yield information that will contribute to an understanding of Tasmania's history*

(Although individual sites at the Springs may meet this criterion, the Springs Precinct as a whole is not considered to meet this criterion at the State level given the poor overall level of survival of the made structures).

*Criteria (d) – importance as representative in demonstrating the characteristics of a broader class of place*

- As a long term, historical, dominantly public recreational site whose values have been primarily its natural setting and landscape values, the Springs Precinct today, with its facilities, setting and historic heritage, is typical, hence is able to represent a major visitor services focus within an accessible, highly valued and special scenic landscape, particularly those at road heads, in Tasmania and in Australia more broadly. With its continuing local, environment-based, public recreational use within Wellington Park since the early 1830s, the managed and evolved landscape of the Springs is able to represent this class of place from the early-mid 1800s through to the present day.

*Criteria (e) – importance in demonstrating a high degree of creative or technical achievement*

(The Springs Precinct as a whole is not considered to meet this criterion at the State level).
**Criteria (f) – strong or special meaning for any group or community because of social, cultural or spiritual associations**

(The Springs Precinct as a whole is not considered to meet this criterion at the State level (although it is highly significant in this respect at the local level); Mt Wellington more generally (including the Springs) is considered likely state level significance in this respect.

**Criteria (g) – has a special association with the life or work of a person, a group or an organisation that was important in Tasmania's history**

- The Springs Precinct is significant at the state level for its strong association with prominent Tasmanian's Henry Dobson and Alan Cameron Walker in the early 1900s. Dobson had a strong personal interest in the Springs and through his involvement with the Tasmanian Tourism Association for the reservation of Mountain Park and the establishment of a hotel at the Springs, and was ultimately the main developer and director of the enterprise from 1907 to 1919. Alan Cameron Walker also saw the potential of the Springs as a significant Tasmanian tourist resort and designed the Springs Hotel and designed and oversaw the establishment of the Exhibition Gardens until his death in 1932, at which time his involvement was celebrated by naming a newly finished shelter at the Springs after him.

- As the manager of Tasmania's capital city, the HCC is an important Tasmanian organisation. Along with the Waterworks Reserve, the Springs is considered of significance at the state level for its long term association with the Council who has been the primary manager of this bushland public recreation site, and in taking a strong lead in developing the site since the 1890s until present.
6 MANAGEMENT BACKGROUND & ANALYSIS

6.1 Current Management & Regulatory Framework

The Springs as part of Wellington Park

In relation to the Springs, which is within Wellington Park, the Wellington Park Management Trust has primary responsibility for planning and policy and development control as part of their overarching responsibility for the management of Wellington Park (under the Wellington Park Act 1993). Because the Springs is located in the Mountain Park portion of Wellington Park which is land owned by the Hobart City Council, the Council resource (financially and physically) the day to day management of the area (as required by the Act), and also have a development approval role in accordance with the Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993.

Management of the Springs is primarily guided by the Wellington Park Management Plan 2005. Under the Wellington Park Management Plan 2005 the Springs is recognised as a special zone (the Springs Zone) and is therefore also subject to an area management (development) plan – the Springs Site Development Plan 2002. The management of the Springs via these two documents is overseen by the WPMT in consultation with the HCC (as the land owner). In order to meet their local government statutory requirements, the HCC has inserted the site development plan into the City of Hobart Planning Scheme 1982 as a local area plan (LAP), in this case the Springs Local Area Plan 2004. In relation to new uses and developments, the Springs is subject to assessment on the basis of both area plans, and both authorities must approve any new uses and development.

Wellington Park Management Plan 2005

Key Management Objectives

Under the Wellington Park Management Plan 2005 the primary management goals 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 Park, and
- provide for community, tourism and recreational use and enjoyment of the Park consistent with the above goals.

Historic Heritage

The provisions of the Wellington Park Management Plan 2005 are the primary provisions for historic heritage, including at the Springs. Under the Plan some level of protection is offered to all historic heritage values, however better management is provided where the historic heritage is formally recognised as 'sites' or 'precincts'. Under the Wellington Park Management Plan 2005 the overarching policy for historic heritage is to 'retain the essential cultural characteristics of the Park'. Key approaches for achieving this are the need for all actions (except for routine day to day management activities or emergency works) to be assessed by the WPMT via a Project Proposal Form assessment process, and a requirement to develop a conservation policy or plan prior to any decisions about major works at a 'site' or 'precinct'. The Plan also contains generic type provisions for protection such as to identify, record, protect, conserve and interpret historic heritage sites. The historic heritage provisions contained in the Plan are summarised in Table 1.

The Wellington Park Management Plan 2005 also includes a policy that conservation and management will adhere to the Burra Charter. The Australia ICOMOS (1999) Burra Charter is a nationally accepted set of guidelines for cultural heritage practice and provides generally accepted policy for managing historic heritage. Key Burra Charter principles include -

- 'significant cultural heritage should be conserved' (article 2.1),
• 'the aim of conservation is to retain cultural significance' (article 2.2),
• 'significant associations and meanings of a place (including spiritual values) should be respected (articles 24.1 & 24.2).

The Springs Zone
Under the Wellington Park Management Plan 2005, the Springs area is recognised as a specific management zone (refer Figure 4). The zone is described as a major visitor site and as having a long history of visitor use. The management objectives for the Springs Zone, as set out in the Wellington Park Management Plan are to –
• provide for a range of tourism and recreational opportunities,
• provide for high levels of public use and enjoyment,
• protect environmental and cultural features and values,
• protect the scenic qualities when viewed from both within and from outside the Park, and
• develop the zone as the principle area for visitor and management services and facilities.

The policies and actions for the Springs Zone in relation to providing for visitors in the Plan specify –
• the level up to which facilities in the Springs Zone may be developed (includes a visitor information centre, outdoor teaching facility, Park management office, restaurant or similar, retail outlet (related to park values), built accommodation (no camping development is allowed), botanical gardens annex, picnic and barbeque facilities, interpretation trails; and
• the Springs is to be developed as a major picnic area within the Park.

There are other more specific policies in this respect.

Use & Development
In the Springs Zone assessment of proposals for services, activities and facilities must conform to the Wellington Park Management Plan 2005, the Springs Site Development Plan 2002 and any supplementary standards, etc, that the WPMT or the HCC apply. In relation to development, the Wellington Park Management Plan 2005 takes a performance based approach which includes specific 'acceptable solutions' and 'performance criteria' for historic heritage for permitted and discretionary developments/uses. These are listed in Table 1.

Spring Site Development Plan 2002
The Springs Site Development Plan 2002 provides much more detailed guidance on the management of the Springs Zone, and is, as the name suggests, strongly focussed on development. The Site Development Plan is in two parts: Part A deals with use and development requirements and performance measures, and plan administration. Part B provides background to the plan which is in essence a summary of the values and land capability and an exploration of visitor use and potential, and the overall 'development context'.

In relation to historic heritage there are some policy, management objectives and performance criteria contained in Part A (refer to summary in Table 1) and a discussion of the 'cultural and historic heritage' is provided in Part B (refer Section 2, this report).29 No individual sites or values are identified, listed or assessed, but Part B identifies four heritage zones (refer Section 2) which are considered to encapsulate most of the significant historic heritage values of the Springs, and for each of which a set of prescriptions for heritage value protection has been provided (refer Table 1). Under the Springs Site Development Plan 2002 these zone prescriptions are considered as 'interim policy' with no statutory power. The zones however are recognised in the Plan through

---

29 There is no definition of cultural heritage or historic heritage in the Plan, but it appears from Part B that it is considered to be the physical historical remains and historical use. Other aspects of cultural significance such as aesthetic and social values do not appear to be considered although there are objectives for the maintenance and enhancement of these values as amenity(?) values. For example, included in the intent of the plan is the maintenance and enhancement of – "(a) The visual amenity of the eastern face of Mt Wellington." and "(d) The opportunities for recreation and quiet enjoyment by all users of the planning area." (Item 1.2.2).
Table 1  Summary of the historical heritage policy and provisions contained in the Wellington Park Management Plan 2005 and the Springs Site Development Plan (and Springs Local Area Plan). (Modified after McConnell & Scripps 2005)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Overarching Management Policy/Objectives</th>
<th>Protective Mechanisms</th>
<th>Specific Policy/Prescriptions</th>
<th>Specific Actions/Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Wellington Park Management Plan (2005)** | • Goal –  
  • ’retain the essential cultural characteristics of the Park’.  
  • General Policy/Objective –  
  • ’protect & retain culturally representative and significant areas, features or artefacts of use and enjoyment of the Park’.  
  • Historic Heritage Objectives –  
  • identify & record sites of historic heritage value;  
  • protect, conserve and interpret historic heritage;  
  • maintain the integrity and authenticity of structural and other historic remains and movable heritage; and  
  • maintain the landscape quality and visual integrity of cultural landscapes. | • For management purposes, areas or sites of historic heritage, including cultural landscapes, will be designated as heritage precincts or heritage sites.  
  • where necessary to provide for special management conditions to protect heritage values, the Trust will designate heritage precincts or heritage sites (in any Management Zone);  
  • conservation and management of heritage precincts and heritage sites will conform with the prescriptions of Section 10.19 of the WPMP.  
  • proposals to develop tourism and recreational services, activities and facilities will be required, where relevant, to behave and operate in a manner compatible with protection of cultural features and values an teach this to visitors;  
  • conservation and management will adhere to the Burra Charter;  
  • a conservation policy or plan (incl a specific statement of significance) will be prepared before any decisions about major works, use, removal or interpretation of historic heritage;  
  • development or disturbance shall not compromise the aesthetic and landscape values of the Park;  
  • priority in conservation works will be given to maintenance and preservation, then restoration;  
  • if causing management problems (incl conflict with other values) remove obsolete facilities assessed not to be of cultural significance worthy of retention;  
  • missing fabric elements may be reconstructed in accordance with a conservation policy/plan, but no hypothetical reconstruction will be permitted;  
  • public access to individual historic features will not be provided or encouraged unless adequate site protection measures are in place;  
  • accurate detailed working documentation will be prepared prior to any conservation works and to record conservation works. | • Undertake an historic heritage audit of the Park (done);  
  • identify and develop areas of historic heritage significance for education or interpretative use in accordance with prescriptions;  
  • identify sites of vanished and extant historic huts and their conservation significance - and where significant provide conservation advice.  
  • assess the resilience and potential to be vandalised of all known historic features to determine which sites may be publicised. | • **Project Proposal Assessment** - a Project Proposal Form (PPF) shall be submitted to the Trust for any use or development (including those uses listed as Exempt in the WPMP), except for routine or general maintenance activities in the course of day-to-day management of the Park, or for emergency works.  
  • **Performance based approach for use & development** (Exempt, Unpermitted and Discretionary works).  
  Development approval is required for any use that is Discretionary (includes Exempt activities that fail to meet one or more relevant qualifications).  
  With respect to historic heritage development applications must meet the following acceptable solution or, failing that, must meet one or more of the following performance criteria –  
  • **Acceptable Solutions (5.2):** ‘use or development will not involve a site listed on the THR under the HCHA 1995 (unless approved by the THC), or a historic heritage site or precinct identified in accordance with the WPMP’.  
  • **Performance Criteria** (5.2):  
  • appropriate measures as outlined in this MP must be put in place, in consultation with the Tasmanian Heritage Office where necessary, to ensure that any adverse effects on historic cultural values and any heritage precincts and sites will be avoided, remedied or mitigated.  
  • the reconstruction of elements of historic heritage fabric within a historic heritage site or precinct identified in accordance with the WPMP shall be carried out in accordance with a conservation policy statement or plan.  
  Note: Unpermitted uses cannot occur; Exempt uses can occur without submitting a Development Application but a PPF needs to be completed and assessed; Permitted uses require a PPF to be completed and assessed and a Development Application to be approved; Discretionary uses require a PPF to be completed and assessed and a Development Application may be approved or refused.

---

The Springs Initial Conservation Policy
McConnell, A. (August 2007)

A Wellington Park Management Trust Report
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Overarching Management Policy/Objectives</th>
<th>Protective Mechanisms</th>
<th>Specific Policy/Prescriptions</th>
<th>Specific Actions/Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Springs Site Development Plan 2002</td>
<td>• Purpose – 'to ensure that the administration of use or development in the planning area is in accordance with the objectives of the RMPS of Tasmania and the Wellington Park Act.'</td>
<td>• Performance based approach (recognises allowable and non-allowable uses/developments) – specifies allowable &amp; non-allowable uses. Must show uses will be in accordance with the scheme standards applicable to the use or development either through compliance with acceptable solutions or use of performance criteria. Recognises minor works (mainly maintenance/repair - do not need public consultation, must meet all Code requirements) and major works (development &amp; new use works – requires public consultation, must meet all Code requirements). No works are non-allowable on grounds of historic heritage impact (only groundwater and vegetation clearing specified here).</td>
<td>• Project applications to be by way of a Project Proposal Form (PPF). SDP details information requirements but does not explicitly require any assessment of cultural heritage impacts. Code 5: Only 5.5 Siting of Buildings refers to historic heritage values. Acceptable Solution (applies to siting of buildings and structures) – 'no buildings to be sited within the boundaries of zones A, B, C &amp; D designated as areas of significance for architectural and cultural significance.' Performance Criteria – - proposals for buildings within 30m of areas of cultural or heritage significance must show the building will not result in a diminution of values specified in part 2 of the Plan; and - proposals for any structures must show that it will not adversely affect any item of cultural heritage significance.</td>
<td>The following are 'interim policy' and have no validity in the 2002 plan - • Zone A – Historic Track Junctions (level 3 significance) – no demolition of existing structures; no changes to sites of early buildings, gardens or tracks, unless comprehensive archaeological reports are prepared; removal of level 1 intrusive structures not prohibited. • Zone B – Springs Hotel Site (level 2 significance) – new buildings are permissible providing archaeological survey is carried out and the position of earlier hotel buildings are identified; new buildings should not exceed the scale of the earlier hotel; historic interpretation is encouraged; maintain 'the general existing landforms' and evidence of former structures and plantings (where not weeds); identify the site of Wragge's weather station. • Zone C – Picnic Ground &amp; Toilets (level 1 significance) – removal of toilet block and picnic facilities not prevented by their cultural significance; retention of the stone shed and store; new structures are not prevented by the cultural significance. • Zone D – Exhibition Garden &amp; Lookout (level 1 significance) – retention of the lookout and sufficient of the pathways and rock walling to show evidence of the Exhibition Garden; new structures are not prevented by the cultural significance; new development should be subject to strict form &amp; siting guidelines.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the 'Codes' which set out the performance criteria and acceptable solutions for various uses and developments, but the relevant Code (5.5 – Siting of Buildings) treats all the zones the same. Protection for historic heritage under the Springs Site Development Plan 2002 in relation to use and development is only offered with respect to the siting of buildings.

Springs Local Area Plan

The Springs Local Area Plan is essentially a copy of part A of the Springs Site Development Plan 2002. It does not update the historic heritage data and contains no information on the historic heritage except for a map of the same four heritage zones recognised in Part B of the Springs Site Development Plan 2002. The Springs Local Area Plan is given effect as Schedule P of the City of Hobart Planning Scheme 1982 (see below).

As with the Springs Site Development Plan 2002, heritage protection is only via the performance based measures for use and development in Code 5.5 (Siting of Buildings). These are essentially the same as in the Springs Site Development Plan 2002, however in the Springs Local Area Plan the second performance criteria requirement – "proposals for any structures must show that it will not adversely affect any item of cultural heritage significance" is replaced by the following performance criteria requirement – "proposals for any structure within Zone D as shown on Map 4 must be consistent with a Conservation Plan".

The Local, State and National Government Management Context

Local Government

Under the Land Use Planning and Approval Act 1993, local government has a responsibility to conserve significant historic heritage. This is achieved through the provisions of a statutory 'planning scheme' generally for each municipality, but in this case it is achieved mainly through the Wellington Park Management Plan (see above) and to a lesser extent through the City of Hobart Planning Scheme 1982 by means of the Springs Local Area Plan which is a schedule of the Plan (included through amendment on 10/11/2004).

State Government

State level historic heritage protective provisions are contained primarily in the Historic Cultural Heritage Act 1995. The Act provides protection for places assessed as being of state level significance (according to set criteria – refer Section 5.4) and listed on the Tasmanian Heritage Register (THR). The Act is administered by the Tasmanian Heritage Council, and it is their role to ensure that the cultural heritage significance of listed places is not diminished through use or works. Under Part 6 of the Act, registered places require Tasmanian Heritage Council approval for all works 'in relation to a registered place which may affect the historic cultural heritage significance of the place'. To ensure appropriate management of registered places there is provision in the Act for 'heritage agreements' to be made with owners of places of historic cultural heritage significance. Alternatively the Tasmanian Heritage Council encourages the preparation of formal conservation management plans, particularly for highly significant heritage places.

There is also provision for temporary protection for unlisted and unassessed sites or places through declaring a place a 'heritage area' which is then treated as a THR listed place (Part 5 of the Act), or through 'stop work orders' (Part 8 of the Act) if it is believed that a development would affect an

---

30 This change was a condition of the RPDC approval of the planning permit for the Springs visitor centre in 2004 (M. Easton, pers comm).
31 Note: No sites in the Springs Area are listed in the City of Hobart Planning Scheme Heritage Schedule at the time of writing.
unregistered historic place considered to have State level significance as defined under the *Historical Cultural Heritage Act 1995*. Stop work orders apply to places that are registered or which are believed to be worthy of registration.

At the time of writing no historic heritage at the Springs was listed on the Tasmanian Heritage Register.

**Federal Government**

Protection for historic heritage at the Federal level is now provided through listing on the National and Commonwealth Heritage Lists under the *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation (EPBC) Act 1999* (& 2003 (Heritage) Amendments). There are no obligations for the protection of sites listed on the RNE since the EPBC legislation was enacted and the *Australian Heritage Commission Act 1975* repealed.

No places in the Springs Precinct are listed on the National Heritage List (although Andrews (2006) has assessed the former Exhibition Gardens as being worthy of listing on the National Heritage List). Historic heritage in the Springs Precinct (and Wellington Park more generally) cannot be put on the Commonwealth Heritage List as neither the area nor any infrastructure are Commonwealth owned.

### 6.2 Issues and Options for the Management of the Springs Cultural Heritage Values

The following is a brief discussion of the issues and opportunities for managing the historic heritage values of the Springs area. It is intended to highlight the issues and opportunities, rather than provide an in depth discussion. It is important however to understand and flag these matters as they are critical in translating the heritage assessment into sound effective heritage conservation advice. Together with the heritage values analysis in Sections 4 & 5, this discussion provides an explanatory framework for the conservation policy for the Springs Precinct. Not all issues raised in consultation are specifically or individually discussed here, but for reference they are listed in Appendix 3.

**Historic Heritage Management within Wellington Park**

Key issues for the management of historic heritage at the Springs have been the overall minimal amount of information about, and prior management of, the historic heritage at the Springs. These are not particular issues for the Springs area and have been identified as key issues for historic heritage management in Wellington Park and Hobart's bushland areas more generally (McConnell 2003, McConnell & Scripps 2005). McConnell & Scripps (2005) see that for Wellington Park the lack of heritage identification leads to the historic heritage of the Park remaining essentially 'unknown', which in turn leads to the historic heritage being 'invisible' as a management need. This is issue is seen as applying to the Springs (at least up to the present study).

Although historic heritage assessment was undertaken in the 1990s for the development of the *Wellington Park Management Plan* and for the development of the *Springs Site Development Plan* (refer Section 2), this work focussed on the remnant fabric in the landscape and did not move beyond the preliminary inventory level, hence was not able to provide a useful basis for management as can be seen from the issues that were raised in relation historic heritage and social values in the recent proposed hotel development (refer summary of *Public Representations to HCC* comments in Appendix 3).
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The need for comprehensive advice for the management of the historic heritage of the Springs as whole was recognised in the Wellington Park audit (McConnell & Scripps 2005). McConnell & Scripps (2005) noted that the Springs was one of three areas in Wellington Park that, based on its history, potentially had a high density of historic heritage, and potentially was a precinct (as recognised in the Wellington Park Management Plan 2005). Given this potential high level of heritage and also the high development potential, the Springs area and the Pinnacle area were both recommended as being of the highest priority for comprehensive heritage studies.

The current Initial Conservation Policy (ie, this document) is seen as an important step in addressing this urgent need for detailed advice for the management of the historic heritage of the Springs. As noted in Section 1, the Initial Conservation Policy is seen as the first step which will provide urgent interim policy until a more comprehensive conservation management plan can be produced in the longer term. In this sense, the preparation of the Initial Conservation Policy can be considered an opportunity to address a key issue raised in the Wellington Park Historic Heritage Inventory & Audit (McConnell & Scripps 2005) and to implement one of the detailed recommendations of the Audit (and also a recommendation of Andrews (2006)).

The Initial Conservation Policy is also seen as important in identifying the area and values of the 'Springs Precinct' and in providing advice that considers the Springs Precinct as a whole rather than a set of individual sites. A holistic approach is seen as important because of the interconnected nature of the history and consequently the physical heritage of the area which requires an integrative assessment and management approach. Such an approach is also seen as important for using the site specific conservation advice that has already been prepared for the former Exhibition Gardens (Andrews 2006) (refer discussion below).

**Planning Context**

A review of the planning framework for the Springs area (refer Section 6.1, above) shows that there are major opportunities as well as major limitations in respect of historic heritage management.

Both the Wellington Park Management Plan 2005 and the Springs Site Development Plan 2002 provide a major opportunity for the conservation (ie, protection and recognition) of the historic heritage of the Springs through the various management goals and objectives, and in the case of the Wellington Park Management Plan 2005, the specific policy and prescriptions for management (refer Table 1). The heritage assessment of the Springs carried out as part of the preparation of the Initial Conservation Policy indicates that desirable historic heritage conservation policy is consistent with the management objectives of both plans, and the Initial Conservation Policy can provide supportive management advice to enable these management objectives to be met.

In terms of how this achieved however, much less direction is provided. The Wellington Park Management Plan 2005 as the overarching management plan does not provide this level of advice, but relies on (and provides for) subsidiary plans to do this. The Springs Site Development Plan 2002 is one of these subsidiary plans. This plan however, as the name suggests, is development focussed (ie, is essentially a development control), and one of the main limitations from an historic heritage perspective is that it only deals with this aspect of management at the Springs and does not provide general advice on how to manage the historic heritage values of the Springs. The Springs Local Area Plan, which is essentially the Springs Site Development Plan 2002, also has the same deficiency. Both area plans are also considered to have deficiencies with respect to how well the development controls provide for the protection and other conservation of significant historic heritage values (ie, meet the objectives for historic heritage conservation in the planning documents that apply to the Springs) (Sheridan 2004, McConnell 2004, McConnell & Scripps 2005).
It should be recognised in relation to the *Springs Site Development Plan 2002* that the heritage assessment and provisions for heritage management are of a preliminary nature only. This is not explicit in the document, but the wording (Appendices, Section 3) makes this clear, eg, "*Interim recommendations for the future use of the site are suggested, and will be subject to more rigorous debate*" (SSDP, 2002, p37, present author's emphasis). The four heritage zones delineated were clearly presented as indicative zones as indicated by their circular nature and associated discussion of their nature. The issue here lies in the fact that the advice appears to have been treated as final advice rather than recognising its preliminary nature. This is evident at a general level in the application of the zones in the performance based development assessment approach. The zones have also constrained the focus of historic heritage assessments undertaken in relation to the recent proposed hotel development (eg, in the Austral Archaeology (2005) assessment).

Clearly these issues need to be addressed. In general terms this can be achieved by the Initial Conservation Policy which is intended to developed comprehensive policy for historic heritage based on significantly better data than underpinned the *Springs Site Development Plan 2002*. However to ensure the policy is translated into active management, the policies in the Initial Conservation Policy need to be endorsed by the WPMT and HCC, and both area plans amended to recognise the Initial Conservation Policy (and subsequent conservation management plan).

It is also important in this context that the Initial Conservation Policy policies and prescriptions are treated as an integrated set of policy rather than a set of policies from which particular policies are selected. As the overarching plan for Wellington Park that also provides for supporting documents at a general level, no amendment of the *Wellington Park Management Plan 2005* is required for the Initial Conservation Policy to have effect (although the Initial Conservation Policy should be recognised in the document when it is next reviewed).

**High Public Interest**

A third key issue and opportunity for historic heritage management at the Springs is the very high level of public interest which attaches to Mt Wellington and, by virtue of the fact it is part of Mt Wellington, to the Springs. The level of public attachment is unusually strong and derives from the unusual conjunction of having a very dominant landscape feature and very large area of essentially undeveloped high quality reserved public land on the fringe of a major population centre which makes it symbolically and aesthetically important as well as a major recreational destination for the residents of greater Hobart.

This strong level of public interest in Wellington Park, including Mt Wellington, was recognised by McConnell & Scripps (2005) in the *Wellington Park Historic Heritage Inventory & Audit* as one of the three key management issues for historic heritage in Wellington Park, and considered by them to create a highly complex context for management. They consider it to be an almost unmatched level of complexity for any reserved land in the Australian context. This complexity obviously has implications for heritage management – such as the need to consider the broader context for historic heritage management, for historic heritage management to be integrated with other values management where possible, a need for sound management practices, and the need to understand and conserve the social values as well as the fabric based heritage values. Although social values have generally not been well recognised in the past, the recent revision of the *Australia ICOMOS Burra Charter* (1999) recognises that community values (social, aesthetic and spiritual values – ie, meanings and associations) are equally important components of cultural

---

32 It should be noted that although the assessment in this document was considered preliminary, it was based on a robust general appreciation of the historic and heritage fabric values, and this can be seen in the similarity of numbers of zones and their location in the *Springs Site Development Plan* compared to the present Initial Conservation Policy.
significance as the historical and scientific values, and recognises people's right to be involved in making management decisions about heritage places.

The strong social valuing of Mt Wellington and the importance of recognising this in management was identified some time ago, and at least as early as 1991 when the Working Group report for the creation of Wellington Park stated –

"The success of any venture for Mountain Park depends on how well it has been researched and whether it represents the majority of the citizens expectations. Because of the proximity to Hobart many people have strong opinions of what they would like to see developed. Hence it will be a massive public relations exercise." (HCC 1991, 44).

This strong degree of public attachment to Mt Wellington and Wellington Park and the consequent need for public involvement in decision making is also recognised in the most recent management document, the Wellington Park Management Plan 2005. However, it could be argued that although there is an established program of community consultation for Wellington Park, particularly in relation to bicycle use and the walking tracks, this still falls short of enabling the nature of the public attachment to be understood and in meeting the level of involvement and management required for such a strong attachment.

It is critical therefore that any historic heritage conservation policy understands and takes into account the social values. Failure to do so will lead to massive public outcry, with downstream issues for management and development. This has been demonstrated by the history of major developments on Mt Wellington over the last 100 years, including the construction of the Pinnacle Road (termed Ogilvie's Scar by its many detractors), a proposal for an aerial cableway to the summit of Mt Wellington (several proposals since the early 1900s), the development of the initial Springs Hotel, and the more recent Springs hotel development proposal.

The present study assessment suggests that the social values of the Springs area require the following as part of the long term management of the Springs –

- maintenance of the views in and out of the Springs,
- maintenance of the essentially natural setting,
- equity of access and use (this has been used as an argument against commercial developments and uses at the Springs and for Wellington Park more generally),
- maintenance of the Springs generally for low-key, passive recreational uses that are traditional and for heritage protection (this explicitly implies maintenance of relative peacefulness and quietness, and avoidance of over-crowding and unrelated commercial activity),
- maintenance of free public access (including access which is not mediated by commercial opportunities or strong HCC control),
- provision of simple, low-key facilities for recreation, primarily by small groups/families (eg, open grassed space, some picnic tables and barbeques, a few shelters, and a toilet) (and for some the present locations of these is important and contributes to their social value),
- maintenance of accessibility (can arrive on foot or by car, and can access picnic space, toilets, track starts, lookouts, etc, by relatively short walks on relatively flat terrain), and
- maintenance of some space for large group events on the same basis as above (ie, the need for one or more private or semi secluded areas which are relatively accessible for low key, passive recreational, group events – eg, family gatherings, parties, weddings, memorial services, small musical or cultural events).

Refer Glossary for an explanation of the term ‘passive’ as used here.

Provision of car parking is seen as being an integral part of car accessibility. Bicycles are not specifically mentioned as a socially valued form of transport to get to the Springs.
The social values therefore strongly inform the nature of use and degree of development which is considered publicly desirable. The social values strongly support the current style and level of use, which is similar to the historic levels of use and oppose large scale and unrelated developments, in particular commercial developments (which is generally consistent with the Wellington Park Management Plan 2005 and Springs Site Development Plan 2002).

Views on new use and development range from non-acceptance of any new use or development (other than upgrading the current style/comfort level of visitor infrastructure) to acceptance of small scale, environmentally safe and sensitive historical or historically compatible uses such as a visitor centre or overnight accommodation. While there is considerable antipathy towards any fully commercial development, including a hotel, there appears to be considerable support for, and interest in, two small scale related developments which do not have a strong commercial imperative. These are an interpretation centre (as opposed to a more commercial, less interpretative visitor centre) and a space for medium scale cultural events such as musical performances (eg, Mountain Festival events) with low key, low impact infrastructure (eg, a stage).

Where current use and new developments are located is also of importance to the local community, particularly the regular users. Most regular users wish to see the current use areas retained for the current uses, and those who support some redevelopment believe the area of the former Springs Hotel is the most appropriate site for this.

It is important to note that the above reflect the social values of the local (greater Hobart) community derived from informal, rather than formal, assessment. Formal consultation is considered unlikely to result in significant change to the above, but is more likely to provide a greater richness and detail to the above considerations. It also needs to be remembered however that it is the local community that most strongly values Mt Wellington. At this stage there has been no consultation with the broader community, but this and more formal consultation with the local community should be undertaken as part of the preparation of the Conservation Management Plan.

The Springs as part of Mt Wellington

An important issue which is related to the above issues and opportunities is the relationship between the Springs and Mt Wellington. The Initial Conservation Policy research indicates that for many people, particularly the local community, the Springs is considered as an indivisible part of Mt Wellington before it is considered a place in its own right. It appears that the Springs is at one level not considered as separate from Mt Wellington, and since Mt Wellington is very strongly socially valued, the Springs by association is strongly (intuitively) socially valued as a place. This is very different to viewing Mt Wellington as simply the 'context' of the Springs, and has implications for the management of the Springs and its historic heritage which include –

- the need to preserve the essentially natural setting (especially the vegetation) of the Springs area to retain the physical and visual continuity with Mt Wellington,
- the need to preserve the Springs area from visual impacts when looking in from outside Wellington Park and from inside Wellington Park (including from key viewing points such as the summit ridge and tracks on the slopes above the Springs) to maintain the area as similarly as possible to the rest of Mt Wellington,
- limiting use and development to that which is appropriate to a natural area reserve – ie, walking, sightseeing and drinking water production.
- for this public land (which has been reserved for conservation purposes) to be managed for free, equitable public access and limited, if any, commercial development, as is the case for the rest of the Hobart face of Wellington Park.
Springs as a Nexus

Although at one level the Springs is seen as an undifferentiated part of Mt Wellington, it is also socially recognised as a special part of Mt Wellington and Wellington Park. In this respect it is seen as a nexus – as a meeting point of a number of major and socially significant walking tracks, as an important meeting point halfway up the mountain, as one of the few accessible, sheltered, level areas in Wellington Park and as an historically important place with a high density of significant historic heritage (because of its historic function as a nexus). Historically the Springs was also a major focus of human use on Mt Wellington and, in addition, was the key visitor destination on the Mountain until the Pinnacle Road was built in 1937.

As an historical and socially constructed nexus, the Springs is a particularly important location on Mt Wellington and within Wellington Park more generally, and again creates an additional imperative to manage the area in a way that is consistent with the historical values, and even more importantly, the social values. The following are seen to be important considerations and objectives in managing the Springs as an historical/social nexus –

- because of the interconnected historical evolution of the Springs and because of the strongly interconnected social values that attach to the Springs as a place, it is extremely important to adopt an holistic approach to the management of the historic heritage of the Springs (which the Initial Conservation Policy, if taken as a whole, attempts to do),
- because of the interconnected historical evolution of the Springs it is important in managing the historic heritage to retain those physical relationships that demonstrate the historical relationships,
- it will be important, in relation to use, to retain the Springs as a meeting point,
- it is important that the Springs area remains as a key junction of walking tracks, and that in relation to this the routes and end points of the significant historic walking tracks are retained (this is particularly important for retaining authenticity).

Springs as a Node for Use & Development

In terms of the overall management of Wellington Park, and in particular Mt Wellington, the Springs is seen as and provided for in the Wellington Park Management Plan 2005 as "the principal area for visitor and management services" (WPMT 2005, p17). Although the reasons for this are not explicit, it is assumed that the primary reason for this objective lies in the fact that the Springs is the only easily accessible, relatively flat, hence usable, area in Wellington Park that is also relatively accessible from Hobart. In addition, it has a relatively sheltered location and has existing public and management facilities and excellent views.

The Wellington Park Management Plan 2005 however puts constraints on this use of the Springs. It does this primarily through the management goals for Wellington Park in which it is specifically stated that community, tourism and recreational use and enjoyment of the Park are to be consistent with the long term protection of the Park's environmental and water catchment values and the retention of the cultural characteristics of the Park (ie, the protection of flora and fauna values, the natural beauty of the land (including features) and water catchment values and the preservation of features of historical, Aboriginal, archaeological, scientific, architectural or geomorphological interest).

The review of the historic heritage values of the Springs indicates that the designation of the Springs Zone as the principal area for visitor and management services is compatible with the historical use of the Springs and in general with the historic heritage values, and as such is a management opportunity. There are some views in the community however that this function would be better served by a 'gateway location' lower down the Mountain.
As discussed above, there are however particular aspects of the cultural significance of the Springs that will impose some constraints the use of the area for visitor and management services if cultural significance is to be retained. In general terms these constraints are –

- the social values,
- the historic heritage values (physical fabric and setting),
- the landscapes/aesthetic values.

The constraints imposed by these values relate mainly to the nature and scale of the use and development, particularly where new uses are being considered, and also to the design (form/appearance) and location of new uses and development. The constraints relating to nature and scale are primarily related to the historical and social values and are discussed above. Location constraints derive from the range of values of the Springs and this is a complex area that is difficult to discuss without specific developments in mind. Design is discussed below (refer Design Considerations, below).

**HCC Management**

HCC management is seen as specific aspect of use and development that needs separate comment. HCC management has significance as an historical activity at the Springs, mainly as a caretaker site, and has strongly influenced the development of the Springs and resulted in a range of historical structures. For this reason and because it is difficult to avoid some management presence (eg, a location near the snow is needed for long-term parking of the snowplough), management is a more legitimate activity at the Springs than new use and development and there is sound precedent to continue this use.

However, like use and development generally, HCC management needs to respect the historic heritage values and other cultural significance of the Springs. This will require care with new infrastructure development. In particular new infrastructure will need to –

- consider and avoid impacts to significant physical fabric,
- be done sensitively to minimise impacts on other values and uses, in particular the social and aesthetic values (refer Design Considerations, below), and
- be kept to a minimum (ie, to essential) to avoid conflict with other values and uses.

It will also require that appropriate processes are put in place to ensure that the above is carefully and fully considered before new HCC use and development. The types of processes and how this can benefit management are discussed in McConnell (2003) and McConnell & Scripps (2005). These processes are important as in the past there have been occasions when there has not been adequate consideration of the cultural significance of the Springs prior to some management actions, and this has resulted in some, to significant, impact on the historic heritage values.

The most significant example is Grays Fire Trail which through its formation (bulldozing) resulted in the destruction of historic heritage (the historic track it used and part of a well preserved area of highly significant Springs early historic heritage). Another example is the development of the western part of the perimeter track in the former Exhibition Gardens into a vehicular track and its extension through to the former hotel garden paddock which resulted in the destruction of significant features of the Exhibition Gardens. Attempts have however been made to consider the cultural values of the Springs in other HCC management infrastructure, and this is reflected in the stone workshed just outside the southern edge of the main picnic area on the lower Springs. The siting has kept the new structure outside the picnic area and kept the visual impacts to a minimum, while the use of concreted stone for the walls and it small size is of sympathetic design. A similar example, although not an HCC management structure is the current toilet building which has also used stone and concrete and a traditional hipped roof form, yet is of innovative style.
Traffic & Safety

Traffic and safety have been raised as issues in connection with the likely increased future use of the Springs for recreation and tourism. In the Springs area generally there is public concern about increased pedestrian risks if the amount of traffic increases. There is also community concern that if levels of use are increased significantly above present levels then this will create significant traffic safety and flow issues on Pillingers Drive-Pinnacle Road, particularly at the Springs and the bottom end of Pillingers Drive given the limited width and scope for widening these roads. There are also historic heritage conservation issues that attach to road widening or other significant modification of both roads as both are of historic heritage significance.

Similar issues apply to the Springs Hotel Loop Road if use of the Upper Springs is significantly increased as the Springs Hotel Loop Road has been identified as also being of historic heritage significance as a route and in relation to the progression of views and the opening up of the vista on arrival at the hotel site. An allied constraint is the accessibility of buses as it is unlikely that large buses (e.g., 42 seat buses) will be able to use the Springs Hotel Loop Road without negative impacts on the historic heritage values, primarily the physical fabric of the road and the visual values of the area. This may not be an issue as there is not a high level of large bus use at present, and increased use could be easily accommodated by mini-buses which should be able to use the existing road. In addition, numbers of large buses are not appropriate on Pillinger Drive–Pinnacle Road due to its narrowness, particularly at the lower end in Fern Tree.

Another traffic-related issue is the need for increased car parking space with higher levels of use and how this will affect the cultural significance of the Springs. The community consultation undertaken indicates that while car parking is important, significant expansion of car parking space is not desired, particularly if it means a loss of public open recreational space (i.e., grassed areas). Vehicle parking is a continued use however, with dedicated parking being provided since Pillingers Drive was opened in the late 1880s.

As with other infrastructure development, car park design and location are also important from an historic heritage conservation point of view. The 1990s overflow car park in the former hotel garden although gravelled is not an appropriate (sympathetic) design and its location appears to have resulted in the bulldozing of archaeological remains related to the former hotel garden. In addition, these impacts appear to have been without purpose as the overflow car park is not used. This also points to the importance of having sound planning underpinning new developments, even apparently minor developments such as car parking. This is also important in relation to general risk management. In considering appropriate locations for car parking it is important to be aware that historically car parking areas were not a dominant feature of the Springs and, apart from some car parking at the Springs Hotel from 1807, parking has been located on the lower Springs level.

New areas of car parking will be essential if there is to be significantly higher levels of use or major developments of the types permitted under the Wellington Park Management Plan 2005. Given the above, there is some scope to cater for new and larger car parking areas without compromising the cultural values of the Springs by understanding the historic heritage values and then carefully considering car park locations, designing them to be unobtrusive and sympathetic, and compensating loss of public recreational space. As well as avoiding impacts on the historic heritage values, there may be opportunities to enhance these. One example that may warrant consideration is whether Pillinger Drive at the Springs has been straightened and if there may be better options for traffic flow and car parking if the original alignment (in the western picnic area) is used. This is also likely to improve the visual quality of the road and its interpretive value, which at present is an unsympathetic straight line through the Springs.

---

35 Dedicated parking included a public stables and a car garage on the Lower Springs level.
Risks to Environmental Values (Water Quality, Weeds, Fire)

Other issues that need to be considered in relation to historic heritage management at the Springs are the environmental risks – to water, native flora through weed invasion and from fire. These issues are considered in other management documents (the Wellington Park Management Plan 2005, Springs Site Development Plan 2002, the Wellington Park Drinking Water Catchment Management Strategy 2002 and the Wellington Park Fire Management Strategy 1999) and are beyond the scope of this historic heritage Initial Conservation Policy, however as management issues and given the spread of the historic heritage values at the Springs, these issues warrant some discussion.

The main fire and water quality risks are likely to come from poor management of recreation and visitation to the Springs and from new developments that require significant new infrastructure. It should be noted in this context that the protection of water quality has been an ongoing issue for the use of the Springs since the mid-late 1800s when the Woods family lived at the Springs, but there has been ongoing use of the Springs over this time. Given this, and the fact that no significant fires are known to have started at the Springs, it would appear that at least for small scale development and use these risks can be successfully managed.

During the development of the Initial Conservation Policy it was noted that in relation to water quality that the spring system in the area is likely to be more complex than the documentation in the Springs Site Development Plan 2002 suggests and to include subsurface drainage onto the lower Springs which may cross surface watersheds. This should be studied in more detail prior to any new major development.

There is also likely to be some risk to the historic heritage values in relation to fire and drinking water management. Both activities have the potential to negatively impact on the historic heritage values as the construction of Grays Fire Trail demonstrates in relation to fire management. It will be important therefore that historic heritage conservation also be taken into account in fire and drinking water management in the Springs area, preferably at the strategic planning and other planning stages (refer also McConnell & Scripps 2005).

Weed management may also impact on the historic heritage values as there are historical plantings at the Springs of introduced species that may be unacceptable weed species. This is considered to be a minor issue at present since only a few exotic historical plantings have survived and most that have (eg, cordylines (yucca), spruce, rhododendrons, daffodils) are not considered to be invasive. Honeysuckle and ivy however are known to exist at the Springs Hotel site and may be more of a weed risk. This situation may be exacerbated if there are attempts to re-create or reconstruct historical gardens which involve the planting of invasive historical species (for example replanting holly which the Springs Hotel was given permission to plant historically).

In considering the existing plantings and future replanting at the Springs and weed issues historical worth needs to be balanced against environmental cost. There is a generally accepted process for assessing the weed risk in relation to historic plantings. This involves assessing the heritage value of species against their level of invasiveness. These measures are outlined in Gilfedder (1995) who presents a useful approach to managing exotic plant species in natural areas. In essence it is a three stage approach (after the cultural heritage values of the site have been assessed) –

1. identification and assessment of the heritage values of the plants at a site;
2. assessment of the plant risk rating (for invasiveness) for the specific location; and
3. develop & implement a program for retention, monitoring or removal of the plant(s) on the basis of the risk rating and cultural values of the plant and site.

This approach should be utilised for all historic plantings and replantings at the Springs where weed risk is being considered. An approach of this type is also required to meet the introduced species policy in the Wellington Park Management Plan 2005 (items 0.10.4 & 6).
Design Considerations

The historical and social values of the Springs are assessed as the most significant cultural values and should therefore strongly inform the design of new infrastructure. Key considerations for design at the Springs appear to be –

- to avoid dominant/dominating structures and significant visual impacts (by keeping size small and heights low),
- to use essentially natural materials (with an emphasis on timber and stone),
- to use historical or historically sympathetic styles and forms.

This should apply to all new construction from car parking areas, tracks, railings and picnic area furniture (including barbeques), to buildings. It should be noted that this does not preclude the introduction of new styles, but requires these to be sympathetic to the historical designs used at the Springs and to the key periods of construction at the Springs, and to maintain an overall rustic feel and connection with the natural setting. As authenticity is an important part of the significance of the Springs, new designs should seek to avoid ‘clever’ but anomalous approaches that are not compatible with history of use of the Springs and its context (an example is the use of sod roofs for buildings, which was mentioned as an inappropriate design during the project consultation).

The Wellington Park Design & Infrastructure Manual (WPMT 2004) has been designed with this type of need in mind and should be the primary initial reference point when considering appropriate design for infrastructure of any type at the Springs. The history of the Springs will provide more fine grained material for consideration. The Initial Conservation Policy has not recognised any specific historic styles that should be retained (partly due to the lack of extant historical infrastructure other than the archaeological remains) except for the balustrading of the Gardens Lookout which appears to be contemporary and is similar to, hence provides continuity with, other recreational historic heritage of the period on the slopes of Mount Wellington (eg, at Gentle Annie Falls).

Existing Heritage Conservation Assessments and Policy

The Former Exhibition Gardens Conservation Management Plan

Although there has been very limited historic heritage research and assessment for the Springs, the former Exhibition Gardens has been studied in detail and a Conservation Management Plan was prepared by Lee Andrews & Associates (2006) (refer also Section 2). Because of this high level of conservation advice that exists for the former Exhibition Gardens, the Initial Conservation Policy has not revisited the Former Exhibition Gardens Conservation Management Plan prepared by Andrews (2006) nor carried out additional research into the former Exhibition Gardens. Consultation in preparing the Initial Conservation Policy has also shown that the conservation policy for the Gardens provided in Andrews (2006) is generally supported by stakeholders, including the local community.

The Former Exhibition Gardens Conservation Management Plan provides comment and suggestions in relation to other historic heritage at the Springs, although it acknowledges this may change with additional research and consideration of the heritage of the Springs as a whole. This has in fact been the case and the Initial Conservation Policy has in some cases generated a slightly different interpretation and assessment based on the additional research that has been carried out and the ability to consider the Springs holistically. It is important therefore that the Initial Conservation Policy is seen to be the primary source of historic heritage conservation advice for the Springs.

In summary, key areas of difference between the Initial Conservation Policy and the Former Exhibition Gardens Conservation Management Plan are as follow (note: these all relate to
The Initial Conservation Policy research has shown that although individual historically recognised areas are linked historically, that these linkages are complex and there are layers of meaning and changes over time (eg hotel garden boundary changes over time) that result in the present day physical relationship being less significant) when assessed in the context of the Springs as a whole than assessed by Andrews (2006). The Initial Conservation Policy research and analysis suggests that while the linkage between the Exhibition Gardens and Hotel Gardens (in particular the boundary between them) is significant, there is no clear historical or present day linkage (other than the demolished Alan Walker Chalet) between the former Exhibition Gardens and the eastern picnic area. Andrews (2006) suggests these areas are linked by virtue of the Exhibition Gardens, Alan Walker Memorial Chalet and Pinnacle Road Springs Base Camp all being Depression employment schemes. Although this is true one was a local employment project while the other was a State project and the present study could find no purposive or other demonstrated historical links between the Exhibition Gardens and the road camp. Furthermore, there appears to have been no strong physical link between the Exhibition Gardens and the Alan Walker Chalet when these were built as these two areas were visually and contextually isolated by native vegetation.

Future Development of the Lower Springs generally: The Initial Conservation Policy analysis suggests that most of the suggested uses of the lower Springs by Andrews (2006) generally would be compatible with the cultural significance of the Springs, however with the exception of restoring the two gardens, the proposed future uses and development are not closely related to historical uses for this area and should be carefully evaluated before implementation. The construction of a viewing platform in the picnic area is not generally supported as it is not considered to enhance the already excellent views from the lower Springs and there is no historical precedent for this.

Hotel Gardens: There are no historic heritage reasons not to recreate the former hotel garden, however it is not considered to be an important conservation outcome as the significance of the area as a garden is not a strongly contributory element to the significance of the Springs Hotel (it was not essential and did not operate throughout the period of the Hotel). Recreation of the Hotel Garden also has some associated issues – 1. it would of necessity be to some extent a hypothetical reconstruction; 2. it would necessitate making decisions about which period of hotel garden and which boundaries should be used given the changes in these two aspects over time; and 3. it has significant management implications that would need to be carefully considered.

Springs Hotel Site: Andrews (2006) comments in relation to this site, including with respect to it being the ‘preferred site of any substantial new building’, is generally supported by the Initial Conservation Policy analysis. Andrews (2006, 75) however notes that any new building at this site should be a new building and not be a replica of the 1907 hotel. Her reasons are that this would create confusion between the historical elements and the reconstruction; and there would be a loss of authenticity as the internal details and historical use would not be able to be reconstructed. Andrews’ (2006) position is supported by some members of the community who note that ‘we should move on’.

While accepting these arguments, it is the view of the present study that there are also some benefits from reconstructing at least the plan and external appearance of the former hotel, since it would be feasible to reconstruct a building with the same external appearance since various photographs and detailed plans for the hotel exist and would ensure the external appearance would not be hypothetical. The present study agrees that creating a replica would be hard to achieve internally given the lack of detail about the fittings and furnishings (and
may not be desirable from a modern hotel management and commercial perspective). A key benefit of at least outwardly reconstructing the 1907 hotel is that it would help understand and interpret this part of the Springs and the Springs as whole which is at present difficult given the lack of a building, and will be even more difficult with a new building on the location (as there will be no sense of the history or historical use of the place). The other advantage of using the same footprint and plans is that there will be less impact on other parts of the site and the building will by definition be sympathetic in style and design and will therefore avoid issues of unsympathetic development.

The above range of views suggests that if there is a proposal for a new building in the Springs Hotel area, then the issue of whether the historical design or a new design is used needs to be fully considered.

One of the recommendations in Andrews (2006) that deserves further discussion is the recommendation to conserve the former Gardens by preserving them as they are today or by partial or full restoration. The restoration of the Gardens has two major issues associated. The first is the difficulty of proceeding given the absence of information about what was planted in the garden and where, hence an element of hypothetical reconstruction is likely to be required. The second issue is the management associated problems of restoration, primarily the cost of restoration and the need for ongoing maintenance of a formal garden. There may also be issues related to the probable co-existence of botanical (heathland community) values with the historic heritage values at this site. On the other hand, the restoration option is favoured by some local and heritage community members who see restoration as enhancing the cultural significance of the Gardens. As explained by one participant, restoration of this and other gardens is seen as important because although conjectural reconstruction may not be desirable for built fabric, in gardens it is important as the plants are the key contributor to the sense of the place, hence the absence of the plants is what significantly detracts. It was accepted that given the lack of information on the historical plantings that the replanting would be experimental, but a number of suggestions were offered to assist in achieving a good heritage outcome. If there is a strong desire to restore the former Exhibition Gardens, then it is a management action that will need to be carefully evaluated.

**Terry’s (2001) Springs Hotel Assessment**

Terry’s (2001) assessment of the Springs Hotel also requires some reassessment in the light of the broader assessment of the Springs historic heritage. It would appear from the present study that while Terry's assessment of the historical and social values is valid –

- there are landscape/aesthetic values that are not recognised (possibly since Terry has only assessed the site against the Tasmanian Heritage Register criteria which do not include aesthetic values); and
- the archaeological values are probably overstated given the main site area is a bedrock bench, the period of use and the post 1967-fire cleaning up of the site.

On this basis the preservation of the limited archaeological features is considered less important for the conservation of the site than Terry suggests, while retaining the landscape values is likely to be more important. The conclusion of the present study is that minor archaeological features which are not rare or which do not have particular scientific value (such as the tennis court asphalt) do not contribute highly to the significance of the site and do not need to be preserved (but should be left if there is no need to remove it), but elements such as feature footprints which demonstrate the location of historic elements, or structural remains that provide an insight into the nature and methods of construction of elements should be of higher priority for retention. The present analysis also suggests that in assessing acceptable change at the site, the potential impacts need to be considered for the whole Springs Hotel site and this needs to be considered in the context of the full Springs area.
Heritage Interpretation & Presentation

As an accessible location in Wellington Park the Springs provides an opportunity for the presentation and interpretation of the natural and cultural values and history of the Springs and Mt Wellington more generally. The Springs also contains a range of cultural and natural values and has superb views (particularly from the upper Springs) which enhance its potential as a site for interpretation. Interpretation/presentation is considered appropriate as, although this is not directly an historic use, it is related to the historical recreational use of the area, and the former Exhibition Gardens can be considered to have presented native flora of Wellington Park.

As with the other current and potential uses there will be constraints on presentation. These include the provisions of the Wellington Park Management Plan 2005 which requires that interpretation and education be related to the values and management of the Park, and that an Interpretation Strategy be prepared to provide a coordinated approach to the development of themes and sites for interpretation (WPMT 2005, p81). There will also be historic heritage related constraints, in particular that the presentation should be sympathetic to the historic heritage values and that site interpretation should not place fragile features at risk. This would include avoiding modifications and use impacts to significant physical heritage as well as ensuring all presentation was sympathetic in design and the style of presentation in keeping with the important low key public access nature of the Springs. Other relevant related policy in the Wellington Park Management Plan 2005 is that all interpretation of historic heritage should conform to the Burra Charter.

The Wellington Park Historic Heritage Inventory & Audit (McConnell & Scripps 2005) also provides advice and recommendations for presentation, mainly in relation to the heritage values of Wellington Park. The Audit also recommends that all historic heritage interpretation (and presentation) is based on an Interpretation Strategy for Wellington Park as a whole (which clearly would need to consider historic heritage). The Audit also recommends that historic heritage interpretation should be based on a Park wide review to identify the issues and opportunities for historic heritage interpretation and review within the Park, and that all presentation should be sympathetic to the historic heritage in its design.

Ongoing Historic Heritage Management

In terms of the range of actions that are required for historic heritage management (as per the process for heritage conservation set out in the Burra Charter) very little active management of the historic heritage has occurred to date at the Springs (other than the preparation of the Former Exhibition Gardens Conservation Management Plan and associated investigations). As McConnell (2003) and McConnell & Scripps (2005) discuss, this has been very much the case for all of Wellington Park and the HCC bushland areas until recently. With the preparation of the Springs Initial Conservation Policy the first two steps of the process – understanding the cultural significance of the Springs historic heritage and developing policy to conserve the significance - will have been achieved. With the implementation of the Initial Conservation Policy management will have progressed to the third step of active management. This should be considered as a significant milestone for historic heritage in Wellington Park (another being the preparation of the Wellington Park Historic Heritage Audit).

The final step of the Burra Charter process, monitoring and review, also needs to be provided for. Given that this Initial Conservation Policy is in effect an initial or preliminary policy, it is considered appropriate that prescriptions for monitoring be developed in the more comprehensive

---

36 In this discussion ‘interpretation’ means the information (content) about whatever is being discussed, while ‘presentation’ means the way in which the interpretation (information) is made available (ie, what media is used, what it looks like, where it is). The distinction is made here as how information is presented can have much greater potential impact on heritage values than what information is presented.
recommended Conservation Management Plan for the Springs. The preparation of this Conservation Management Plan is also an appropriate opportunity for the review of this Initial Conservation Policy.

As flagged elsewhere, further research and analysis will be required to develop the more comprehensive Conservation Management Plan. Additional research that has been identified in preparing the Initial Conservation Policy is as follows –

- **additional field survey**: systematic survey of the core heritage area of the Springs Precinct (ie, the identified special management zones), survey in better visibility conditions (where possible) of the non-core area, and targetted survey to locate the Childs Grave and formation of the Springs Timber Tramway above Grays Fire Trail, which are the two only identified but as yet unlocated sites in the Springs Precinct;

- **additional historic research**: some targetted research of archival and oral sources is required to provide more reliable and detailed data on a number of the identified sites;

- **landscape and aesthetic values research**: assessment of the landscape and aesthetic values has not been formally undertaken as part of the Initial Conservation Policy, but because landscape and aesthetic values have been identified as significant values for the Springs Precinct, then these should be formally assessed;

- **community consultation**: community consultation has been very restricted in the preparation of the Initial Conservation Policy and the limited range of sources used (in part because of their ease of accessibility) may have created some biases in the results, hence broader consultation (ie, with more people in the various communities of interest and a wider range of communities of interest) is required to develop a better appreciation of the social values that attach to the Springs; and

- **comparative analysis**: the amount of comparative analysis undertaken in the preparation of the Initial Conservation Policy has been small and largely based on the author's personal knowledge (largely restricted to Tasmania in relation to the heritage values being considered) and to the existing Springs assessments, primarily the work of Sheridan (2004) and Andrews (2006) in relation to landscape values and the former Exhibition Gardens. Comparative analysis is essential for assessing the level of significance of the historic heritage, which in turn is critical to developing sound conservation policy. As key elements of the Springs historic heritage may be of high level significance it is important that such research be undertaken. Themes and related sites that are seen as particularly requiring comparative analysis are grand landscapes & their historical appreciation, the tourism movement of the late 1800s/early 1900s (especially those based around natural features), 19th century water supply, and Depression employment in Australia.

### 6.3 Towards a Conservation Policy for the Historic Heritage Values of the Springs

In conformance with the Australia ICOMOS (1999) *Burra Charter* this Initial Conservation Policy takes a values based approach to historic heritage management. This approach is defined in Article 2 of the *Burra Charter* which states that "places of cultural significance should be conserved" and that "the aim of conservation is to retain the cultural significance of a place" (refer Section 1.5 for the Burra Charter definition of significance).

The particular evolution of the historical use of the Springs, seen as an integral part of Mt Wellington, has led to the historical and social values being unarguably the key cultural values of the Springs, with the physical heritage and landscape/aesthetic values being very important, but
secondary, values. The actual values provide a strong basis for the development of conservation policy and long term management.

Analysis of the management context indicates that historic heritage conservation can operate generally within current statutory framework and provisions of the Wellington Park Management Plan 2005, and generally in-line with the management objectives of the Springs Site Development Plan 2002 and current Springs Local Area Plan, and what is desired is very similar to the historical and present day uses. The key issue appears to be ensuring new use and development is compatible with the conservation of the cultural heritage values of the Springs. The other key issue identified is ongoing management quality.

The management analysis has also determined that given the existing management context and long term management needs for the Springs Precinct, the best approach to providing detailed conservation policy for the Springs as a whole is to recognise both site specific management needs and special heritage zones within the Springs Precinct which have particular historic heritage and other cultural values, hence management requirements (and to provide conservation advice for each zone).

In addition, in formulating the initial conservation policy for the Springs, it is important to keep in mind that this is, as the name suggests, only initial or preliminary advice, and that there is a need and an undertaking to prepare a comprehensive conservation management plan in the longer term.
7 INITIAL CONSERVATION POLICY

7.1 Overarching Conservation Policy

1. The Springs Precinct will be recognised as an area of high cultural significance, primarily for its historical and social values, but also for its scientific (archaeological) values, its aesthetic values and its landscape values and natural setting.\(^{37}\)
   
   **Rationale:** This recognises the high level and range of cultural significance of the Springs Precinct.

2. All use and management will recognise and respect the special relationship of the Springs to the Pinnacle and Mt Wellington as a whole, as well as the relationship of Mt Wellington and Hobart.
   
   **Rationale:** This recognises a key aspect of the cultural significance of the Springs Precinct, in particular the high social and landscape value.

3. All use and management will recognise and respect the continued historical and contemporary uses of the Springs for 1. primarily low key, non-commercial\(^{38}\), passive\(^{39}\) and dominantly outdoor recreation, 2. provision of limited facilities for visitors to the mountain, 3. water supply and, to a lesser extent, for 4. scientific work and 5. nature appreciation; and their strongly historically interconnected nature.
   
   **Rationale:** This recognises key aspects of the cultural significance of the Springs Precinct, in particular the high, interrelated historical and social values which are the primary cultural values of the Springs Precinct.

4. All use and management will recognise and respect the character of the Springs as a public space in an essentially natural and relatively remote, but accessible, setting.
   
   **Rationale:** This recognises a key aspect of the social and historical significance of the Springs Precinct which are the primary cultural values of the Springs Precinct.

5. All use and management will recognise and respect the special cultural significance of the Springs as a nexus.
   
   **Rationale:** This recognises a key aspect of the social and historical values of the Springs Precinct which are the primary cultural values of the Springs Precinct.

6. All use and management will recognise and respect the significant historic heritage (ie, the physical fabric and its setting, and the values which attach) of the Springs Precinct and the authentic, high integrity and interconnected nature of this historic heritage.
   
   **Rationale:** This recognises the cultural significance of the physical historical remains as a whole (primarily the ability to demonstrate the historic evolution of the Springs) as part of the cultural significance of the Springs Precinct.

\(^{37}\) The setting of the Springs is the essentially natural eastern flank of Mt Wellington. The managed open space at the Springs is considered to be part of the Springs proper (refer Glossary for various related terms).

\(^{38}\) This term has a particular meaning in the context of this policy and report – the term is used to reflect wording used by the community and should be taken to mean use that has no cost (monetary) to the user (refer Glossary).

\(^{39}\) This term has a particular meaning in the context of this policy and report – the term is used to reflect wording used by the community and should be taken to mean activities that are essentially quiet, low key, reflective and non-competitive (refer Glossary).
7. All use and management will recognise and respect the special landscape setting, views and viewscape of the Springs Precinct.

*Rationale:* This recognises the important landscape, aesthetic and social values of the Springs Precinct which are important elements of the cultural significance of the Springs Precinct.

8. This Initial Conservation Policy will be used as the primary basis for the conservation and other management of the cultural heritage values of the Springs Precinct (until replaced by more comprehensive conservation advice).

*Rationale:* This recognises the high level of cultural significance and range of cultural heritage values of the Springs Precinct, the need for detailed and effective management policy, and the limited prior historic heritage data and analysis on which historic heritage at the Springs has been based.

9. The conservation and other management of the Springs Precinct will be in accordance with *The Australia ICOMOS Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Significance (The Burra Charter)* (Australia ICOMOS 1999).

*Rationale:* This recognises the importance and status of the Burra Charter guidelines as a standard for cultural heritage practice under the *Wellington Park Management Plan 2005* and the *City of Hobart Planning Scheme 1982*.

### 7.2 Initial Policy – General Heritage Management

2.1 The Springs Precinct as defined in this study will be formally recognised as a ‘precinct’ under the *Wellington Park Management Plan 2005* by the Wellington Park Management Trust. The Precinct boundary is to be that shown in Figure 4 of this Initial Conservation Policy.

2.2 Historical place and feature names in the Springs Precinct that are in use will be retained to recognise and celebrate the history and historic significance of the Precinct. In particular the name ‘the Springs’ for the locality will be retained to recognise the importance of the springs in the history of European use of the area and to celebrate this special Wellington Park natural landscape feature and its unique expression in this locality.

2.3 Notwithstanding the other specific conservation policy in Sections 7.2 -7.7 of this Initial Conservation Policy, the conservation of the cultural heritage values of the Springs Precinct will be on the basis of the five recognised precinct management zones (as shown in Figure 4) and the specific policy/prescriptions for these zones (as set out in Table 2).

2.4 As part of good management and as part of the *Burra Charter* process, the use, management and condition of the significant historic heritage and other significant cultural heritage values of the Springs Precinct will be routinely monitored (and the monitoring results be fed back into management).
2.5 Heritage management in the Springs Precinct will be based on a sound understanding of the cultural heritage values; and to this end further research will be taken into these values as required or desirable.

Specific additional recommended heritage research (other than that specified in Table 3 and the Endnotes table) includes, but is not limited to –

- systematic survey in the less historically used areas when visibility conditions permit (refer policy/prescriptions Zone 5) in particular to locate and document the Childs Grave site, and the Springs Timber Tramway above Grays Fire Trail;
- comprehensive survey of the former Exhibition Gardens (Zone 4) when visibility conditions permit;
- detailed field based recording (including accurate survey) of all identified historic heritage sites and features;
- greater historical analysis of the more recent (20th century) history;
- research into the historical and contemporary landscape values;
- formal social values research which recognises the various communities of interest;
- comparative analysis to assist in assessing the State and National level significance of the Springs; and
- research to ensure the range of natural values area well understood – in particular local flora, geology/geomorphology and water (ground water flow and springs) – as the natural features have a complex relationship to the historic heritage through their historical use and appreciation and as the socially values natural setting.

7.3 Initial Policy – Conservation of the Physical Heritage

3.1 Notwithstanding the other specific conservation policy in Sections 7.2-7.7 of this Initial Conservation Policy, the individual historic heritage sites and features identified in this Initial Conservation Policy are to be managed in accordance with the 'Management Requirements' for individual historic heritage sites and features as set out in the summary table in the Endnotes.

3.2 Reconstruction of historic heritage sites and/or features is to be strictly limited to repair and restoration (refer Burra Charter) (note: under the Wellington Park Management Plan 2005 hypothetical reconstruction is not permitted). Restoration in this policy can be taken to include the reinstatement of historical routes and sections of historical routes, and other reinstatement of relatively small portions of sites where the reinstatement is not hypothetical.

There appears to be a case for allowing for the restoration of the former Exhibition Gardens with only very limited knowledge of the original plantings. If restoration of this site is desired, then the decision to proceed in this direction needs to be carefully assessed from both a heritage conservation and a general management perspective.
3.3 Exotic plantings within the Springs Precinct which are related to the historical significance of the Precinct are to be retained except where their retention will, or has high potential to, impact on the natural values, including as a high weed risk. To determine the level of risk for any plantings, an assessment process along the lines of that recommended by Gilfedder (1995) should be adopted.

(Note: The conservation of the physical heritage values of the Springs is also provided for through other policies in the Springs Precinct Initial Conservation Policy.)

7.4 Initial Policy – Landscape Values Conservation

4.1 In order to respect the aesthetic and other scenic and social values of the Springs Precinct the significant views out of the Springs Precinct, both up to the upper slopes and summit of Mt Wellington and out and down across Hobart and southeastern Tasmania will be retained in all locations from which they occur. In addition, no actions should be taken within the Springs Precinct that will have a negative impact on the viewscape (historical or contemporary) provided by the Springs from within Wellington Park (in particular from the upper slope of the eastern face of Mt Wellington) or from outside the Park.

7.5 Initial Policy – Conservation of Social Values

5.1 Ongoing management of the Springs, including use and development, will provide for continued low key public recreation of the Springs Precinct as its primary non-conservation use.

5.2 The natural setting of the Springs Precinct will be retained as the dominant Springs Precinct setting to retain the natural values, the feel of being in an essentially natural environment and the feeling of remoteness from Hobart.

5.3 The social significance of the three main areas of managed (and regularly used) open public space at the Springs will be recognised by retaining these areas for public use and recreation, or retaining the same approximate land area of similarly managed and developed open space elsewhere at the Springs (other areas which are appropriate to use in this way from a heritage conservation perspective are other parts of Zone 3, mainly the former hotel garden area).

The valued character of the managed open, public spaces will be retained through the maintenance of the natural surrounds and provision of low key facilities such as picnic tables, barbeques and small shelters while limiting intrusive non-recreational development within the managed open spaces, and by avoiding restrictions on the

---

40 The setting of the Springs is the essentially natural eastern flank of Mt Wellington. The managed open space at the Springs is considered to be part of the Springs proper (refer Glossary for various related terms).

41 Public use is meant in a broad sense (refer Glossary).
recreational use as a result of commercial use or development.

(Note: the above only applies to discrete areas managed for low key use area (ie, the 2 lower Springs picnic areas and the Springs Hotel platform) or planned alternative locations. Note also that high levels of use and crowding are not appropriate in these areas as this type of experience is not in keeping with the character and historical and socially valued use of the Springs).

(Note: The conservation of the social values of the Springs is also provided for through other policies in the Springs Precinct Initial Conservation Policy.)

### 7.6 Initial Policy – Heritage Interpretation & Presentation

6.1 The Springs Precinct is an appropriate location for the interpretation and presentation of the values and history of the Springs and Mt Wellington more generally given its long-term historical use, its cultural and natural values, its views, the focal nature of the area historically, and its accessibility as a site within Wellington Park.

6.2 All interpretation and presentation of the values and history in the Springs Precinct should be based on an Interpretation Strategy for Wellington Park as a whole (which considers all the key values of the Park, including the historic heritage).

6.3 All heritage interpretation and presentation of the values and history in the Springs Precinct should be in keeping with the dominantly low key public use of the Springs, and its natural setting and other cultural and natural values in its location, style and quantity.

6.4 Presentation of the history and historic heritage in the Springs Precinct should not impact on the physical historic heritage and should not involve reconstruction of this historic heritage (refer policy 3.2)

### 7.7 Policy Implementation and Review

7.1 The *Springs Precinct Initial Conservation Policy* is to be recognised as the primary policy for the management of the historic heritage values of the Springs, to be achieved in the first instance by its endorsement by the Wellington Park Management Trust and the Hobart City Council.

7.2 The *Springs Site Development Plan 2002* will be amended to give the *Springs Precinct Initial Conservation Policy* effect as the primary policy for the management of the historic heritage values of the Springs. For consistency, the *Springs Local Area Plan* (ie, Schedule P of the *City of Hobart Planning Scheme 1982*) should also be amended.

*(This recognises the overarching primary nature of the WPMP in the management of)*

---

42 In this discussion ‘interpretation’ means the information (content) about whatever is being discussed, while ‘presentation’ means the way in which the interpretation (information) is made available (ie, what media is used, what is looks like, where it is). Refer also to the Glossary.
7.3 This Springs Precinct Initial Conservation Policy will be replaced by a comprehensive Conservation Management Plan for the Springs Precinct (or redefined precinct area) (note: a CMP was endorsed as the second stage of the process for developing conservation management advice for the Springs as part of the endorsement for preparing the Initial Conservation Policy).

The Conservation Management Plan should be completed within five years and be based on more detailed research and analysis (in particular comparative analysis and social values research) (refer also policy 2.5).

7.4 The preparation of a Springs Precinct Conservation Management Plan (see policy 7.3) will constitute the next review of the Springs Precinct Initial Conservation Policy. Requirements for ongoing review should be set by the Conservation Management Plan.

Note: No policy or recommendation is made for the listing of heritage sites in the Springs Precinct or of the Springs Precinct as a whole as part of the Springs Precinct Initial Conservation Policy on the basis that 1. this should await more detailed research and analysis of the sites and the precinct as a whole and is therefore more appropriately the role of the Conservation Management Plan when it is prepared; and 2. adequate recognition and protection of the historic heritage will be provided for in the interim by the adoption of the policy contained in this Initial Conservation Policy. The only site which is sufficiently understood (and documented) to be listed at this stage is the Former Exhibition Gardens.
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Table 2: Precinct Management Zones – Description, Management Objectives and Management Policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Heritage Management Objectives</th>
<th>Specific Policy/Prescriptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>EARLY HISTORIC ZONE</td>
<td>To preserve the physical remains related to the early historical use of the area.</td>
<td>1. Identified historic heritage will be recorded in detail and accurate mapping produced to provide a basis for management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This zone encompasses the early historical (1831 – c.1907) development and use in the Springs area and its significant historic heritage remains which demonstrate the close interrelationship between water supply, recreation and management at the Springs. It also includes those natural attributes within the Springs Zone that were the catalyst for the focus of historical use of the Springs (ie, the springs and views). The zone is one of a dense cluster of archaeological remains related exclusively to this early historical use. The key sites included in the zone are the 1831 Diversion (part); the junction of the Fingerpost (&amp; Radfords) Track, the Wellington Falls Track, the Ice House Track and Pinnacle Track; the main 19th &amp; early 20th century shelter sheds; and Woods' (c.1859-1880) and Gadd's (c.1891-c.1907) dwellings and associated activity areas which are represented by a complex of terraces, platforms, tracks and building remains. This zone is highly significant in relation to the historical values of the Springs as this is the area in which all known 19th century use of the Springs occurred (other than use of the tracks) and the area from which later use evolved. The area is also highly significant because it retains a high integrity set of physical (archaeological) remains related to all elements of this historic use, and the area overall has high integrity. The area also contains natural and aesthetic values that relate to the early historic use (ie, views to mountain and over Hobart, springs, natural setting/vegetation). The individual sites within the zone range from local to state (and possibly national) level significance.</td>
<td>To preserve the significant views from the area.</td>
<td>2. Conservation works will be undertaken as necessary in order to preserve the extant physical fabric.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To protect the landscape and other natural setting of the physical remains.</td>
<td>3. Conservation work (including vegetation removal) may be undertaken within site and feature areas and immediately adjacent in order to restore, partially restore or repair historical fabric, layout and/or views where this does not impact on other cultural or natural values. (Note – reconstruction of historic heritage sites generally in this zone is not considered desirable for a range of reasons, including the potential to impact on the heritage of the area and the fact hypothetical reconstruction would be required. In particular the dwellings and outbuildings associated with Gadd's and Wood's occupation should not be reconstructed).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To provide for the continuation of the key significant continued uses (ie, water supply and passive, pedestrian based recreation.</td>
<td>4. No new use is to occur in this zone that is not sympathetic to the historic heritage value of this zone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To preserve the historical relationship of the historic heritage.</td>
<td>5. No new development is to occur in this zone. Signs?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To retain the historical and physical links with the other historical use areas of the Springs Precinct and adjacent areas.</td>
<td>6. No mechanised machinery (other than portable machinery) is to be used in this zone except on Grays Fire Trail unless special permission is provided by the WPMT (and then only where the use can be demonstrated not to have an impact on the historic heritage values of the zone).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To present the historic heritage values consistent with the above objectives.</td>
<td>7. No vegetation should be removed except as necessary for natural and cultural values management. In this context consideration should be given to minimising power line easements and retaining low height shrubbery vegetation in the easements (instead of clearing easements) within the zone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8. Grays Fire Trail is not to be widened or upgraded in such a way as to create additional visual or visual impact; and no associated infrastructure is to be installed within the zone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9. No modification of the 1831 Diversion should be undertaken except for water supply and quality management purposes (or conservation purposes – see items 2 &amp; 3 above). In this case the work should only occur after formal assessment of the site/site complex and be guided by conservation policy for the site based on the assessment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2 SPRINGS HOTEL ZONE

This zone is the core area of the former Springs Hotel building and immediate grounds, associated outbuildings and infrastructure (including footpaths, service roads and access roads), plantings and a rubbish dump, as well as containing important walking tracks. (Note: the zone does not contain the former hotel garden and grazing area (which is contained in Zones 3 and 4), and, in the case of tracks, tramways and roads, only contains the sections in the immediate vicinity of the former hotel).

The Springs Hotel operated from 1907 to 1967 when it was burnt in the bushfires. It was a major focus of use by hotel guests and by day users of the Springs during its life. In the last c.20 years the open grassed tennis court has been used for private group activities such as parties, large family picnics and memorial services, and the car park below is the main walker car parking area at the Springs.

The Springs Hotel Zone is of high historical and social significance as the site of the Springs Hotel. The large open flat area within the zone (the hotel building site - tennis court) has local social significance as a private public use area suited to group use and as an access point to various major walking tracks in the area. It is also has significant views up to the mountain and out to Hobart and beyond. The archaeological remains of the hotel are of some significance and the earlier tracks which pass through the area are highly significant. The essentially natural setting of the area is also of some significance.

| 2 | SPRINGS HOTEL ZONE | 10. Walking tracks are to be managed so as to retain their historic alignments and nature. Alignments will not be modified except to return them to historic alignments.  
  | | 11. All presentation of the historic heritage of the zone is to be low key, have a low visual impact, and have no impact on the physical heritage and its setting. |

| 1. The area is to be managed as a visitor and public use focus.  
  | 2. Public access (ie, free access) to the developed and historical areas of the zone is to be maintained.  
  | 3. Significant physical heritage features are to be retained (refer to Table 1).  
  | 4. Vegetation removal in this zone should be kept to a minimum and should be restricted to essential purposes (including removal of potentially invasive species). In this context the widespread removal of native vegetation is not appropriate, but vegetation can be cleared immediately adjacent to or within heritage sites and features for heritage management purposes (including presentation).  
  | 5. Walking tracks are to be managed so as to retain their historic alignments and nature. Alignments will not be modified except to return them to historic alignments or where naturally induced changes cannot be repaired.  
  | 6. All use, including new use, in this zone is to be sympathetic to, and in keeping with, the historical use and the other cultural significance of this zone as a focus of visitation and public use. New uses unrelated to historical and contemporary uses should not be allowed.  
 | 7. All new development in this zone is to be sympathetic to, and in keeping with, the significant historical use and the other cultural significance of this zone as a focus of visitation and public use. To achieve this –  
  | • All new development is to be restricted to existing developed areas (i.e., areas which have been recognisably modified), and development should seek to re-use existing sites for the same/similar functions.  
  | • New buildings (other than small outbuildings) are to be contained on the levelled area of the Springs Hotel site (i.e., area of former hotel, croquet lawn and tennis court) will be no higher than 2 stories above the present bench level; and will have sufficient set back from the terrace edge to allow for open, publicly accessible ground on the east and south sides.  
  | • No major new roads are to be constructed, and significant... |
### LOWER SPRINGS 20thC USE ZONE

This zone is the main area of early-mid 20th century use and development at the Springs. It includes those areas that have been used for grazing and gardens since c.1907 by the Springs hotel, sites related to Depression employment public works (Springs Depot, Pinnacle Road and Alan Walker Chalet), and the main public use area which has been a picnic area and public use area since the early 1930s. The area also contains current HCC management facilities (tool shed and snow plough shed). (Note: the Former Exhibition Gardens is recognised as a zone in its own right given that it is a discrete area with specific management requirements – see Zone 4).

The area is historically significant in relation to the use by the Springs Hotel, Depression employment, and the mid-late 20th century public recreation which is based on enjoyment of an essentially natural setting with special views of the upper slopes of Mt Wellington.

- To retain the historical significance of the area as the site of Great Depression employment works, for its associations with the former Springs Hotel, and as a focus of 20th century public recreational use.
- To retain the social significance of the area as a low-key, passive, public recreational area, and as the main public use recreational area at the Springs.
- To preserve the culturally significant physical remains of historic use.
- To maintain the significant natural setting.
- To preserve the significant views from the area.
- To present the cultural and historical meaning of the area.

### Alteration to the Springs Hotels Loop Road

Alteration to the Springs Hotels Loop Road (particularly in the southern section) is not acceptable.

- All new buildings and other structures will avoid significant impacts to the visual (including scenic outlook and inlook) and other heritage values of the zone through appropriate design (form, style, colours, materials, etc).
- All new development will incorporate a heritage assessment in the design and planning stage, and will incorporate relevant impact mitigation advice arising from the assessment (see item 5).
- If use of the hotel terrace as ‘private public’ space for ‘private public’ group uses is lost or significantly compromised by new uses or development, then an alternative usable ‘private public’ space must be provided zone 3.

8. Prior to any significant change to the use of the area or any new development, an historic heritage impact assessment is to be carried out to provide specific heritage impact mitigation and management advice.

9. Presentation of the historic heritage of the zone should be sympathetic to the cultural significance of the zone.
natural values of the Springs, and Mt Wellington more broadly if desired, consistent with the above objectives.

5. All use, including new use, in this zone is to be sympathetic to, and in keeping with, the historical use and the other cultural significance of this zone. New uses unrelated to historical use of the Springs should not be permitted.

6. Given the significance and nature of the public recreational use in this zone, the currently managed (and regularly used) open public space at the Springs will be retained for public use and recreation, or the same approximate land area of similarly managed and developed open space will be provided elsewhere in Zone 3.

7. All new development in this zone is to be sympathetic to, and in keeping with, the significant historical use and the other cultural significance of this zone.

8. Consistent with new development being sympathetic to, and in keeping with, the significant historical use and the other historic heritage values of the zone new development should –
   - be sited to avoid their domination of the open spaces (i.e., within vegetated areas or placed to the side or on the edge of open spaces) and viewscape impacts;
   - be small in scale,
   - be simple and of plain, rustic or other appropriately traditional design and style,
   - seek to use natural and natural-appearing materials in the construction and finish (with an emphasis on stone, concrete and timber).

9. All new development will be preceded by detailed heritage survey, assessment and recording in (and adjacent to) the development area. Where new heritage is identified a heritage impact assessment should be carried out to provide specific heritage impact mitigation and management advice.

10. All ground disturbing works in the zone should be archaeologically monitored.

11. Presentation of the historic heritage of the zone should be sympathetic to the historic heritage values of the zone.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4 EXHIBITION GARDENS ZONE</th>
<th>This zone is the area defined as the <em>Former Exhibition Gardens</em> (Andrews 2006). (Note: the boundary has been determined separately by the WPMT by analysis of the historical data, archaeological features mapped by Austral Archaeology (2005) and field</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- To recognise the Former Exhibition Gardens as a place of cultural significance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- To protect the ‘fabric’ of the Former Exhibition Gardens.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- To protect the setting of the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. This zone (i.e., within the zone) is to be managed as per the *Former Exhibition Gardens Conservation Management Plan* (Andrews 2006) policy and guidelines. Where this is incompatible with the policy contained in the *Springs Precinct Initial Conservation Policy*, then the Initial Conservation Policy will have precedence.
### The Springs Initial Conservation Policy

A Wellington Park Management Trust Report

McConnell, A. (August 2007)

---

The Former Exhibition Gardens was a fully planted-out, semi-formal native plant (and rhododendron) garden designed and started by A.C. Walker in 1931, and completed by L.M. Shoobridge in 1932. The gardens were established with funds raised from an Exhibition, also held in 1931, as a Depression employment scheme. The Gardens retains the hard landscaping (eg, path and garden edging, rock hedges and water features), some plant remains (a few rhododendrons and eucalypt lignotubers) and the associated lookout.

The Former Exhibition Gardens is regarded as having outstanding cultural significance. It is regarded as being unique in Australia, and as being of historical, aesthetic, social and scientific significance at the national, state, and local levels (Andrews 2006).

---

### 5 SPRINGS PRECINCT GENERAL ZONE

This zone comprises that part of the Springs Precinct that is not a special heritage management area.

The zone has had little known historic use other than for access to and from the Springs. The known cultural heritage values that attach to the zone are the historic walking and other tracks and their essentially natural setting; and the natural environment generally which is part of the strongly socially valued landscape and natural environment of the eastern face of Mt Wellington as a whole.

- To identify and preserve the culturally significant physical heritage remains of this zone and their heritage values.
- To maintain the significant natural setting of the Springs area and individual sites within the zone.

1. Significant physical heritage features are to be retained (refer recommendations for individual sites/features in Table 1).
2. Walking tracks are to be managed so as to retain their historic alignments and nature. Alignments will not be modified except to return them to historic alignments.
3. To maintain the essentially natural setting of the significant historic sites in this zone, and in the Springs Precinct more generally, vegetation removal in this zone should be kept to a minimum and should be restricted to essential management purposes.
4. All new development is to be preceded by a heritage impact assessment (to include on-ground survey) to provide specific heritage impact mitigation and management advice.
5. Given that this area has had minimal prior archaeological survey, systematic archaeological survey should be carried out (by the WPMT/HCC) when conditions allow for more reliable archaeological survey (eg, after fire).
6. Identified historic heritage will be recorded in detail and accurate mapping produced to provide a basis for management.
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Summary of the historic heritage of the Springs Precinct – history, nature, significance, and management requirements.

(Notes: 1) The data provided here is only summary data. Apart from the historical information (refer Appendix 2), site and feature photographs (Appendix 3) and a more detailed discussion of significance for the sites of high significance (refer Section 5.3), this reflects the limited nature of assessment and documentation of the individual features (more information is available for some sites in the WPMT Historic Heritage Database). Additional research and documentation is recommended as part for the conservation policy.  2) Extant made features which are not considered to have cultural significance, have been included in the table to indicate that they have been considered.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place Id</th>
<th>Place Name</th>
<th>Period of Use</th>
<th>Description &amp; Function/ Interpretation</th>
<th>Cultural Significance</th>
<th>Contributory Significance (to the Springs Precinct)</th>
<th>Management Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F 1</td>
<td>Gorbys Corner</td>
<td>c.1970s-?</td>
<td>Vertical cliff under lookout, minor footpads, access from road. Important local rock climbing location in 1970s and possibly later.</td>
<td>local social (some)</td>
<td>contributes</td>
<td>no special requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 2</td>
<td>Road Lookout</td>
<td>c.1967+-present</td>
<td>Roadside lookout with extensive/panoramic view over south east Tasmania. Partially defined by a c.1m high cemented rock wall. Built on post-1967 bushfires remains of the Springs Hotel. Has 1 memorial stone on outer side.</td>
<td>local social (some); landscape/aesthetic</td>
<td>contributes moderately</td>
<td>Assess archaeology prior to disturbance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 3</td>
<td>Sandstone Feature 1</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Large vertical boulder of sandstone on road edge. Appears to be vertical (cliff collapse or put there). Is a visually interesting feature and has interesting natural weathering features. Has previously had graffiti on S face.</td>
<td>local social (some)</td>
<td>contributes</td>
<td>Retention desirable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 4</td>
<td>Gardens Lookout</td>
<td>c.1931-present</td>
<td>Small square lookout area on edge of sandstone cliff with extensive/panoramic view over south east Tasmania. The lookout has contemporary (?) steel railing with wire mesh infill, and a flat floor with a central sandstone outcrop that provides seating. Believed to have been constructed as part of the Exhibition Gardens.</td>
<td>local social (some); high landscape/aesthetic</td>
<td>contributes strongly</td>
<td>Retention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 5</td>
<td>Gardens Loop Track</td>
<td>c.1931 &amp; mid-late 900s</td>
<td>A maintained dirt road upgraded in the 1990s as access to the overflow car park in F11. The western half was originally the alignment of the southern perimeter track of the Exhibition Gardens. As a vehicular access dates from at least the 1970s, and possibly earlier</td>
<td>western half has some historical significance given its association with F6; the eastern half has no significance</td>
<td>the western half contributes (as part of F6); the eastern half is intrusive</td>
<td>Consider rehabilitating the eastern section.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 6</td>
<td>Former Exhibition Gardens</td>
<td>1931-?</td>
<td>Remains include hard elements – paths with rock edges, rock-edged garden beds, rock hedges and water features and a small number of eucalypt lignotuber and rhododendron plantings. Constructed as a semi-formal native plant garden (with some rhododendrons in the W woodland area) designed by A.C. Walker and constructed using public funds as Depression employment scheme.</td>
<td>local (some) high state &amp; national</td>
<td>key element</td>
<td>Retention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 7</td>
<td>stone feature 1</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Line of stones with possible right angle. Appears to be part of a building foundation; but may be a garden feature related to F6.</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>Assess archaeology prior to disturbance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 8</td>
<td>cleared area 1</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Small elongate rectangular to oval area set in heathland that has only a mossy ground cover. Appear to have been deliberately cleared.</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>Assess archaeology prior to disturbance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 9</td>
<td>lookout rocks 1</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>One of the 2 groups of sandstone outcrop with cliffs below that provide extensive view over south east Tasmania. A footpad suggests low present day use; possibly used historically.</td>
<td>landscape and setting values; possible historical value</td>
<td>contributes moderately as part of natural setting</td>
<td>no special requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 10</td>
<td>rock climbing site 1</td>
<td>modern</td>
<td>A low vertical sands tone cliff with associated foot pads (on bench and below) trampling. Two shelters in base of the low sandstone cliffs to W, one of which appears to have been used as a bivvy.</td>
<td>Possibly local social (some)</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>no special requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feature</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Key Value</td>
<td>Significance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Springs Hotel Garden &amp; Grazing Area</strong></td>
<td>c.1909 – c.early 1950s?</td>
<td>Roughly rectangular open grassy space that approximately reflects the area of the former Springs Hotel garden paddock used for livestock and producing fruit (&amp; berries) and vegetables for the hotel. A larger area was used historically for gazing. Historic features include a drystone fence (F12), a roadtrack alignment and fencing remains (S side). Modern intrusive elements include a 1990s car park with perimeter rocks, vehicle tracks and the snowplough shed (F15). An associated natural feature is the boggy area (spring) (F11A).</td>
<td>high historical value; high-moderate archaeological values; some local social value</td>
<td>Assess significance of noted features (eg, roadtrack formation and area of former buildings prior to disturbance. Retain significant elements. Archaeologically monitor all other ground disturbance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>drystone wall</strong></td>
<td>c.1909 - c.early 1950s?</td>
<td>Wide, low drystone wall which forms the east boundary of the Springs hotel Garden and Grazing Area (F11); appears to have partly collapsed. Presumed to be contemporary with the early development of F11.</td>
<td>refer F11 [related place top F11]</td>
<td>contributes strongly</td>
<td>Retention</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>water tank?</strong></td>
<td>? (20C?)</td>
<td>Square in-ground pit (c.2.5m x 1.5m, and has stone lining in part of the NE half. Has an associated long low (c.5m x 2m x 1m high), grass covered mound (of earth and stone?). The pit is down slope of a spring (F11A) and is interpreted as a water tank; the associated mound is presumed to be the spoil form the excavatio of the tank.</td>
<td>refer F11 [related place top F11]</td>
<td>contributes strongly</td>
<td>Retention</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>spruce tree</strong></td>
<td>? (20C?)</td>
<td>Small (c.2.5m high) spruce (?) tree which is significantly shaded by regrowth eucalypt woodland-forest. Its origin is unknown, but given the species it is presumed to have been deliberately planted.</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>no special requirements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>snowplough shed</strong></td>
<td>modern</td>
<td>Substantial shed on concrete foundation constructed to store the HCC snowplough (used for clearing the Pinnacle Road in winter); has gravelled access.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>intrusive</td>
<td>no special requirements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>hotel garden artefact scatter 1</strong></td>
<td>c.1909 - c.early 1950s?</td>
<td>Scatter of early bricks and masonry fragments and metal artefacts in a mound; probably not in-situ. Interpreted as the bulldozed remains of the Hotel Gardens historical structures (ie, fowl house, etc).</td>
<td>low - for association with F11.</td>
<td>contributes</td>
<td>Assess archaeology prior to disturbance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>hotel garden artefact scatter 1</strong></td>
<td>c.1909 - c.early 1950s?</td>
<td>Scatter of masonry fragments (mainly concrete slab) in a low mound; not in-situ. Interpreted as the bulldozed remains of the Hotel Gardens later structures.</td>
<td>very low - for association with F11.</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>Assess archaeology prior to disturbance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>lookout rocks 2</strong></td>
<td>?</td>
<td>One of the 2 groups of sandstone outcrop with cliffs below that provide extensive view over south east Tasmania. A footpad suggests low present day use; possibly used historically.</td>
<td>landscape and setting values; possible historical value</td>
<td>contributes moderately as part of natural setting</td>
<td>no special requirements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>drain 1</strong></td>
<td>modern?</td>
<td>Earthen ditch. Origin is not known – may be historically constructed drainage or recent.</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>no special requirements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>walking track 1</strong></td>
<td>modern</td>
<td>Dirt footpaths that winds through the bush.</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>no special requirements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>mound 1</strong></td>
<td>? (late 19C/early 20C?)</td>
<td>Circular mound of stones c.2m diameter and 1m+ high. Presumed from its proximity to F22 to be related to that feature. History is unknown but its form is suggestive of an historic hut chimney butt.</td>
<td>unknown (potentially high historical and scientific)</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>Assess archaeology prior to disturbance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>foundations 1</strong></td>
<td>? (late 19C/early 20C?)</td>
<td>Corner of an in-ground foundation line of local stone and hand made bricks. History is unknown but possibly relates to F21 ( &amp; F23 &amp; 24) – possibly part of one historical structure (hut?)</td>
<td>unknown (potentially high historical and scientific)</td>
<td>contributes</td>
<td>Assess archaeology prior to disturbance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>foundations 2</strong></td>
<td>? (late 19C/early 20C?)</td>
<td>A discontinuous c.3m (?) in-ground foundation line of local stone and hand made bricks. History is unknown but possibly relates to F24 ( &amp; F21 &amp; 22) – possibly part of the one historical structure (hut?)</td>
<td>unknown (potentially high historical and scientific)</td>
<td>contributes</td>
<td>Assess archaeology prior to disturbance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lower Springs artefact scatter 1</strong></td>
<td>? (late 19C/early 20C?)</td>
<td>Scatter of handmade brick fragments over a c. 10m x 5m area immediately south of F23. History is unknown but presumed to be part of the same structure as F23.</td>
<td>unknown (potentially high historical and scientific)</td>
<td>contributes</td>
<td>Assess archaeology prior to disturbance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>Requirements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 25</td>
<td>L Springs Work Shed</td>
<td>modern</td>
<td>Small square shed with walls of round dolerite cobbles in concrete, with a low angle concrete skillion roof and on a concrete slab foundation; has steel window frames and a door; has a cobble lined path leading to the door. Built by the HCC in the 1980s as a work shed.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>Intrusive (creates confusion with historical elements)</td>
<td>no special requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 26</td>
<td>L Springs Picnic Area (eastern)</td>
<td>mid 20C</td>
<td>Open grassed area surrounded by native vegetation on 3 sides; has a small number of scattered picnic facilities (tables, barbeques, shelter shed (F27) and toilets (F128). The flat grassed area is understood to be essentially the area that was cleared and levelled for the Springs Depot in 1934 (refer F88). The date of establishment of the picnic area is unknown but it is believed to post-date WWII.</td>
<td>high local significance (high social, moderate landscape/aesthetic)</td>
<td>contributes strongly</td>
<td>The area should be retained for public use in a similar manner and setting as at present (if the area is used for other purposes, then an alternative picnic area(s) with similar qualities and of a similar area should be established elsewhere at the lower Springs. Any ground disturbance in this area should be archaeologically monitored.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 27</td>
<td>L Springs Stone Shelter (possibly also the site of the Alan Walker Chalet)</td>
<td>mid 20C</td>
<td>Medium sized shelter shed with small enclosed entrance porch located near the Pinnacle Road; it has stone rubble construction (with cement mortar) walls, a gable CGI roof, and rests on a multi-age concrete slab foundation. A modern barbeque is built on the same foundation and a 1932 tone tablet commemorating the construction of the Alan Walker Chalet is attached to the back of the barbeque. The present shelter was built in the early 1970s after the earlier shed (post-WWII?) was burnt in the 1967 fires. The present shelter incorporates some of the earlier remains (lower walls and possibly footprint/porch is new). Also probably the location of the Alan Walker Memorial Chalet</td>
<td>of social significance as part of the picnic area; of probable archaeological significance in relation to the 1932 shelter</td>
<td>Contributes</td>
<td>Assess archaeology prior to disturbance of foundations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 28</td>
<td>L Springs Toilets</td>
<td>modern</td>
<td>Large concrete toilet block with unusual concrete hipped roof that floats suspended on a central concrete core; has decorative stone and concrete low walls framing an open sitting/waiting area. Constructed in the c.1970s? Architect unknown.</td>
<td>No heritage significance (of interest architecturally).</td>
<td>Neutral (location slightly intrusive)</td>
<td>no special requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 29</td>
<td>L Springs Picnic Area (western)</td>
<td>mid 20C?</td>
<td>Small open grassed area surrounded by native vegetation on three sides; has a small number of scattered picnic facilities (tables, barbeque &amp; a shelter shed (F30)) and has 3 mature rhododendron plants at the north end (one of which is deciduous). The date of establishment of the picnic area is unknown but it is believed to post-date WWII.</td>
<td>High-moderate social significance; moderate landscape/aesthetic significance at the local level</td>
<td>contributes moderately</td>
<td>The area should be retained for public use in a similar manner and setting as at present (if the area is used for other purposes, then an alternative picnic area(s) with similar qualities and of a similar area should be established elsewhere at the lower Springs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 30</td>
<td>L Springs Open Shelter</td>
<td>modern</td>
<td>Small open shelter shed with fireplace/barbeque; has pentagonal pyramidal roof and concrete floor. Date of construction unknown, probably 1980s.</td>
<td>of social significance as part of the picnic area</td>
<td>contributes</td>
<td>no special requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 31</td>
<td>Fingerpost Track</td>
<td>c.1831</td>
<td>Relatively wide (c.4’) dirt foot path through the bush; has steps cut into the sandstone just above the Pinnacle Road in two places (below lower Springs and below the Springs Hotel site). Earliest extant historical track in Wellington Park; size suggests it was possibly constructed to bridle track standard.</td>
<td>high historical, social &amp; scientific significance at the local level; of medium state level significance mainly associational</td>
<td>Key element</td>
<td>Retention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Code</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>Retention</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 32</td>
<td>Lenah Valley Connector Track</td>
<td>Modern</td>
<td>Benched dirt footpath built using natural materials; includes features such as drystone walls and banks and stone features. Constructed c.2000.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>no special requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 33</td>
<td>concrete platform 1</td>
<td>c.1934?</td>
<td>Small rectangular (c.2.5m x 3.5m) raised concrete platform. History is not known but is considered likely to be part of the 1934-37 Springs Depot.</td>
<td>historical significance (some)</td>
<td>contributes</td>
<td>□ Assess archaeology prior to disturbance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 34</td>
<td>excavated spring? 1</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>Semi-circular depression associated with cutting grass. Interpreted as a natural springs that has been partly excavated by hand (date of modification not known).</td>
<td>unknown (of high local significance as one of the local natural springs)</td>
<td>contributes</td>
<td>□ Retention desirable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 35</td>
<td>Grays Fire Trail</td>
<td>modern</td>
<td>Modern bulldozed track constructed for fire management purposes; construction has partly destroyed historic features.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>intrusive</td>
<td>no special requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 36</td>
<td>Springs Hotel Loop Track</td>
<td>c.1936</td>
<td>Narrow bitumen bypass road off the Pinnacle Road that runs to Springs Hotel Site. Has a c.50m section of drystone walling at N end constructed after 1929 landslip (refer F37). Built as access to the Springs Hotel. The north section was built as an extension to Pillinger Drive in 1907; the southern section was constructed to create a loop road in 1936 (1939?).</td>
<td>of significance as an integral part of the Springs Hotel (refer F44)</td>
<td>contributes strongly</td>
<td>□ Retention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 37</td>
<td>landslip</td>
<td>c.1929</td>
<td>Small area of landslip (c.10m x 25m) in steep bank (excavated for the Springs Hotel Loop Rd) on the W side.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>no special requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 38</td>
<td>Fingerpost Track (upper central)</td>
<td>c.1831</td>
<td>refer F31.</td>
<td>refer F 31</td>
<td>key element</td>
<td>□ Retention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 39</td>
<td>quarry 1</td>
<td>c.1880s?</td>
<td>Small (c.5m x 8m) approximately rectangular quarry on west side of Pinnacle Road. Presumed to have been associated with the construction of Pillinger Drive carriageway in c.1888.</td>
<td>Of significance as part of Pillinger Drive/Pinnacle Rd (refer F79)</td>
<td>contributes</td>
<td>□ Retention desirable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 40</td>
<td>L Springs building foundation/ footprint 1</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Small relatively flat, horizontal depression in level area immediately west of the Pinnacle d and south of the Fingerpost Track; has a low earth bank on the W and S sides. Probable building footprint; purpose and age unknown.</td>
<td>unknown (probable medium-low local)</td>
<td>contributes</td>
<td>□ Assess archaeology prior to disturbance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 41</td>
<td>Radfords Track</td>
<td>Mid-late 19C</td>
<td>Relatively wide (c.4') dirt footpath through the bush; has steps cut into the sandstone just above the Pinnacle Road in two places (below lower Springs and below the Springs Hotel site). Earliest extant historical track in Wellington Park; size suggests it was possibly constructed to bridle track standard.</td>
<td>high historical; high social; high scientific</td>
<td>key element</td>
<td>□ Retention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 42</td>
<td>Springs Hotel Lower Road Edge Garden</td>
<td>c.1907 +</td>
<td>Strip of established garden along the east side of the Springs Hotel Loop Road. Extant elements include 2 mature cordylines (yucca), ivy, tree ferns, and along the eastern edge are stone lines and a drystone feature (rounded, vertical sided feature) presumed to be associated garden beds and features. Not shown in early photos, possibly only dates to c. late 1930s after the loop road was constructed.</td>
<td>of significance as an integral part of the Springs Hotel (refer F44)</td>
<td>contributes moderately</td>
<td>□ Retention desirable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 43</td>
<td>Springs Timber Tramway Formation</td>
<td>Pre-1925 – c.1927</td>
<td>Benched formation that runs north from near the NW corner of the Springs Hotel Site approximately to Sphinx Rock. Originally had sleepers and rails. Is understood to have been built by the government for firewood woodcutting as a depression employment project and to be c.44chains long. The HCC paid for the rails, proposing to remove them and sell them and upgrade the track. The section N of the Pinnacle Rd has been incorporated into the Lenah Valley Track, but some evidence of the former sleepers is extant. The S end below Grays Fire Trails which has cut through the formation is well preserved as a track.</td>
<td>Moderate-high historical and some social significance; the alignment and unmodified sections have moderate scientific significance.</td>
<td>contributes</td>
<td>□ Requires further historical research and assessment □ Retention desirable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| F 44 | Springs Hotel & Grounds Site | 1907 | Only the archaeological remains of the Springs Hotel survive, but these are intact. These include a large 'L'-shaped bench which contains the remains of the hotel (masonry remains in the rear bank), terracing and steps at the front, the area of croquet lawn, the tennis court area (much of the bitumen survives), a brick and stone wall between the croquet lawn and tennis court, drains, a road formation, the concrete foundation of part of the rear of the hotel, the water tank stand, part of a brick chimney (not in situ), various paths and scattered daffodils and jonquils. Includes nearby the following as related features the Springs Hotel Loop Rd, a zig zag track, other minor tracks and building foundations, stone piles, artefact scatter and post 1967 dump. The Springs Hotel Garden and Grazing Area on the lower Springs is also related (refer F11). The Springs Hotels was constructed in 1907, but had various later modifications and developments. It operated (although not always providing accommodation until it was burnt down in the 1967 bushfires. As well as providing accommodation it provided refreshments for visitors to the Springs (via a kiosk). | high historical and social significance; moderate landscape/aesthetic and archaeological significance of state and local level significance | key element | - Retention of levelled bench.  
- If area used for new development then new development should be sympathetic in design and location and incorporate historic elements (in particular the building foundations) where possible  
- Prior to disturbance the site needs to be fully documented (may require archaeological investigation) |
<p>| F 45 | Cosmic Ray Observatory | 1966 (1970s) | A green painted, metal sheet roofed, A-framed rectangular building (c.3m x 6m) on a concrete slab foundation. The building sits on an irregular levelled platform (bulldozed) (that has destroyed part of a couple of earlier features (F46 &amp; 67). Established in 1956, burnt in the 1967 bushfires and rebuilt; no longer used as an observatory. | historical significance | intrusive | no special requirements |
| F 46 | Springs Hotel Zigzag Track | c.1907+ | Preserved lower section of a zig zag foot track that ran up the north side of the Springs Hotel and which appears to have been constructed as a hotel footpath. The extant section is a c.3' wide benched track with drystone walling bank (on lower side) with one corner. | historical, scientific &amp; aesthetic significance; local contributes moderately | - Retention desirable |
| F 47 | U Springs building platform 1 | mid-late 19C? | Benched rectangular area on slope presumed to be a building footprint. History unknown but may be foundations of Woods stable. | unknown – probable moderate local significance | contributes moderately | - Assess archaeology prior to disturbance |
| F 48 | U Spring track 1 | 19C? | Narrow, benched elongate formation that runs diagonally up slope and with drystone walling on the lower side. History unknown – presumed to relate to the period of Woods or Gadds occupation. | unknown – probable moderate local significance | contributes moderately | - Retention desirable |
| F 49 | U Springs track 2 | 19C? (or 1970s?) | Benched formation that runs diagonally up slope; c.2m wide (probably bulldozed). The current formation is presumed to be associated with the construction of Grays Fire Trail or 196access to Woods Cottage | unknown – none or moderate local significance (or intrusive) | contributes moderately | - Retention desirable |
| F 50 | Woods Cottage Site? | c.1859 | An area of large flat benched terrace connecting this platform to a set of platforms (F60) on the south side of a small, a track that runs down to the SE and an artefact dump on the north edge (material suggests this is related to Gadds occupation period). The terrace has no structural remains but has a springs/underground creek running across it and part of a fireplace surround was located on the terrace. Presumed to be all or part of the site of Woods Cottage (may have also included F60) which was established in 1895 or 1880 and occupied by the Woods Family until the 1880s. | high historical and moderate scientific significance at the local level | key element | Retention |
| F 51 | Milles Track (Wellington Falls track) | 1845 | Foot track that runs along the outer edge of the 1831. Constructed in 1845 as a formal access track to Wellington falls; paid for by public subscription as a private enterprise. | high historical, social &amp; scientific significance at the local level | key element | Retention |
| F 52 | 1831 Diversion | 1831 | Earth channel built around the SE slopes of Mt Wellington to pick up water from the natural springs occurring in this area and to feed them into the Hobart Rivulet (see also F59). In 1866 the water was re-diverted back into Browns River to be picked up by the Mountain Water Supply System (refer F66). | high historical and scientific significance at the local and state level, and possible significance at the national level (as part of Hobart's 1st water supply system) | key element | Retention |
| F 53 | U Springs track 3 | c.late 19C? | Narrow benched that runs diagonally up slope to the SW (away form the Springs) from the upper shelter sheds. History unknown – likely to relate to the period of Woods or Gadds occupation | unknown – probable moderate local significance | contributes moderately | Retention desirable |
| F 54 | U Springs building platform 2 | c.late 19C? | Small benched rectangular area on slope; presumed to be a building footprint. History unknown (possibly a recreational hut site). | unknown – probable moderate local significance | contributes moderately | Assess archaeology prior to disturbance |
| F 55 | excavated spring 2 | c.late 19C? | Semi-circular vertical earth bank with gully flowing downslope from base of spring (for increased access to water/beautification). | of high local significance as one of the local natural springs | contributes moderately | Retention desirable |
| F 56 | U. Springs track 4 | c.late 19C? | Probable short section of c.4’ track that has been largely destroyed by Grays Fire Trail. History unknown – location suggests it may be the remains of an early access track to the 1831 Diversion or to Woods or Gadds cottages. | Unknown – probable moderate local significance | contributes moderately | Retention desirable |
| F 57 | Gadds Cottage Front Garden | c.1890s | Approximately rectangular area c.25 x 25m that has a substantial (c.1m wide) stone fence along the N and E sides (now partly collapsed), a metal drum set in the ground (garden bad?) and scattered bulbs (daffodils) and possible associated tracks, now faint. The western side has been destroyed by the construction of Grays Fire Trail. Established by the Gadd family during their occupation, probably in the 1890s. | Of significance as part of Gadds Cottage (refer F60) | key element | Retention |
| F 58 | U Springs building platform 3 | c.late 19C? | Benched rectangular area on slope with vertical drystone walled retaining wall on N and E sides, presumed to be a building footprint. History unknown but location suggests it was related to Woods or Gadds’ occupation. | unknown – probable moderate local significance | contributes moderately | Assess archaeology prior to disturbance |
| F 59 | U Springs benched formation (1831 Diversion continuation?) | 1831 | Short curved section of benched formation that continues north of the 1831 Diversion and on the same level. Interpreted as the north end of the 1831 Diversion, which has been filled in following the 1866 rediversion to become track (possibly is part of R56 which) | of significance as part of the 1831 Diversion (refer F52) | key element | Retention |
| F 60 | Gadd's Cottage Site | c.1891 | The cottage was constructed in 1891 by the HCC and occupied by the Gadd family from 1891 to 1907, and possibly up until the 1910s or 1920s by later Rangers. The site comprises two large flat, horizontal terraces with drystone wall embankment on the lower side and associated minor drystone terracing and path edging and steps. The north terrace has a large stone mound (large blocks of sandstone/mudstone) that has 2 straight edges hence appears to be part of a structure (chimney butt and/or foundation). The south terrace contains foundation outlines, concrete foundation and two rectangular brick and stone chimney bases which are the remains of Gadds Cottage. There are large old native trees and bulbs associated (on the terrace edges) and the area has cutting grass and appears to be associated with one or more springs or spring creek lines. | high historical and social significance at the local level; of some scientific significance; some higher level significance for its association with Wragge’s observatory. | key element | Retention |
| F 61 | U Springs Shelter Sheds | c.1890s | A large trapezoidal shaped terrace with a drystone walled bank on the north side. Set against the west side are two rectangular brick and stone chimney bases and there is a line of stone block foundation along the north side and scattered stone (originally part of the structures) on the east side. Interpreted as the remains of the two large shelter sheds that were built at the upper springs near Gadds Cottage. The earliest was constructed by the HCC by 1895. | high social, moderate historical and moderate-low scientific significance at the local level | key element | Retention |
| F 62 | U Springs track 5 | c. late 19C? | Narrow, benched elongate formation that runs across the slope; has drystone walling on the lower side. History unknown – presumed to relate to the period of Woods or Gadds given that it runs form the rear of where the cottages were located. | unknown – probable moderate local significance | key element | Retention desirable |
| F 63 | natural spring? | (natural) | Not inspected, but large gully suggests the spring source (refer Springs Site Development Plan) is of significant size. | of high local significance as one of the local natural springs | contributes | Retention desirable |
| F 64 | excavated spring 3 | c. late 19C | Small semi-circular vertical earth bank with gully flowing downslope from base of spring (for increased access to water/beautification); associated cutting grass and other wet vegetation. | of high local significance as one of the local natural springs | contributes moderately | Retention desirable |
| F 65 | excavated spring 4 | c. late 19C | Irregular bank line c. 25m long with a vertical straight sided section (hand excavated?) at the south end; the excavated area is open but the creek line below is choked with cutting grass. Presumed to be a former active spring with some (for increased access to water/beautification). | of high local significance as one of the local natural springs | contributes moderately | Retention desirable |
| F 66 | 1831 Diversion Browns River Re-diversion | c.1866 | In c.1866 the 1831 Diversion (F52) was re-diverted into Browns River to supply water to the new Mountain Water Supply system. The re-diversion is extant as a culvert under Grays Fire Trail and as a steep sided narrow gully (partly hand excavated?) running directly downslope below this. | historical and scientific significance as part of the Mountain water Supply system | key element | Retention |
| F 67 | U Springs track 6 | pre-1956 | Benched elongate formation c.4-6' wide that runs across the slope; partly destroyed by the construction of the Cosmic Ray Observatory. History unknown, but presumed from early-mid 1900s photographs to be a rear access to the Springs Hotel (possibly related to F70). | Unknown – probable moderate local significance | contributes moderately | Retention desirable |
| F 68 | U Springs track 7 (?) | Unknown | Short narrow section of benching, possibly part of a former foot track. History unknown. | Unknown – probable moderate local significance | contributes moderately | Retention desirable |
| F 69 | U Springs stone mounds | unknown | Two small irregular low stone. History unknown | Unknown – probable low local significance | contributes | Assess archaeology prior to disturbance |
| F 70 | U Springs track 8 | unknown | Benched elongate formation c.4-6' wide that runs across the slope. History unknown, but presumed from early-mid 1900s photographs to be a rear access to the Springs Hotel (possibly related to F70). | Unknown – probable moderate local significance | contributes moderately | Retention desirable |
| F 71 | U Springs building platform 4 (?) | unknown | Small benched rectangular area on slope presumed to be a building footprint. History unknown but may be foundations of the small shed below Woods stable, or possibly associated with the Springs Hotel. | Unknown – probable moderate local significance | contributes moderately | Assess archaeology prior to disturbance |
| F 72 | amphitheatre (spring?) | unknown | Semi-circular steeply sloping grassed bank. Possible former active spring that has been excavated (for increased access to water/beautification). | of possible high local significance as one of the local natural springs | contributes | Assess archaeology prior to disturbance |
| F 73 | Fingerpost Track (upper top) | c.1831 | refer F31. | refer F 31 | key element | Assess archaeology prior to disturbance |
| F 74 | U Springs building platform 5 (?) | c.1907? | Benched rectangular area on slope with vertical bank below and with 4 steel girder uprights extant. Interpreted as the Springs Hotel water tank. | moderate local significance; associated Springs Hotel feature | contributes moderately | ▪ Assess archaeology prior to disturbance |
| F 75 | U Springs building platform 6 (?) | early-mid 20C? | Horizontal concrete, suspended (?) slab on slope. History unknown but presumed to be associated with the Springs Hotel. | Unknown – probable moderate local significance | contributes moderately | ▪ Assess archaeology prior to disturbance |
| F 76 | U Springs building platform 7 (?) | Unknown (1859-1870s?) | Benched rectangular area on slope presumed to be a building footprint. History unknown but given location is possibly the foundation of Woods shed that was located below Woods stable. | Unknown – probable moderate local significance | contributes moderately | ▪ Assess archaeology prior to disturbance |
| F 77 | U Springs building platform 8 (?) | Unknown (1859-1870s?) | Benched rectangular area on slope presumed to be a building footprint. History unknown but given location is possibly the foundation of Woods stable. | Unknown – probable moderate local significance | contributes moderately | ▪ Assess archaeology prior to disturbance |
| F 78 | Lenah Valley Track | c.1928-30 | A benched c.3-4' wide foot track that runs approximately along the contour from just north of the Springs to Junction Cabin. Extant and unmodified. Constructed in the late 1920s/early1930s as part of a RED scheme. | High local significance – historical, social &amp; scientific | contributes moderately | outside of precinct - no special requirements |
| F 79 | Pillinger Drive/Pinnacle Road | 1888 &amp; 1934-7 | This road was constructed in 2 sections: 1. Pillinger Drive from Fern Tree to the Springs constructed as a carriageway in 1888, but not bituminised until the mid-1900s; and 2. Pinnacle Rd constructed from the Springs to the Pinnacle 1934-7 as a dirt road. Both sections are extant and minimally modified except for new guttering and sealing and sections of stone walling. A small section in the Springs area may have been straightened in c.1934-7. | Pillinger Drive has high local significance (historical and social). The Pinnacle Rd has local and state level significance (historical &amp; social) | Key elements | Retention |
| F 80 | coin hoard | mid 20C | Package of coins (mainly low denomination and mid 1900s) recovered which was buried in the bank on the line of the Lenah Valley Connector Track c.20m south of the Lenah Valley Track. Now removed and held by the HCC. | local moderate-low significance (historical) | contributes | no special requirements |
| F 81 | U Springs track 9 (?) | unknown | Faint narrow formation running down slope – possibly a former foot track. History unknown. | unknown – probable moderate or low local significance | contributes moderately | Retention desirable |
| F 82 | U Springs building platform 8 (?) | unknown | Benched rectangular area on slope presumed to be a building footprint. History unknown but may be foundations of Woods stable. | unknown – probable moderate local significance | contributes moderately | ▪ Assess archaeology prior to disturbance |
| F 83 | mound 2 | unknown | C.1m high elongate mound on the W side of Radfords Track below the Springs Hotel Loop Road. History unknown | unknown – probable low local significance | contributes | ▪ Assess archaeology prior to disturbance |
| F 84 | Springs Hotel Dump | c.1967 | Area of building rubble and artefactual material that is known to have been dumped in this location in the post-1967 bushfire clean up of the Springs Hotel site (M. Knott, pers comm.). | low local significance | contributes | Retention |
| F 85 | Pinnacle Track (modern) | Early 20C | Benched foot track leading from upper Springs NW to Pinnacle; formation has been upgraded several times; has associated piping (Hobart Water – disused) and guttering to drain water form Springs above track. | high-moderate local significance (historical, social) | contributes strongly | Retention |
| F 86 | Ice House Track | 1849 | Foot track that leads directly up to South Wellington form the Upper Springs. Present route takes off to SW of Springs on new benched track which follows in part an earlier benched section; prior to this the track lead up form c.50m to N of the main upper Springs track Junction. One of these two routes is thought to approximate the original 1849 bridle track. The track has both direct upwards story sections and cross slope benched sections. | high historical, social &amp; scientific significance at the local level; of medium state level significance mainly associational | key element | Retention | Original route at lower end should be researched and the track re-routed to original route in this section. |
| F 87 | cleared area 2 | Unknown (pre-1945) | A levelled mound of earth of irregular shape, c.10m diameter, with low earth and rubble banks on the N, E &amp; S sides. History and function are unknown but appears to be the termination of F6 when the perimeter track of the Exhibition Gardens was first upgraded into a road. | unknown | unknown (contributes) | ▪ Assess archaeology prior to disturbance |
| F 88 | Springs Depot Levelled Area | 1934 | Part of F26. A flat grassed area understood to be essentially the area that was cleared and levelled for the Springs Depot (the main base for the construction of the Pinnacle Rd) in 1934. No features known to relate to the Depot are known but F26B&amp;D and F33 may be associated. The date of establishment of the picnic area is unknown but it is believed to post-date WWII. | moderate local significance (possibly some state as part of suite of Depression projects) | contributes strongly | ▪ Retention desirable |
| F 89 | Childs Grave | Mid-late 19C? | Low mound with a surround of stones that formerly had a wooden cross on top is known to occur on the upper (W) edge of the upper Springs. Could not be re-located during inspection | potentially of high local significance | contributes strongly | ▪ Re-location and recording ▪ Retention |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>associations</td>
<td>the special connections that exist between people and a place (and which may include social or spiritual values and cultural responsibilities for a place) (<em>Burra Charter</em>, 1999, 3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>authenticity</td>
<td>the ability of a place (or object) to provide knowledge and understanding of original and subsequent characteristics of the place from all sources of information (including meanings) (<em>Nara Document on Authenticity</em>, cited in Lennon 2002).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>community</td>
<td>the public in general or in some cases (generally qualified) a particular group of people that have interests in common (eg, the Aboriginal community, the local community) (<em>TWWHA Management Plan</em> 1999, 206).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>compatible (use)</td>
<td>respects the cultural significance of a place (a compatible use involves no, or minimal impact on cultural significance) (<em>Burra Charter</em>, 1999, 2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conservation</td>
<td>all the processes of looking after a place so as to retain its cultural and natural significance (<em>Burra Charter</em>, 1999, 2) (<em>Australian Natural Heritage Charter</em> 1996, 8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conservation management plan</td>
<td>a document which details how to look after the values of a place which has natural and/or cultural significance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cultural landscape</td>
<td>physical area with natural features and elements modified by human activities which results in patterns of evidence layered in the landscape, and which gives a place its particular character, reflecting human relationships with, and attachment to, that landscape (Lennon &amp; Matthews 1996, 4) - most simply &quot;the combined works of nature and man&quot; (<em>Operational Guidelines</em> 1997, item 36); or may be an area of land which has powerful religious, artistic or cultural associations with the natural element rather than the material cultural evidence, which may be insignificant or even absent (<em>Operational Guidelines</em> 1997, item 39).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cultural significance</td>
<td>aesthetic, historic, scientific, social or spiritual value for past, present and future generations; and which is embodied in the place itself, its fabric, setting, use, associations, meanings, records, related places and related objects (<em>Burra Charter</em>, 1999, 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fabric</td>
<td>all the physical material of a place, including components, fixtures, contents and objects (<em>Burra Charter</em>, 1999, 2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage</td>
<td>a value that derives from the past (ie, is inherited or transmitted from the past), and may include cultural practices and traditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>historic heritage</td>
<td>a value that is inherited or transmitted from the non-Aboriginal past; may include cultural practices and traditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>integrity</td>
<td>the extent to which the layered historic evidence, meanings and relationships between elements remains intact and can be interpreted in the landscape (and in relation to cultural landscapes it is also the integrity of the relationship with nature that matters, not the integrity of nature itself) (Lennon 2002, 56).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interpretation</td>
<td>in this discussion ‘interpretation’ is used to refer to the information (content) about whatever is being discussed; it is what (information) is presented (refer also ‘presentation’).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maintenance (cultural)</td>
<td>continuous protective care of the fabric and setting of a place (to be distinguished from repair) (<em>Burra Charter</em>, 1999, 2) or its values.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
meanings — that which a place signifies, indicates, evokes or expresses (and which generally relate to intangible aspects such as symbolic qualities and memories) (Burra Charter, 1999, 3).

non-commercial use — this term is used in this document to reflect wording by the community (in relation to the Springs); should be taken to mean ‘use that has no cost to the user’.

passive use — this term is used in this document to reflect wording by the community (in relation to the Springs); should be taken to mean activities that are essentially quiet, low key, reflective, and non-competitive in nature as opposed to the more normal use of ‘passive’ to refer to activities that require no active input.

presentation — in this discussion ‘presentation’ means the way in which the interpretation (information) is made available (ie, what media is used, what looks like, where it is); it is how information is provided (refer also ‘interpretation’).

preservation (cultural) — maintaining the fabric of a place in its existing state and retarding deterioration (Burra Charter, 1999, 2).

public use — this term is used in this document in its broadest sense and generally should be taken to include the range of public uses that occur and have occurred at the Springs, including for example walking, picnicking, reflection, nature appreciation, and social and memorial events, and associated activities such as car parking and rest stops.

reconstruction — returning a place to a known earlier state (and is distinguished from restoration by the introduction of new material into the fabric) (Burra Charter, 1999, 2).

related place/object — place/object that contributes to the cultural significance of a place/object but is not at the same place (Burra Charter, 1999, 3).

repair (cultural) — return of fabric or values to closer to its original state; involves restoration or reconstruction.

resource — physical attribute (as in natural resource = physical natural attribute)

restoration (cultural) — returning the existing fabric of a place to a known earlier state by removing accretions or reassembling existing components without the introduction of new material (Burra Charter, 1999, 2).

setting — the area around a place (ie, the physical environment that a place is situated within) which may include visual catchment; this generally does not include the physical environment of the place itself which is regarded as part of the place (eg, at the Springs the bench, the open space and lawns are part of the place, while the setting is the surrounding slopes with native vegetation).

significance — quality of having value (may be intrinsic value or attributed value).

sympathetic — to be in keeping with the place in respect of the values (eg, historical, social, fabric based) of the place; generally relates to use/function and style/design.

value — physical or non-physical attribute of a place that has value or is valued at any level.
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PROJECT PROPOSAL
Springs Historical Background

The Springs has long been known as focus of European historic activity in Wellington Park. The first documented European activity in the area was the capture of water from the Springs to feed into the initial development water supply in 1831 (1831 Diversion), probably the first town water supply development in Australia. The first known recreational use began in the 1837 with the visit of Lady Jane Franklin’s party to the Summit (and Springs) and the development of a shelter at the Springs (& one at the Pinnacle) in 1843 at Lady Franklin's behest for visitors to Mt Wellington. It has continued to be a focus for visitors to the mountain through to the present.

The first known long term occupancy in Wellington Park was the Woods family's home at the Springs (c.late 1850s-1870s, upper Springs Plateau?), where the Woods family provided refreshment for visitors to the Mountain and who possibly also earned a living carting ice from the ice houses above the Springs. From the mid-1800s until the 1900s the Springs was a major stopping place on the main route up to the Pinnacle (via the Hobart Rivulet/Huon Rd and South Wellington). By the early 1890s Charles Gadd was carting ice from the ice houses and by 1898 had built a residence at the Springs (on the upper plateau). Gadd lived here until the 1930s. He was appointed as Honorary Ranger for the Mountain Park and oversaw the construction of picnic shelters and the development of the Springs Hotel. The family provided hospitality to visitors and possibly buried a daughter in the area. Gadd and one of his daughters also staffed the Springs weather observatory set up in 1895 by Wragge as one of a pair of stations needed to make more accurate weather forecasts (the other was at the Pinnacle), the first such weather observatory in the southern hemisphere and the second in the world. The Springs Hotel which was established in 1907 (and designed by Alan Walker), also on the upper plateau, had a chequered history until it was burnt down in the 1967 bushfires, but it was a popular focus for walkers and visitors to the Springs throughout its history. It also included a vegetable and fruit garden and grazing paddock on the lower Springs Plateau.

The Springs was also the focus of the Depression employment schemes in the 1930s as the site of the Exhibition Garden, a rare early native garden established by influential people of the time such as Alan Walker and Louis Shoobridge; a new stone visitors shelter; and the start of the second section of the Pinnacle Road (Springs to Pinnacle) with the main work site being located at the Springs. A second native garden was planted at the Springs (below the hotel site) by members of local community groups after the 1967 bushfires to help ameliorate the devastating effect of the bushfire at the Springs.

The Springs continued to be a popular day use area for a range of visitors, and today is still the main focus of day use visitors with the range of activities including sight seeing, picnicking, family parties, performances, bushwalking, snow play, and memorial services. The Springs continues to be a base for road works with the snow plough based on the lower Springs Plateau.

Heritage & Management Background

The long term history of use has left a considerable legacy of cultural heritage values that are multilayered across the full Springs area. Previous heritage studies of Wellington Park (Hepper & de Gryse 1994, McConnell & Scripps 2005) have acknowledged this historic
heritage by listing a number of sites in the Springs area and McConnell & Scripps identified it as a possible heritage precinct (refer Springs Site Summary in Attachment 1). Apart from the Exhibition Garden, no sites in the Springs area have been previously recorded or assessed, and only limited historic background research has been carried out. This is in spite of a number of the sites being considered to have, or potentially have, state or higher level cultural significance (refer also Attachment 1).

Because of the dense, complex and interrelated heritage of the Springs, McConnell & Scripps (2005) designated the Springs area as a proto-precinct (ie, a potential precinct, but with insufficient evidence at that stage to declare it a precinct). Because of the potential values of the Springs (& the Pinnacle), McConnell & Scripps (2005) also recommend that as a matter of priority –

"On ground survey, assessment and formulation of management policy be undertaken for the two highest sensitivity areas that are also in development areas – namely the Springs area and the Pinnacle area – prior to any new works or decision making for these areas" (recommendation 1.7, p 70).

They provide a map showing an approximate boundary for the proto-precinct based on the available information at the time of writing.

The recent Former Exhibition Garden Conservation Management Plan (Lee Andrews & Associates 2006) also concludes that the different areas (sites) at the Springs are inextricably linked, and recommends that –

"the former Exhibition Gardens be recognised as an integral part of the wider Springs area and that the whole of this area be considered as a culturally significant precinct" (conservation policy 2, p67).

The Conservation Management Plan (Lee Andrew & Associates 2006, 76) also recommends that a Conservation Management Plan should be undertaken for the broader Springs site.

Although the Springs Site Development Plan and more recent Springs Local Area Plan included consideration of historic heritage, neither are based on any form of over overarching historic heritage conservation policy, or even an integrated assessment of the historic heritage values.

It is argued that the background research and assessment carried out for the Springs Zone management planning has been minimal and the recommendations for site protection are overly general, sketchy, poorly justified and fall short of the standards for significance assessment and development of conservation policy as set out in the Australia ICOMOS (1999) Burra Charter. Indeed, this failure can be considered to be the key cause of the significant impediment to, and curtailment of, the recent proposal to develop a hotel and visitor centre at the Springs.

If the historic heritage is to be soundly managed as per the provisions of the WPMP, then ongoing decision making for use and development at the Springs will continue to be impeded until there is an assessment of the historic heritage of the Springs as a whole and development of an overarching conservation policy for the Springs area. It is also suggested, given the interrelated historical and physical nature of the sites at the Springs, that the Springs area should be regarded as, and designated as, a precinct under the WPMP, with the boundaries, values and conservation policy to be determined through analysis.

At this stage there is an approved Visitor Centre development for the lower Springs Plateau. The original development proposal has been significantly modified to avoid impacting the

---

1 Even the Former Exhibition Gardens Conservation Management Plan suffers from having to make recommendations for areas outside the Exhibition Gardens without being able to fully assess the associated site (eg, for the Hotel Gardens and Paddock) or even interpret the Exhibition Gardens without a full understanding of the history and heritage of the Springs area (although a good attempt has been made to do this within the restricted scope of the Conservation Management Plan). This is acknowledged in the Conservation Management Plan by the recommendation to develop a Conservation Management Plan for the full Springs area.
Exhibition Gardens, but the other cultural heritage values have received little consideration (as they are not well understood and there was no requirement to do so). Given that there is still potentially some flexibility with aspects of the final design, then it is considered desirable to urgently prepare some form of overarching conservation policy for the full Springs area (ie, the Springs Precinct) to ensure that impacts on the historic heritage from this development can be mitigated as fully as possible.

Proposal

Since the preparation of a full Conservation Management Plan for the Springs Precinct is likely to require some 6 months to complete, a two stage process is proposed for the conservation planning for the Springs Precinct (using as a basis the area designated by McConnell & Scripps 2005) –

1. preparation of an initial conservation policy for the Springs Precinct to guide the development currently being considered which is seen as a 6-8 week process that will to a large extent utilise existing documentation but which will require some additional historical and social values research as well as field inspection; to be followed at a later stage (& prior to new major development proposals) by

2. preparation of a full Conservation Management Plan for the Springs Precinct which is seen as a c.6 month long process which would include more in depth site recording, historical background research and social values assessment to generate the a conservation policy, and which would provide management advice for the individual sites as well as for the precinct as a whole.

The following explores what would be required to prepare an Initial Conservation Policy for the Springs Precinct and what such policy would contain.

Proposed Approach – Initial Conservation Policy Springs Precinct

Proposed tasks and time breakdown

1. **Background Review:** To expedite the project strong reliance will be placed on existing information. The background review will therefore be a key component and would comprise a review of the history, heritage information, and management advice and issue from existing documents, in particular McConnell & Scripps (2005), Lee Andrews & Associates (2006), the Wellington Park Management Plan (2005), the Springs Site Development Plan (1998)/Springs Zone Local Area Plan and submissions relating to the Springs Development to help assess management issues and social values.

2. **Historical Research:** Although there is a certain amount of information available from secondary sources (eg, the existing heritage studies (see above), de Quincy (1987), Buckman (2000)) which will be reviewed, this information is sketchy for most sites and there is none for other sites. Because it appears that the historical significance of the Springs is likely to be a major component of the cultural significance of the area, then it is considered important to undertake additional research into the primary sources. Such research will target key likely sources for the known sites and for the main periods of use and development. The Exhibition Gardens will not be included in this research as they are considered to be well researched (and the results from that research demonstrate the value of primary archival research for the area). For reasons of efficiency and effectiveness the primary archival research should be undertaken by an appropriately experienced historian.

3. **Field Inspection:** At this stage, in order to save time, a detailed survey and recording of sites is not proposed. However, because the Exhibition Gardens is the only site recorded to date field inspection will be required to ascertain what physical heritage is extant at

---

2 This is because of the need for substantive community and stakeholder consultation (given the high social value of the Springs area) and additional background research and documentation of the individual sites (which are currently undocumented except for the Exhibition Gardens).
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each known site and, as far as possible in the present conditions, the extent of the sites, and to map the historic heritage of the precinct. Summary data only will be provided for individual sites at this stage. No systematic survey will be carried out (this is largely because most sites in the precinct are considered likely to have been already identified).

4. Community Consultation: For an area such as the Springs which is strongly socially valued this would normally be a major component of establishing the significance of, and conservation policy for, the sites and area. Given the community consultation that has already occurred as part of the Wellington Park Historic Heritage Audit project and the community input into the Springs Site planning and submissions in relation to the proposed hotel development, there is considered to be sufficient existing information available to develop a general appreciation of the social values of the Springs. However since some of this information is likely to be biased towards the proposed development and the Exhibition Gardens and to exclude consideration of some sites and the area in general, a small amount of targeted consultation is proposed to balance the existing information and fill gaps. The targeted consultation proposed is with community members who are known to strongly value the area and/or to have a good knowledge of the area and its history of use, including present day use. The consultation will be via one to one meetings with these people and/or a focus group style meeting.

5. Assessment of cultural heritage significance: This will include a preliminary assessment of the individual sites and will focus on preparing a statement of significance for the Springs Precinct as a whole. It will use as a basis the Australia ICOMOS (1999) Burra Charter criteria for cultural significance.

6. Development of Conservation Policy: As per the Burra Charter Process (Australia ICOMOS 1999) and Kerr (1990), a conservation policy will be prepared for the full Springs Precinct based on the assessed cultural significance and taking into account the history of use, existing management and planning provisions and advice, and desired future uses and constraints. At this stage conservation policy will not be prepared for individual sites except to the extent it is (a necessary) part of the precinct conservation policy. This project will take into account existing heritage conservation policy (ie, for the Exhibition Gardens (Lee Andrews & Associates 2006).

7. Reporting: The findings of the project will be summarised into a final Initial Springs Precinct Conservation Policy. This document will, as per the standard conservation management planning process, outline the study aims and methodology; document the history of the precinct and its historic heritage, provide a brief analysis of the significance of the precinct as well as a statement of significance for the precinct; provide a summary analysis of management constraints, interests and opportunities; and finally present the overarching conservation policy for the precinct. The conservation policy is likely to take the form of an overarching conservation policy statement for the Springs Precinct as well as policy and prescriptions for recognised areas within the precinct. It will also include definition of the precinct boundaries and provide maps of recognised heritage places, areas, zones of archaeological sensitivity, etc, as determined appropriate from the analysis.

8. Review and Endorsement: Given the time constraints of the project, it is proposed that a draft conservation policy document be prepared for review by key management stakeholders who obviously need an opportunity to comment (ie, the WPMT, HCC, HW), and also by a sample of community members with a demonstrated close interest in the Springs and its ongoing management (eg, the Fern Tree Community Association, the Mountain Festival, the current development proponents) and via limited heritage peer review (eg, Heritage Tasmania, Lee Andrews & Associates, David Parham, Gwenda

---

3 Preparation of individual site conservation policy and management advice is seen as more appropriately the role of the next stage (ie, preparation of the more detailed Conservation Management Plan for the Springs Precinct) which will be based on more comprehensive information.
Sheridan, Leslie Gulson and Ian Terry) given the social significance and potential high heritage significance of the Springs area.

The final document would be revised on the basis of comment received on the draft document and with a final internal review before completion. The final Initial Conservation Policy to then be endorsed by the WPMT to give it status under the WPMP (to be part of the basis for management of the Springs Zone).

The work will be performed to at least the required standards for cultural heritage assessment in Tasmania, and be in accordance with the Burra Charter (Australia ICOMOS 1999), currently the main guidelines for cultural heritage practice in Australia.

**Personnel**

Since a Springs Precinct Conservation Policy is urgently required, and given her expertise and familiarity with the Springs area and the associated historic heritage management issues, the above project could be undertaken by the present WPMT Cultural Heritage Officer. In this case external assistance from an appropriately experience historian will be required to efficiently undertake the research into the primary historical sources. Alternatively the work could be undertaken as a consultancy by appropriately qualified professionals.

**Breakdown of Tasks, Personnel & Time**

The following is an estimated breakdown of time for each task (per specialist). The times provided are conservative in order to reflect the real time likely to be required to prepare a sound acceptable initial conservation policy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task / Personnel</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage Officer/Heritage Professional</th>
<th>Historian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Background Review</td>
<td>3 days</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical Research</td>
<td>1 day</td>
<td>5 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Inspection</td>
<td>1.5 days</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targetted Community Consultation</td>
<td>1.5 days</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance Assessment</td>
<td>1.5 days</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Analysis</td>
<td>1.5 days</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting</td>
<td>5 days</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>15 days</strong></td>
<td><strong>5 days</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Time Frame**

Since the heritage and historical research can be carried out concurrently, the time estimated to carry out the actual tasks is 3 weeks. However given that there will be a need to allow for comment on the draft and to revise the draft the total time that would need to be allowed is 5-6 weeks.

If the Initial Conservation Policy is to be prepared in house by the WPMT Cultural Heritage Officer, then since the position is only 2 days a week, it is estimated the project overall would take approximately 8-10 weeks to complete.

**References**

Australia ICOMOS 1999 The Australia ICOMOS Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Significance (The Burra Charter). (Revised edition)
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DETAILED HISTORICAL INFORMATION (SITE/THEME BASED)
### Cosmic Ray Observatory

Submission from Physics Department Uni Tasmania to build an observatory to obtain results that could be compared with those obtained at Sandy Bay. Propose a building 10 feet square and at least 50 feet from other buildings. Favoured proximity to Hotel for security.

2 February 1956 permission granted for building 12 feet square with pitched roof, one steel shuttered window and one steel sheathed door on a solid concrete base, of corrugated iron, painted a suitable colour to match surroundings. Three year leases until 1965 than on recurring basis with 12-months termination.

7 February 1967 Observatory destroyed by fire.

21 October 1967 Approval granted for new observatory on original site but seven feet wider.

1967?? Newspaper clipping re plans to rebuild noting that 'The loss of the observatory caused a gap in a world wide research programme into cosmic ray intensity variations and their connections with sun spot activity' and that 'it was one of a network of Australian cosmic ray stations ranging from Lae, in New Guinea, to Antarctica'.

5 October 1970 Security fence erected around observatory (Plans photocopied).

16 March 1978 Meteorological instruments for measuring air temperature and ground frost approved ‘within small fenced compound’ [on tennis courts?] 

### Exhibition Gardens (& rhododendron gardens)

June 1931 A meeting chaired by Mayor Soundy agrees to hold and Art, Antiques & Historical Exhibition to raise funds to aid the unemployed by contributing funds for the development of tracks and shelters on Mt Wellington in the early 1930s. Shortly after the initial meeting a newspaper article proposed use of the funds form the exhibition for a native flors nursery on Mt Wellington.

Aug-Sep 1931 Alan Walker, chair of the Exhibition Committee proposed that part of the £1,000 raised at the Aug-Sept 1931 Exhibition (which was highly successful) be used for a special garden at the Springs' devoted to growing examples of the less known local trees and shrubs such as waratahs, grass trees and others'. This was agreed to in Sept 1931 by the Council Reserves Committee. Termed the 'Exhibition Garden' at this time, it was also planned to have a rhododendron garden. The land used for the Exhibition Gardens was the former Springs Hotel grazing area, and use of this land had to be negotiated with the lessee of the Springs Hotel. A committee to oversee the development of the gardens was formed. Members were Alan Walker, A.V. Giblin, D.W. Watson and Louis Shoobridge.

**References**

- MCC16/2/398 Hobart City Council correspondence file DR109/247 Cosmic Ray Observatory (n & pc)

* 'pc' indicates a photocopy, 'n' handwritten notes
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Source(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aug 1931</td>
<td>Frank Walker, Launceston nurseryman, donated 100 rhododendrons to the HCC, which the HCC accept and plant shortly after at the Springs.</td>
<td>Andrews (2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 1931</td>
<td>The laying out of the garden was commenced in c.Nov 1931 by Alan Walker and was completed in 1932(?) with a hiatus created by Alan Walker's death in Dec 1931. The Exhibition Gardens were laid out as a formal garden with rock hedges, and birdbaths. Visitors to the garden recall plants were specifically and exclusively native plants and cut out of the bush using existing shrubs and trees. The area of the gardens is c.100m x 300m.</td>
<td>Gulson (2003)/Andrews (2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late 1932</td>
<td>The Mayor's Report notes that the 'Alan Walker Chalet' and garden of native flora nearby add two distinctive points of interest [to the Mountain Park], while warm thanks are due to Mr Frank Walker, of Launceston, for his generous gift of 100 Rhododendron plants which have been planted in the same locality and are firmly established.</td>
<td>Gulson (2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930s</td>
<td>The Exhibition Gardens seem to have had some set backs – in the early 1930s native plants were affected by the cold, and in 1934 the gardens may have been damaged by a fire. The gardens however were advertised and appear to have been well visited throughout the 1930s. A 1934 newspaper account describes the Exhibition Gardens as a show area for natives and as also including a rhododendron area.</td>
<td>Gulson (2003)/Andrews (2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940s</td>
<td>In 1940 the native gardens were reported as being destroyed by bushfire, however the gardens, remembered as primarily rhododendron beds appear to have survived (the rhododendron gardens which were alongside Radfords Track.</td>
<td>Gulson (2003)/Andrews (2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950s-1967</td>
<td>The rhododendron plantings were still visited in the 1950s-1967 and had plants that were tree sized. In 1964 the gardens are referred to as the 'former Exhibition Gardens'.</td>
<td>Gulson (2003)/Andrews (2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Max Knott stated that the park at the Exhibition Gardens was reopened in 1965, suggesting that part of the Exhibition Gardens re opened.</td>
<td>McConnell &amp; Scripps (2005, Inventory)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>Post fires the rhododendron plants were subsequently moved by the HCC (to the park at the Pillinger Rd turn off from Huon Rd (Knott 2005).</td>
<td>McConnell &amp; Scripps (2005, Inventory)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post 1967</td>
<td>Some minor changes to the area made (the new vehicle track and car park in the former hotel paddock built, the Hotel Garden extended to the west) and in 1971 the proposed snow plough shed in this area was found an alternative location in order to avoid potential damage to the 'Lookout Gardens'. One route foot route through the gardens was maintained 'which appears to be largely a linking of existing paths and which is very popular with children'.</td>
<td>Gulson (2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>Exhibition Gardens referred to in government correspondence as the 'Lookout Gardens'. File notes also refer to the gardens as having previously been 'Rhododendron Gardens'.</td>
<td>Gulson (2003)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### The Springs Interim Conservation Policy
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---

#### 1970s

- HCC staff used to slash the perimeter path.

#### 1990s memories – 'The garden was beautifully laid out with Rhododendrons, rock edges, and the Council looked after this garden. It was burnt out in the 1946/7 fire on the mountain but Chris [Butler] managed to encourage some of its progeny in his own garden'.

---

**Gadd, Charles**

- **Background:** Charles Gadd originally came from the New Norfolk area. His parents were John Gadd and Sarah Manton who were married in New Norfolk in 1850. John was an ex-convict and later became a constable. Charles Gadd was born in 1851. He was married in 1878 to Sarah Lowe in New Norfolk. Sarah Gadd died in 1919 and Charles Gadd died in 1931, both in Hobart. Charles Gadd was living South Street Battery Point when he died, but the Gadds appear to have been living in Macquarie Street when Sarah died. Charles Gadd was at one stage Grand Master of the Freemasons Lodge when he was living in Hobart.

  - The Gadd family also had a connection with the Fern Tree Hotel – Frances ('Fanny') Matilda Gadd who was proprietor of the Fern Tree Hotel [possibly by 1902 to possibly 1922?] with her husband was Charles Gadd's sister. She was born in New Norfolk in 1865 and married Frank Tasman Andrews in Hobart in 1890. Gadd family history also suggests that Charles and Gadd and a relative may have built to Fern Tree Hotel, with one of them pulling out due to a lack of money.

- 30 April 1884 Charles Gadd to be informed that that Corporation has no power to let the land at waterworks.

- 1880s and 1890s Gadd employed as contractor on public works for Corporation.

- 1890s "At that time [1890s] Mr. Charles Gadd, the mountain ranger, with his sturdy pony, "Baby", was carting blocks of ice to Hobart for sale".

- 23 June 1898 Gadd applied for an increase in salary due to extra work caused by fire and decrease in visitors (part of income from supplying refreshments to visitors?). Granted bonus of £10

- 19 September 1903 Charles Gadd, Ranger and resident at the Springs, assisted in the attempted rescue of Mark Richards who collapsed with hypothermia a short distance above the Springs in the Go-As-You-Please Race from Hobart to the Mt Wellington summit and back.

- 29 September 1903 Charles Gadd gives evidence to the Coroner at the inquest into Mark Richards death on 19 Sept 1903.

- 9 January 1907 Gadd to be given one month’s notice with a view to appointing a more suitable officer.

- 16 February 1907 Gadd to stay until 31 March

- 16 April 1928 Charles Gadd is noted as being present at the opening of the Rock Cabin at the Pinnacle which attracted over 400 people and was considered to be the largest ever gathering on the Mountain. He is noted as being at this time 77 years old and together with L.M. Shoobridge the fourth oldest person

---

**HCC Mountain Park staff, meeting 19/9/2006**

- Chris Butler, Fern Tree resident (interview notes by G. Sheridan, 4/6/1998).

---

**Tim Gadd, pers comms (emails) September 2006**

- (Charles Gadd is Tim Gadd's great great grandfather)

---

**MCC16/65/2 Waterworks Minutes (n)**

- Thwaites (1974, 84)

---

**The Mercury 21 Sept 1903**

**The Mercury 29 Sept 1903**

**MCC16/72/1 Reserves Minutes (n)**

---

**The Mercury, 16 April 1928**
present. Gadd is included in the following description 'All are
bushmen of long experience and to the novice they appear to be
of tireless and of unlimited energy. It is their custom and it has
been for years- to walk to the summit every weekend, and it is
not too much to say they know every square foot of the
mountain'.

Summary 2005: The first Ranger was Charles Gadd and he
lived in the house with his family from the early 1890s. In the
1890s Charles Gadd carted blocks of ice from at least the
upper ice house to Hobart for refrigeration using a pony. For
over 15 years Mrs Gadd supplied meals for visitors to their
cottage (Thwaites).

A Fanny Gadd married Frank Andrews and at some stage they
ran the Fern Tree Hotel. Tim Gadd is the great-great grandson
of Charles Gadd. (T. Gadd).

Mr Gadd's quarters at The Springs were to be the 'half-way
house observatory for the 1895 Mt Wellington observatories
set up by Wragge (one at the Pinnacle the other at the
Springs), and Gadd (an employee of the HCC) and his
daughter Edith were appointed as observers. (Thwaites).

A Cornish photo (no.22) shows a medium sized house built
on the upper slopes of the Springs with a well made (rubble
packed) road running immediately in front of the downsliple
side. The road has a picket fence on the downhill (E) side, and
the house is built on a platform with rock walling on the road
side. There is a low stone wall running downsliple from in
front of the house. The house has a hip roof (iron?), an
internal brick chimney, is clad in horizontal plankling, and has
a roofed front verandah with rustic railings along the front.

The c.1895 photo in T. Gadd's article shows the house looking
the same as in the Cornish photo, but the house and yard
appears to be very new, and there is also a shelter shed to the
south on the same bench. In 1969 Cornish writes that the
Rangers House 'has long since disappeared'.

Gadd’s Cottage/
Springs Cottage/
Ranger’s Cottage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18 November 1890</td>
<td>Hall’s tender for construction of cottage accepted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 December 1890</td>
<td>Mayor’s annual report ‘There has also been erected at the Springs Mt Wellington a new and substantial cottage, together with a commodious shed for the accommodation of visitors to the Mount, which there is no doubt will be greatly appreciated.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 January 1891</td>
<td>Charles Gadd appointed caretaker at the Springs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 January 1891</td>
<td>Gadd to move into cottage at 4pm today – to be allowed £10 pa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td>‘the highest Telegraph Office on the Mountain was installed in the hut [Gadd’s Cottage] at the Springs and the telephone was connected in 1894. It was listed as a public telephone and used by later rangers as well as the Mount Wellington Hotel’. Also ‘A mail bag had been forwarded from Fern Tree to the Springs since 1899, and in 1917 was carried by the ranger’s wife who was paid six pounds per year’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 December 1898</td>
<td>Plan shows ‘Gadd’s House’ slightly above and to the north of the ‘Waterway’, with a ‘Shelter House to the south of the house, a large yard in front of the house, and a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>McConnell &amp; Scripps (2005, Inventory)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 July 1899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 November 1904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 January 1906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 January 1907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 March 1911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horse trough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ice Houses &amp; Track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10 July 1858 (Webbs Ice House/Upper Ice House) Ice house was established at the suggestion of Lieut Governor Sir William Denison 8 or 9 years ago and with assistance of his Private Secretary. Refers to 57 people being there or at Springs on a recent public holiday; locates it a 3435 feet asl.

14 February 1872 (Governor's Ice House) Town Clerk to Governor’s Private Secretary; ‘Near a place known as the ‘Old Camping Place’ in the vicinity of the Springs is an unoccupied Hut I understand was formerly a receptacle for Ice for your establishment but that it is at present abandoned for such a purpose…” Asks permission to use the hut as a depository for tools and shelter for men ‘repairing the Springs’.

In reply Private Secretary says ‘by all the means the Hut belongs to the Governor.’ Director of Water Works to get the key from Woods.

Ice Houses – general: Sole distribution and management of the venture was placed under John Webb who contributed to the construction fund (had an interest as the owner of the Marquis of Water ford Inn (later he owned Webb's Hotel renamed the Orient and later Hadleys). Notes that Webb later built a second ice house at the Springs.

Indicates that the track was built by an overseer and party of 6 convicts, and comments that the track was later extended over the boulder scree and ridge to become the 'first tourist track to the summit from the Springs, originally known as the 'Ploughed Fields Track', and that the track lost favour when newer more direct eastern face tracks were established.

Lady Franklin Party visit

22 December 1837 Lady Franklin and party travelled to Sassafras Valley via the car track then walked up a ‘rude pathway formed some time since by the descent of timber and then proceeded south west by the ridge or saddle to the summit.

Breakfast on summit. The overnight camping place appears to be as follows: ‘The Crater like Valley, which descends from the Plateau, on the south western side was lionised, its clear delicious brook of water scrutinised, and many a frolicsome shrimp was netted and landed on the bank …. A good encamping ground was then selected, under the lee of a jungul of stunted gums, where the heather was soft, the wood abundant, and the water excellent, and the tents being pitched, the gentlemen returned to the flag staff for their fair companions, and led them by the easiest route to the little camp.’ [de Quincey 1987 has interpreted the 'Crater-like Valley to be the amphitheatre immediately south of the organ pipes and hence the camping place at the Springs, but the rest of the description suggests the camping place may have been on South Wellington, possibly Devils Gulch].

22 December 1837 – camp is noted as having been set up by the Surveyor General 'for Lady Franklin's accommodation'.

29 December 1837 A second arranged party visited the mountain and used the tents set up for the Franklin party. Because of heat and sun it was considered desirable that after reaching the summit the party should ‘at once proceed to the tents in the valley ... and there they passed the remainder of this tropical day ... reclining on a sumptuous set of opossum skin rugs and killing time in the style of Lallah Rookh'.

After visiting the summit on the second day and painting the names of the members of both parties on the ‘gigantic
columns’ in letters a foot high, they descended. ‘The heat was excessive, and so it was some hours before the ... spring at the cutting grass jungul could be reached’. The party separated, one group choosing to rest a while at the ‘springs’ [sic] while the others returned home. The party who had gone ahead became lost ‘It appears that after Captain Mackay’s party had separated from Mr Champ and Mr Frankland at the Springs [sic]...’ [Given that they were descending towards Sassafras Valley [Lenah Valley?] the springs are unlikely to be 'The Springs']

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lady Franklin's Springs Hut</th>
<th>12 November 1839 Alex Cheyne (Director of Public Works) instructed to build a hut at the Springs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 March 1840 Two men who escaped from the Prisoners Barracks reached the mountain and after being lost for two days, ‘they came to a hut, belonging to Lady Franklin, which they robbed of some wearing apparel and two guns’ – may not be Springs Hut.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16 (28?) August 1848 Edward MacDowall applies to rebuild hut now in a ‘most dilapidated state’ as cost of £15 to be met by subscription. Permission sought to pull down old hut and cut timber for new one – to be of two rooms with benches and tables fitted into the walls. MacDowell thinks it will be a 'pleasant situation (?) for a pic nic'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29 August 1848 Lieut Governor approves the application to rebuild hut, ‘a favourite resort’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 September 1848 ‘The hut when rebuilt, will contain two rooms, occupying a space of 16 feet by 14 feet, in a better situation. One room will thus be available for the ladies. A fireplace will be constructed ...’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The location of this hut is not known. Gulson (2003) suggests it was at the lower Springs, but the history of the area suggests it more likely to have been at the upper Springs near the race, and possibly was taken over and used by Woods form 1859.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Mountain Park | 25 November 1927 – re Irby report for establishing Mountain Park |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mountain Rangers/Caretakers</th>
<th>See also Charles Gadd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23 November 1886 Perrin recommends that a 'young active caretaker be appointed, whose duty would be to supervise the Reserve [State Reserve].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21 March 1907 Thomas James Smith appointed Mountain Ranger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21 December 1907 Smith resigned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 March 1908 T. A. Pitman appointed – 30 shillings voted for removal expenses to Springs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29 May 1908 Ranger to submit monthly reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 February 1917 after Pitman has resigned [1916?] - £5 allowed to him for repairs he made to the cottage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27 July 1917 – Dobson notes that 'Pitman left the Springs last year' and complains that the telephone was not moved at that time to the 'Boarding House' but was reinstated at the 'Ranger's Cottage'.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSO6/2/5496 Colonial Secretary’s Office (n)</th>
<th>Colonial Times 10 March 1840 (pc)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LSD1/23/490 Lands and Surveys Department (n and pc)</td>
<td>CSO24/59/2160 Colonial Secretary’s Office (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hobart Town Courier 9 September 1845</td>
<td>MCC16/72/1 Reserves Minutes (pc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.S. Perrin 23/11/1886 Report on the State Reserve at Mount Wellington.</td>
<td>MCC16/72/1 Reserves Minutes (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCC16/72/1 Reserves Minutes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain Water Supply (Mountain - Sandy Bay Rivulet system)</td>
<td>15 August 1859 J. N. Gale’s original proposal was for the Springs water to be diverted into a tank on the Hobart Rivulet and from there to the Wellington Rivulet. 24 August 1859 Mayor to Colonial Secretary on great evils of the existing supply – (1) taken from too low a level (2) passes through Degraves establishment since 1845-6 when Degraves by-passed existing Town Tunnel (3) reservoirs insufficient. Degraves threatened to sue if existing supply diverted. Degraves 1836 grant gave him water rights – Mayor says this is a negligent oversight and wants the grant re-issued. 12 December 1859 Gale proposes new scheme which avoids possible compensation scheme – existing supply not diverted as such but Browns River to flow to its natural course – proprietors on Hobart Rivulet have rights to water in its natural course but not to water from water scheme. 1869 In front of Woods’ hut ‘(for here are the celebrated Springs) and gurgling over cool shining pebbles in a narrow channel is the limpid stream that supplies twenty thousand human beings in hive below with pure water, with hundreds of tons to spare. At a few hundred yards from Woods hut along the watercourse, the road to the summit is seen – Burst-your-gall track’… path skirts the watercourse – 4 miles to the Falls, 1 mile along the watercourse are slate beds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pillinger Drive/ Springs Carriage Drive</td>
<td>Summary 2005: Initially constructed to the Springs from the Huon Road (the bottom section is Pillinger Drive). The construction of this section is recorded as having started in 1888, using short term prison labour, but due to a shortage of such labour it was completed by free labour (Aves). The route is shown on Randall’s 1875 map suggesting it may have been at least a track between the Springs and Fern Tree from earlier (possibly from 1831 just after the Huon Road was built and when the 1831 Diversion was constructed, or the 1860s in association with the construction of the first stage of the Mountain Water Supply System). This section is also shown on the 1903 Plan. Cadel (2001) mentions that in 1934 he does not remember the road being sealed. 23 November 1886 Perrin recommends 'The formation of a carriage drive from the Huon Road to the Springs, and the planting of an avenue thereto.' 1888 Aves describes work on the road to the Springs as starting in 1888 'using short term prison labour for its construction, but owing to a gratifying shortage of supply of such labour, it was finished by free workers. 13 December 1898 Plan shows Pillinger Drive coming around the base of the sandstone cliffs across the lower Springs and terminating at the Hobart Rivulet (ie, approximate current location) 26 June 1907 Pillinger Drive to be extended to Hotel. 1950s Road still a dirt road, 1980s Road widening and concrete guttering built in the c.1980s under the RED Scheme [Pillinger Drive &amp; Pinnacle Rd?].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinnacle Road /Springs Depot</td>
<td>Summary 2005: Gulson (2003) notes that &quot;Lower Springs used as a base camp for construction of the Mountain Road and buildings constructed&quot;. This is confirmed by Cadel (2001) and Underwood (2001) who worked on the scheme in the early 1930s – they describe the Springs as the place they started work everyday (but indicate there was no accommodation there).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 October 1930 Proposal for road to Pinnacle following the recently approved track to be named Gray’s Track. Matter later dropped.</td>
<td>MCC16/72/1/13 Reserves Minutes (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 July 1934 Committee approves request from Govt to build Pinnacle Road as dole scheme. ( ? ) 1934 Road surveyed. Asst City Engineer estimates 5 1/2 miles road @ £3520 – 6-8 months per mile employing 40 men. 3 and 19 September 1934 Huts to be erected at Springs, sanitary pits to be dug off the track and regularly filled in.</td>
<td>MCC16/72/1/15 Reserves Minutes (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 September 1934 TC to Director of Public Works re cubicles for 100 men to be erected at Springs – would prefer galvanised iron to weatherboard. Recommends Kemp &amp; Denning’s tender for 2 10-division and 1 5-division cubicles of galv. iron at cost of £648 – refers to plans (not on files)</td>
<td>PWD24/1/6 Public Works correspondence: Tourist Tracks in Municipalities: Hobart (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 October 1934 Men working on Pinnacle Road to be camping in huts provided from 22 October.</td>
<td>PWD24/1/6 Public Works correspondence: Tourist Tracks in Municipalities: Hobart (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 October 1934 100 men now employed at Springs end of the road – as weather improves hope to establish another camp at 2m 20ch mark for 70-80 men in tents and accessible by pack track from Lenah Valley track.</td>
<td>PWD24/1/6 Public Works correspondence: Tourist Tracks in Municipalities: Hobart (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 June 1935 Working parties to be reduced during winter months. Proposal to move the huts at the Springs to a point further up the road – later decided to move some of the huts to Mount Arthur Saddle.</td>
<td>PWD24/1/6 Public Works correspondence: Tourist Tracks in Municipalities: Hobart (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 April 1936 3 shelter sheds to be located along the road including Pinnacle and Mount Arthur Saddle (plans on file)</td>
<td>PWD24/1/6 Public Works correspondence: Tourist Tracks in Municipalities: Hobart (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 July 1936 4,787 men employed on Pinnacle Road since August 1934</td>
<td>PWD24/1/6 Public Works correspondence: Tourist Tracks in Municipalities: Hobart (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 October 1936 In response to query from HCC that huts at Springs were not fully occupied (HCC paid for huts?) Director of Social Services informed the Director of Public Works that - after the huts were completed the Health authorities would not allow more than 3 men to occupy any one of them Two were required for the Time Keeper and Hut Attendant, and Storeman, the accommodation was reduced to 69 men. It was then decided not to insist on married men living in camp, but all the single men camped on the job for 20 days at a time and then were taken off the dole for 15 weeks. The average weekly number of men in the camp was 45.</td>
<td>PWD24/1/6 Public Works correspondence: Tourist Tracks in Municipalities: Hobart (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinnacle Road opened January 1937</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980s Road widening and concrete guttering built in the c.1980s under the RED Scheme [Pillinger Drive &amp; Pinnacle Rd?].</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plantings</td>
<td>27 July 1916 100 rhododendrons to be purchased (not clear if this at Springs). Authority given to plant hollies at the Springs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter Sheds – Lower Springs (including Alan Walker Chalet)</td>
<td>Summary 2005: A 1932 report notes that 'the new shelter shed at the Springs to be called the Alan Walker Chalet'. The shelter shed was near the Exhibition Gardens and was also paid for by the money raised at the 1931 Exhibition (Gulson). It is presumed that the c.1932 shelter shed was on the Hobart side of the road and at the site of the current stone shelter, given Knott's (2005) comment about building the present shelter on the site of a previous shelter on a pre-existing concrete slab' he though was probably from the early 1900s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23 October 1931 new shelter shed approved (Alan Walker Chalet) – stone foundations and stone pillars, to be 50' x 20', stone to be obtained from surrounding locality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26 November 1931 The new area had been cleared for the proposed shelter, but the Reserves Committee was very angry that 'a further area of valuable and picturesque bush and undergrowth had been ruthlessly chopped down and burnt out form the site of the new shelter ...'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 February 1932 The new shelter was almost complete and the Council intend to hold a public ceremony to open it. The Town Clerk suggested that a tablet be placed on the shelter in commemoration of the Council taking over a further area of Mountain Park, and that Mr D.W. Watson might be pleased to do the work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 March 1932 The shelter shed is completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Late 1932 The Mayor's Report notes that the new shelter shed at the Springs to be called the 'Alan Walker Chalet', and the chalet and garden of native flora nearby add two distinctive points of interest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The present shelter shed was constructed by the HCC in the 1970s under the RED scheme on the site of a previous shelter shed (Knott 2005).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter Sheds/Picnic shelters – Upper Springs</td>
<td>see also Gadd Cottage and Lady Franklin's Springs Hut.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Summary 2005: There was a shelter shed in the upper Springs area at least from 1898 (see Crawford &amp; Ryan 1988 map) until it was burnt in the 1967 bushfires. A 1920s photo (Cornish) shows one partly open shelter shed at the same height as the Rangers House and to the south. The photos show this shed to be open on the east end and 2/3 open on the north side, with the other walls being weatherboard, a brick chimney at the W end, a gable roof with an open decorative bush pole feature in the E gable end, a long table and benches inside, and a timber floor (on a foundation of a single course of rounded (dolerite?) rocks). The HWC 1931 map has 'shelter sheds' shown in the correct location). A 'Shelter Shed' in the same approximate location is shown on the 1959 plan. Aves notes the existence of a shelter shed in this general area in 1957 describing the start of the Pinnacle Track as being 'at the shelter shed behind the Mountain Lodge'. R&amp;K Davies (2001) mention the shelter shed above the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Springs.
T&R Errey comment that the shelter shed was large, had one open side, and sat above the site of the Springs Hotel immediately west of the point where the Milles Track and Pinnacle Tracks diverge. They note that the hut was commodious and able to shelter a number of walking parties bothered by difficult weather conditions; that it was particularly important in the era of few private motor cars; and there were far reaching views of the Derwent Estuary and distant ranges on a clear day through the open side. A shelter shed (only 1) behind the Springs Hotel and slightly to the S is also remembered by Kiernan in the early 1960s (2005). Burnt down in the 1967 fires.

28 November 1895 Complaint from Gadd re ‘annoyance at the shelter shed.’
13 December 1898 plan shows a 'Shelter House' immediately south of 'Gadd's House'.
1900 Shelter built halfway between caretaker’s cottage and the Springs
15 November 1927 Reserves Committee note that the public area in the vicinity of the shelter shed 'is somewhat confined and the question of putting back barb-wire fence for a reasonable distance to provide more room' was discussed. It is noted that 'It appears that the only objection to this is course would be possible contamination to the Hotel's water supply. This could, however, be easily overcome by connecting the Hotel supply with the 2” pipe close by, a course of action desirable in any case as interference with supply has been experienced by Miss Pitman' and that 'a cover is required for one of the tanks'.

Other shelter sheds/sheds
July and 1 August 1906 ‘Special Constable’ Gadd in letter re Pillinger Drive refers to timber being carted up to board up the timber shed for the contractors men to sleep in while they were working on the new hotel.
15 November 1927 Reserves Committee note that it 'was suggested that a public want would be met by providing fireplaces and shelters similar to those at the Bower', and ordered that this be considered.

1971 A proposal by the PMG to construct a snowplough shed located in the Exhibition Gardens was modified by Councils Engineers and approved in an alternative location because of the potential damage to the 'Lookout Gardens'.
late 1970s Current stone shelter shed in eastern picnic area was destroyed in the 1967 fires; had the top half re-built in the late 1970s; had window openings and the current steel window frames, but glass was only put in by the HCC staff in the 1980s.
early 1980s Stone shed on south side of eastern picnic area in treed area constructed as a HCC staff tool shed; no knowledge of any structure in the area prior.
1980s – open shelter in western picnic area thought to have

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event/Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28 November 1895</td>
<td>Complaint from Gadd re ‘annoyance at the shelter shed.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 December 1898</td>
<td>Plan shows a 'Shelter House' immediately south of 'Gadd's House'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>Shelter built halfway between caretaker’s cottage and the Springs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 November 1927</td>
<td>Reserves Committee note that the public area is somewhat confined and the question of putting back barb-wire fence for a reasonable distance to provide more room was discussed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>Proposal by the PMG to construct a snowplough shed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>late 1970s</td>
<td>Shelter shed in eastern picnic area destroyed in 1967 fires.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>early 1980s</td>
<td>Stone shed on south side of eastern picnic area constructed as a HCC staff tool shed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springs Child's Grave</td>
<td>Located at the top end of the upper Springs 'in the triangle made by the tracks' is a low mound with stones arranged around the edge and understood to be a child's grave, possibly associated with the Woods or Gadd families (Wolfe 2005, who was shown the site by Alan Wiggins).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springs Hotel</td>
<td>Summary 2005: Built 1907 at a cost of 3,300 pounds, designed by Alan Walker; burned down in 1967 bush fires. The construction of the Springs Hotel was a complex arrangement which included Henry Dobson (Chair of the Tasmanian Tourist Association and State Senator) having backing for the reservation of a park and permission to develop an hotel and 'aerial tramway' (there was however strong opposition to his proposal on water quality grounds); Dobson had a close association with the Springs and Mr &amp; Mrs Dobson held a Garden Party there by in 1902 (at which time there was a shelter and grassy terraces) (Macfie 1994). Unpredictable weather conditions and the advent of WWI contributed to the commercial failure of the hotel, and its purchase and subsequent leasing by the HCC (Macfie). It included from c.1909 an area for cultivation (including berries) and grazing at the Lower Springs (Gulson, 2003). Buckman (&amp; others) note that it never attracted a great number of visitors and was never profitable. It closed down in 1919. Terry (2001, p3) notes the HCC purchased (&amp; presumably reopened) the hotel in 1921. Major additions were made to the hotel in 1923 (Terry 2001). Lucy Pitman &amp; her brother were the lessees of the Springs Hotel 1927 – 1939. In August 1928 Miss Pitman (licensee of Springs Hotel) was granted permission to plough up and sow grass on the flat adjoining the old stables, otherwise she could not provide enough feed to keep her cows in proper condition. Council paid half the cost of seed etc (MCC 16/72). In 1931 the lower farm area is noted as having pig styes, cow sheds and an old stables (Gulson, p6). Used by Youth Group walks in the c.1940s for buying food while on walks on the mountain (Baker 2001). A local sawmill in Fern Tree owned by the Daleys (in the Long Creek area below Huon Road) used to supply timber to the Springs Hotel pre-WWII (Daley, 2001). At the end of the 1951/52 summer season (Arthur Young was manager at the time) the hotel closed down as an overnight accommodation venue altogether. Bucher (2001) comments that this was because the HCC had refused to give permission to 'build a proper hotel'. Prior to this for some time the hotel had only operated as an accommodation place in the summer season and only the kiosk remained open in the winter (Bucher 2001). In 1951/52 the farm was not used (Bucher 2001 reports having bought sheep from Fern Tree but they appear to have roamed around unfenced). In the 1950s and 1960s the Hotel is reported as serving teas and having a 'shop' and being unlicensed. Was a place to meet before a walk or to regroup after a walk (Nicholson 2001/Cornish 2001) R&amp;K Davies (2001) noted that the Hotel was used on occasion by members of the HWC as an overnight base for walks (would have been 1950s-60s). Ernie Lacey managed the hotel up to a major bushfire (1945? or 1967?) after which the Laceys moved to Bracken Lane,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fern Tree (Officer & Williams 2005). Closed finally after being burnt in the 1967 fires. Terry (2001) notes that the site was subsequently cleared of building debris. The Springs Hotel had components in various areas of the Springs. Terry notes the Springs hotel facilities included tennis courts, croquet lawns and gardens – all near the hotel. The 2 MCC plans 1 show a water tank and 2 sheds behind the hotel and a garden and grazing area below the road on the lower flats; one plan shows a tennis court behind the hotel, and two buildings (?) in the lower cleared area (hotel farm/gardens). A plan in Gulson (2003, p4) shows the lower farm area divided into a 'grazing area' and a 'garden' and also shows a 'stables' and 'fowl house'.

13 May 1893 Public meeting to promote tourism suggests better access to summit and a sanatorium at the Springs

1898 Sketch plan of Springs area showing proposed 'upper site' (approx location of hotel) and 'lower site' (centre of southern edge of lower Springs above sandstone cliff; a proposed drainage pipe shown running below Radfords Track to just below Pillingers Drive immediately to E of SW end of cliffs.

12 September 1899 HCC meeting – objections to Hotel proposal because of possible contamination of the Springs and possibility that young men would be led astray.

5 October 1900 Report by Rahbek on proposed hotel sites (upper and lower Springs [approximately final hotel site and gardens area respectively]; includes plan (based on the 1898 plan by Goddard):
Rahbek notes the view from the upper Springs hotel site (proposed) is 'truly magnificent, being probably one of the finest in Australia';
Rahbek notes that neither site can be used for a hotel while either Browns River or the Hobart Rivulet are used for water catchment purposes as 'the rainfall or any drainage is bound eventually to gravitate into one or both of the catchment areas, no matter whether it is travelling on top of the surface or below'.

1907 Site plans and floor plans of the Springs Hotel. Shows a rectangular plan with extension on SW corner (kitchen, pantry, scullery) and an outbuilding (laundry, storage and staff accommodation to rear (west) at south end; with guest facilities and staff bedrooms on the ground floor and 14 bedrooms on the upper floor. The greywater-septic is shown feeding into the system used by Gadds Cottage with the septic tank at the lower Springs.

1907 Naturalist Geoffrey Smith from the University of Oxford stays at the Springs Hotel for about a month while conducting research on the mountain shrimp (*Anaspides tasmaniae*).
Smith was appalled at fire damage from 1897 still apparent on the southern slopes knowing 'few places so desolate or despairing to walk through as these charred and blasted acres'.

Early 20C - photographs (from postcard collection Tasmaniana Collection) show a Stevensons screen on the edge of the lawn in front of the hotel
27 July 1917 description of hotel operations and proposals to improve accessibility etc, by Dobson. Dobson notes that annual rent is £10, but that he feels it is unreasonable that it has had to be paid given that the company 'has been ten years without a dividend', claiming the War as being 'greatly responsible for this financial result'. He also argues that he has received no support form the Council while he has added immeasurably to the benefits of tourism and Council. Dobson also asks the Council to reconsider purchasing the hotel, noting that it 'has proved to be essential for the development of the Tourist traffic, and it is about the best health resort in the Commonwealth, as many visitors can testify' and noted that although they refused to purchase the hotel four years previously [1913?] they 'allowed the wife and daughter of the Ranger to rent the boarding house for three years, with liberty for Mr Pitman to assist, after hours so long as this did not interfere with his work for the Council. Mrs Pitman has no experience in catering, but she and her daughter were fairly successful and worked up'. Dobson goes on to recommend that the Council purchase the hotel, keep on his present tenants Mr George and Mrs Mason and their daughter to continue to run the hotel, which they had done successfully for the past season, appoint George Mason also as the Ranger (notes he is very familiar with the Mountain and has built one of the larger huts in the bush of the Cascades Brewery Company), let out the Ranger's Cottage, and carry out refurbishing of the hotel.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15 November 1927</td>
<td>Reserves Committee notes that Miss Pitman is the lessee of the Springs Hotel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 April 1928</td>
<td>By this time the Springs Hotel has been purchased by the Council and have 'considerably improved it'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1929</td>
<td>Rock retaining wall constructed on the edge of the roadway leading to the Springs Hotel. The wall was drystone, 120' long and 6' high and was constructed to prevent landslips 'as had recently occurred'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 1933</td>
<td>Springs Hotel advertised, with L.M. &amp; T.A. Pitman as proprietors, tel 4820.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 1933</td>
<td>Springs Hotel advertised, with L.M. &amp; T.A. Pitman as proprietors, tel 4820.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 1934</td>
<td>– a major fire moved up from the Cascades and burnt out the Springs. 'The Springs Hotel was surrounded within a radius of half a mile, but 200 men worked hard and made it safe while the fire burnt beyond the Organ Pipes'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 1934</td>
<td>Springs Hotel advertised, with L.M. &amp; T.A. Pitman as proprietors, tel 4820.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 1939</td>
<td>Committee established to look at ways of improving access and accommodation at Hotel. June 1939 Improvements costed at £2200.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930s</td>
<td>C. Butler remembers Ernie Lacey who had come down from the Springs in the 1930s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MCC16/72/1 Reserves Minutes

The Mercury, 16 April 1928

McConnell & Scripps (2005, Inventory)

The Tasmanian Tramp 1 (1933).

The Tasmanian Tramp 2 (1933).

de Quincey (1987, p78)

The Tasmanian Tramp 3 (1934).

MCC16/2/410 Hobart City Council correspondence file DR109/247 Springs Hotel Access Road (n)

Chris Butler, Fern Tree resident (interview notes by G. Sheridan, 4/6/1998).
Dec 1945 – 'the Springs Hotel was saved once more as flames burnt up to the eastern face of the Organ Pipes'.

Dec 1946 Springs Hotel advertised, with Misses P. & M.I. Deegan, tel B5467.

1940s C. Butler remembers in the 1940s in an effort to use the Hotel it was advertised as a Sanatorium for people who had TB, but by the 1950s it was hired out. Someone called Stephenson owned it by this stage [1950s?].

Dec 1955 Springs Hotel advertised as the 'Mountain Lodge', tel B0167.

1950s? – description: 'The Springs Hotel was a large wooden building owned by the HCC. It had a German tenant, Etwin Kruegerl who was a refugee from East Berlin. But it was a loss making business and Kruegerl used to supplement his income by keeping a few cows and sheep. In the building there was a huge stove built out of stone, and several fireplaces. Mrs Kruegerl was a maker of rye bread – big loaves of rye bread, which many people loved to come and buy. As well the hotel catered for backpackers (about 30) in summer. Coffee/tea and apple cakes with cream were a speciality and people came because of the apple cakes. It was lovely to sit in the long summer evenings and watch the sun go down on the day, the sunset, in the cool of evening, eating apple cake – this was especially popular. One walked up to the Springs via the Middle Track form Fern Tree, it took about half an hour. The hotel was bigger that that at Fern Tree but in the fire of 1967 it was one of the first casualties'.

17 February 1965 Report on Springs Hotel and valuation of contents: Lessees at this time appear to be Mr & Mrs Liebetrau. Although they have spent £2,000 on repairs since they have been there the report states 'Apart from the rooms which have been recently painted there is an air of neglect of maintenance making the building very mediocre but nevertheless functioning as a third class boarding establishment. The meals served and menu offered for tourists seemed very good and every effort seems to be being made to cater for their visitors. A sum of £2,000 spent to finish their work, painting and renovating would make the premises more presentable but it would not overcome the disadvantages of an aged structure which is far below the standards expected by the tourist industry'. The report goes on to suggest the Council should 'plan for the stage development of a small but completely up to date motel type structure' apparently in the same location replacing the existing hotel bit by bit. In interim recommends £50 be spent on maintenance and the premises be retained for 3 years.

August 1965 Valuation report indicates that as well as c.18 guest bedrooms, the hotel had and office, hall, sitting room, smoker's room, den, lounge, dining room, pantry, kitchen and 3 staff bedrooms.

7 February 1967 Hotel destroyed by bushfires.

15 March 1967 Salvage report on Springs Hotel site: the following are considered in good or repairable condition – 24
| Springs Hotel Grounds, etc | 6 December 1907 Horses and cows belonging to the licensee of the hotel not to be kept in the public stables but in the area to be fenced off as grazing reserve.  
19 February 1909 Committee agreed to  
- extra land for coquet lawn  
- grazing area to be surveyed  
- company to be allowed to use the land opposite the side door of the hotel as a herb garden – to be properly fenced  
- supply of half dozen rest seats  

Between 1907 – 1910 Postcard of view from Pillinger Drive, Lower Springs to Springs hotel and South Wellington. Shows cleared scrubby area between Pillingers Drive and Gadds House, Gadds House, Springs Hotel with outbuilding on south side (west end) and no modifications on the lower Springs other than the road, a signpost (Fingerpost Track crossing?) and a post and wire fence on the west side of the road.  

19 August 1910 Hotel was granted a strip of land for a tennis court but to give up an equivalent area from land already granted. Stables must be built on site already agreed.  

15 November 1927 Reserves Committee notes that Miss Pitman has 'mentioned that business was lost owing to a lack of garage accommodation' and that 'after inspection t was decided that the stalls on one side should be made suitable for housing cars. The question of removing the other side of the stables to parking area near Hotel ordered to be given consideration'.  

1939? Plans show Springs hotel and outbuildings (with water tanks and tennis court labelled) and a lower Springs lease area of over 2 acres which includes the present day picnic area which is shown as having a 'garage' on the road edge and a septic tank to the east. Suggests the loop was only completed in c.1939.  

1 May 1963 – Annotations (3/5/63) to a memorandum requesting Council consideration of supporting works on the access road to the Springs Hotel although not a public road because 'it is now in such a state that tourist buses will no longer use it' indicates that only the N section existed prior to 1936 when the south link section was constructed by the PWD and Council. Prior to that the north section was seen as 'the last section of Pillinger Drive'.  
Plan shows the extension to Pillinger Drive (approx the route of the Pinnacle road) at upper intersection as 'tramway to the icehouses'; a lower extension of the drive to the hotel as 'timber tramway'; and above the hotel access from the intersection to the rear of the hotel as 'access row for food to hotel'. |

| Max Knott (pers comm) via HCC Mountain Park staff meeting (19/9/06) | 1967 (post-bushfires) When the hotel site was cleared the rubbish was dumped on the SW corner of the Springs where the Road Lookout is.  

| MCC 16/72/1 Reserves Minutes (n) | Plan shows the extension to Pillinger Drive (approx the route of the Pinnacle road) at upper intersection as 'tramway to the icehouses'; a lower extension of the drive to the hotel as 'timber tramway'; and above the hotel access from the intersection to the rear of the hotel as 'access row for food to hotel'. |

| Postcard 'Mountain Lodge, Mt Wellington, Tas. AB646' | 1 May 1963 – Annotations (3/5/63) to a memorandum requesting Council consideration of supporting works on the access road to the Springs Hotel although not a public road because 'it is now in such a state that tourist buses will no longer use it' indicates that only the N section existed prior to 1936 when the south link section was constructed by the PWD and Council. Prior to that the north section was seen as 'the last section of Pillinger Drive'.  
Plan shows the extension to Pillinger Drive (approx the route of the Pinnacle road) at upper intersection as 'tramway to the icehouses'; a lower extension of the drive to the hotel as 'timber tramway'; and above the hotel access from the intersection to the rear of the hotel as 'access row for food to hotel'. |

| MCC16/2/410 Hobart City Council correspondence file DR109/247 Springs Hotel Access Road (n) | Water radiators; 1 coal boiler (White Rose No.8) and associated pump, pipes and motor; 2 small boilers in the laundry (Ideal No.140); concrete floor and brickwork; 200 gallon oil storage tank; and water storage tank and stand. The following are considered as suitable for scrap iron only – 5 water radiators, 6 baths, 5 cisterns, various burnt motors, cast iron pipes, ranges, and iron pipe. |

| MCC 16/2/1/40 Memorandum (pc) | Water radiators; 1 coal boiler (White Rose No.8) and associated pump, pipes and motor; 2 small boilers in the laundry (Ideal No.140); concrete floor and brickwork; 200 gallon oil storage tank; and water storage tank and stand. The following are considered as suitable for scrap iron only – 5 water radiators, 6 baths, 5 cisterns, various burnt motors, cast iron pipes, ranges, and iron pipe. |
1950s-1967  The Springs Hotel had 'attractive gardens adorned with suitable flowers and mountain ferns', and had 'grass verges and lawns' around the building that were used for picnics by bushwalkers.

early 1990s – gravelled car park and works in the former hotel garden area were put in the early 1990s by the Council. The car park was built as an overflow car park when the road was closed above the Springs due to snow; gate to stop hooning also put in at this time; the loop track not put in at this time (has been there as long as people remember)

Springs Hotel Link Road

9 August 1939  Council approved altering the one-way traffic by-road at the Springs to give the Hotel a frontage on Pinnacle Road.

17 April 1963 Link Road in bad state cannot be used by cars or buses.
Plan 1 May 1963 shows tracks and tramways around hotel After some debate about who was responsible, HCC upgraded the road in 1965.

Springs Lookout No.1

Summary 2005: Gulson indicates that the lookout was built as part of the Exhibition Gardens in the 1930s (c.1931). The lookout is not shown on 1909 plan but is a clear open area with a track to it in the 1957 and 1967 air photos (in Gulson). Used today as a lookout and has path to it; also used as a memorial location by members of the local community (Kiernan).

Springs Timber Tramway

The tramway has been generally assumed to have been built to provide firewood to the Springs hotel. Recent archival information provided by John Chick indicates that it was a government built firewood cutting tramway, constructed in c.early 1925, possibly on an existing White Rock Track, and disused by 1927, with the rails sold to the HCC who intended to remove and sell them and upgrade the track. Fred Lakin remembers the tramway from when he was a child (1920s) as a child and remembers there were small carriages on the tramway to carry the timber.

Hobart City Council Minute Books (Minutes of the Reserves Committee (1907-1973), AOT MCC 16/72/v/p (see following)
V8 –
p18, 21/4/1925 – request from Mr Lacey (lessee of the Springs) for widening White Rock Track (= Lenah Valley Track to Sphinx Rock) to permit him to get wood at a cheaper rate – not agreed to.
p41-42 – White Rock Track: Supt of Reserves to report as to condition: Supt reported that the tramway was still in place on the track. If the govt have completed their woodcutting he advised that they be requested to remove the tramway and put the track in the same condition that they found it. There were about 44 chains of track.
p46 – White Rock Track: A/g Town Clerk submitted for information a letter forwarded to the Sec Public Works suggesting that the Govt give the rails (used in connection with the removal of firewood) to the Council on condition that the Council remove them and do repairs to the track.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appendix - 24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>p10 – p20, 8/3/1927 - White Rock Track: Cost of 50-60 pounds to take up the rails and repair the track – letter sent to Govt. p24, 22/3/1927 – letters proposed to be sent to Govt to see if they would be prepared to sell the rails. p28, 5/4/1927 – City Engineer valued the rails at 100 pounds. p44, 7/6/1927 – the rails were laid two years ago in order to facilitate the removal of firewood from the slopes of Mt Wellington in connection with provision of work for the unemployed. p53, 5/7/1927 – Govt accepted 50 pounds for the rails, conditionally that the Govt is relieved of its obligation to restore the track to its original condition. 15 November 1927 Recommendation for the ‘tram-line’ track is for steps to be taken to ballast track and restore same to its former condition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCC16/72 Reserves Minutes (pc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springs Water Supply/Race/Watercourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McConnell &amp; Scripps (2005, Inventory).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
18 March 1841 Lieut Governor approves a scheme to cut a new watercourse to add water from a Spring 'lately discovered' to the town supply.

4 February 1845 Description of early visit to Wellington Falls which commenced by way of timber tracks above Degraves Mill and over the summit via Sphinx Rock ('White Patch'); on their return they 'agreed to proceed round to the stream, or "springs" as it is called, which supplies, or rather ought to supply, the town with water. We gratified ourselves with a view of this useful watercourse' and wondered 'by what clever contrivance it happened that with such a pellucid and plentiful stream as may here be seen running, the inhabitants of the city below should be literally gasping for a cup of clear water'.

19 April 1845 We had much satisfaction in recently announcing the determination of the Lieutenant Governor to bring in a fresh supply of pure water for the inhabitants of Hobart Town from 'The Springs', which were discovered by Mr Skene and diverted from their original destination into a temporary stone duct leading towards the town, with the view of being subsequently made available for a plan of waterworks, whereby the town would be effectually placed beyond the danger of contact with private establishments. We now learn the project has been abandoned…. Complains about Degraves' diversion of the original water supply.

17 September 1847 The Lieutenant Governor has sanctioned the repair of the of the 'watercourse on the side of Mount Wellington, which conducts the water from the springs into the Hobart Town Rivulet, and to construct a wooden trough in it to prevent the waste of water through the porous soil'; Alex Cheyne requests a party of 25 men including 4 sawyers and 1 carpenter 'wit the requisite bedding, cooking utensils, etc, for the party which will be stationed on the Mountain'.

24 September 1847 Alex Cheyne’s proposal to line the 1890 yards of watercourse from the head of the Hobart Town Rivulet to the ‘further spring’ with covered troughing ten inches wide and seven and a half inches deep. But will be useless if the Town Tunnel is not reopened. Indicates that convict labour will be used for the works.

7 February 1850 Tree to be removed from Watercourse.

1 November 1858 scheme to put Guy Fawkes Rivulet in good order and connect it to ‘present supply’ approved, also reservoir at junction of Guy Fawkes Rivulet and ‘present creek’. Approved

c. 1860 Plan of Springs system

7 November 1867 Director of Water Works to report on the advisability and expense of laying with brickwork the watercourse form the Springs

14 November 1867 Director recommends work to watercourse and also ‘next river beyond Fork Creek.’
### Appendix - 26

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>Source(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25 November 1867</td>
<td>Work on bricking Springs and Long Creek, and 'puddle the Springs' approved</td>
<td>MCC16/65/2 Waterworks Minutes (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 March 1872</td>
<td>TC to Director Water Works – his report for the augmentation of supply from the Potato Fields source is approved - £50 voted for survey and £30 for 'complete repair of the Springs conduit.'</td>
<td>MCC16/7/6 Town Clerk's Letter Books (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 November 1899</td>
<td>'Scheme for piping the water leading from water holes to be taken into consideration at an early date' (?).</td>
<td>MCC16/65/2 Waterworks Minutes (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>Rahbek notes following an inspection that &quot;The Springs&quot; 'consisted of a smaller number of springs which have been connected by an open drain, running in a direction south to north until a certain point is reached, where the water is turned down a gully which forms the beginning of Bower Creek, and which again sends its water into the Hobart Waterworks Service Reservoirs'. Also notes that 'just north from the spur [on which Gadds Cottage is situated], and about the same height as &quot;The Springs&quot;, a creek, called the Hobart Rivulet – takes its rise'.</td>
<td>JPPT 1900 no. 68 (pc) Parliamentary Papers - K.L. Rahbek 5/10/1900 'Hotel or Sanatorium at &quot;The Springs&quot;, Mount Wellington'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 September 1902</td>
<td>Director Water Works reports that matter should be considered before summer.</td>
<td>MCC16/65/3 Waterworks Minutes (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stables</td>
<td>2 November 1899 £40 approved cow shed and stables at Springs and improving sanitary arrangements.</td>
<td>MCC16/65/2 (n) Waterworks Minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18 June 1903 Health Officer reports not desirable to have horse on the watershed but if this unavoidable they must be properly controlled. Cab Proprietors to be asked if they would pay for stabling if erected by HCC.</td>
<td>MCC16/65/3 Waterworks Minutes (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1907 Site plans for the Springs Hotel show 2 stables buildings located on the lower Springs on the east side of Pillinger Drive (which appears to have been subsequently realigned) with a track form the Hotel to the stables which approximates the present Radfords Track.</td>
<td>CSD 22/1/539- Chief Secretary's Department (pc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCT Garden</td>
<td>Summary 2005: A garden of native plants planted by members of the Tasmanian Conservation Trust in 1969-72 with permission of the HCC (Gulson). Seen generally as being a project between the TCT, the HWC and the Society for Growing Native Plants (Davies &amp; Erreys). T&amp;R Errey (2005) note that the <em>Eucalyptus Johnstonii</em> and other tall species eventually 'swamped' the less competitive plantings and there is minimal evidence of the garden today, but that the garden was psychologically, ecologically and historically important at a time of very widespread devastation and loss. R&amp;K Davies (2001) comment that HWC &amp; Field Naturalists members were also involved, and the planting was done to try and help mitigate the damage caused on Mt Wellington. They also comment that the garden was proposed to be between the Pinnacle Road and the Springs Hotel loop road but only about half of this area (the S half) was actually planted.</td>
<td>McConnell &amp; Scripps (2005, Inventory)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19681972 In 1968 following the denudation caused by the 1967 bushfires, a 'State Herbarium' of native Tasmanian plants was proposed for the Springs site by the TCT. 'Unsightly dead timber was to be cut out, useful firewood given to pensioners, and the site prepared for planting with raised seedlings'</td>
<td>J. Sprent, E. Jones, G. Sheridan &amp; R&amp;T. Errey, 16/12/202, representation to the RPDC (Proposed Eco Tourism Hotel)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix - 27

**The Springs Interim Conservation Policy**  
_A Wellington Park Management Trust Report_  
McConnell, A. (August 2007)

- **Development, the Springs**

1969: Tasmanian Conservation Trust scheme for rehabilitating Springs after 1967 bushfires. It is stated that 'The Tasmanian Conservation Trust with the cooperation of the Hobart city Council is planning to establish a garden of native flora in the vicinity of the Springs Hotel site on Mt Wellington. It is hoped to create an attractive plantation which will include a number of beautiful Tasmanian species not otherwise easily accessible to visitors together with groups of botanically related plants of special interest'. Dead and burnt trees cleared. There is an attached plan and a list of proposed plants (itemised under the following groups – rainforest, alpine and high moor, conifers, proteaceae, myrtaceae, epacridaceae, compositae, leguminosae).

The plan shows the area to be planted: Stage 1 is all of the area between the hotel side road and the Pinnacle Rd, and Stage 2 is the hotel area uphill to Milles Track. Stage 2 is understood not to have been planted (McConnell & Scripps 2005).

### The Springs - General Summary 2005: The area of flat bench on the SE side of Mt Wellington. The Springs Water Race (1831 Diversion), part of the first Hobart Water Supply, was constructed at the Springs in 1831. A visited location since the early 1800s (possibly by 1804 exploration parties of Collins complement and possibly by the Lady Franklin party in 1837). Was used at least from the 1850s as a site for site seeing picnics, music, dancing and/or flower picking (Thwaites). Nicholson (2001) describes the Springs as 'the meeting place on the mountain' and talks about how it was the place people met (talking about the 1930s-40s) – to socialise, eat, ski; and that it was such an important meeting place because it was a flat sheltered area with views, facilities and good car and walker access. Important as a stopping place on the various tracks that stopped or started at the Springs. An important visitor destination to the present day.

1804 – It is likely that a party under Collins that included Robert Brown (botanist), Harris (deputy surveyor) and Humphrey (mineralogist) were the first Europeans to visit the Springs area as they climbed the mountain to find the source of the Hobart Rivulet on the 18 June 1804; or Harris who spent 3 days exploring within a few months of arrival; or Robert Brown who climbed the mountain 10 times (but preferred the north route).

25 October 1833: Springs possibly visited by Backhouse and Walker on their ascent of Mt Wellington – ‘we availed ourselves of a path that is nearly obliterated, which was used by the workmen when laying a watercourse from the breast of the mountain for the purpose of supplying Hobart Town with Water’ [Springs Water Race].

10 July 1858: H.M.H. notes that ladies and gentlemen do make frequent riding parties to the building [Webb's Ice House] and

---

**Development, the Springs**

- MCC16/2/403 Hobart City Council correspondence file DR109/247  
  Tasmanian Conservation Trust (n and pc)

- McConnell & Scripps (2005, Inventory)

- de Quincey (1877, p13)

- Backhouse (1843, pp159-160).

- Mercury 10 July 1858 (pc)
that ‘on a late visit to the spot on a public holiday no less than fifty-seven people were counted at the House or ‘the Springs’, some laden with flowers of the Grass Tree and other beautiful shrubs which grow all round; others dancing to the music of a flute, and still more enjoying their luncheons and the glorious view’.

23 November 1886 "The Springs, " from whence a splendid view of the City and environs is obtainable, is a dreary, miserable, neglected-looking place in its present condition, which under other circumstances, might be made one of the most pleasant resorts around the City of Hobart'. Also comments on the impertinence of retaining forest 'as trees are well known conservators of springs'. Recommends the 'reservation and planting of "The Springs" with exotic trees and laying out of the grounds as a pleasure resort ...'.

1897 – major fire burns from Cascades around to Longley – possibly burns Springs area.

1900 Rahbek expresses major concerns about water contamination into the Hobart Rivulet and Browns River water catchments from the proposed Springs Hotel and also strongly advises that "The Springs" cottage, the shelter sheds, and any other sheds there may be in the vicinity be removed as soon as possible and suggests a location immediately below the sandstone cliffs (refer plan). HE suggests that the road should be terminated at the base of the sandstone cliffs, the stables and other buildings be erected in the head of Dunns Creek and that the upper part of Pillinger Drive be used only for foot traffic, and that steps be cut in the sandstone cliffs and an area fenced and 'an open pavilion erected [inside the fenced area] which would enable visitors to enjoy the fine view obtainable from that position'.

May 1905 Werthmeiners report indicates the high level of visitation to the Springs in the early 1900s - '9500 people visited the Springs November last to April, 8,000 availed themselves of vehicles to reach the Springs, 7,000 went to the Pinnacle along the new track [Panorama Track]. If anything I believe the above figures are underestimated'. Sheridan notes that based on these figures the proportion of visitors to Tasmania visiting Mt Wellington in 1905 was very similar to now.

1907 Site plans for the Springs Hotel show a greywater-septic system from Gadds Cottage (and a toilet between Gadds Cottage and 1 shelter shed) running down the north side of the Springs Hotel which feeds into it with the septic tank at the lower Springs north of 2 stables buildings (stables are on east side of Pillinger Drive).

27 July 1917 Dobson (Springs Hotel Company Chairman) requests Council upgrades at the Springs including that the Council settle on a plan 'for increasing the beauty of the Pillinger Drive and the locality of the Springs by planting wattles, sassafras flowering shrubs, berries and ferns in suitable places, erecting one or two ornamental rest houses and providing more seats both on the drive and the track to the Pinnacle' arguing that in part this is needed to replace plants lost in a recent fire. He also suggests that the track to the White

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>McConnell, A.</td>
<td>August 2007</td>
<td>The Springs Interim Conservation Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix - 29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rock [Sphinx Rock] be extended north to meet the New Town Track.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1934 Hobart Walking Club typical walk – described as starting from the Cascade Brewery tram terminal and arriving at the Springs - ”The view from here is known the world over, for on a clear day, the area one can see is ninety square miles; then on the Pinnacle, returning home via the Springs.”</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Feb 1934 – a major fire moved up from the Cascades and burnt out the Springs. ‘The Springs Hotel was surrounded within a radius of half a mile, but 200 men worked hard and made it safe while the fire burnt beyond the Organ Pipes’</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1930s-40s Local children used to ski sometimes at the Springs ‘where there was a lovely open grassy slope’</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dec 1945 – another major fire with flames burning up to the eastern face of the Organ Pipes; notes that the Springs hotel was saved again implying that the Springs area was burnt in this fire.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1955 Aves notes that on the plateaus at c.2,000’ the sandstone weathers to ‘curious rounded shapes’ and that ‘Some grotesque shaping is seen on the road just below the Mountain Lodge at the Springs’</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1967-1969 ‘A number of proposals were put forward for facilities to replace the Springs Hotel, including the use of the Pinnacle and the Upper and Lower Springs areas. Suggestions for the Lower Springs included a cafe near the Exhibition Gardens, car parking for a multi-storey hotel at the Springs Hotel site and a cable car to the pinnacle.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tracks to Springs ( &amp; Fingerpost Track)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4 February 1845 description of visit to Wellington Falls – from Degraves’ mill they travelled by ‘the middle path’ of easiest and most gradual ascent, one of many paths made years before for timber carriage – notes a hut at ‘the upper end of this tract’ 1700 feet above sea level. Proceed to Wellington Falls via the summit [possibly Old Track on Sprents 1846 map].</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nov 1846 Sprents map shows a ‘track to the Springs and to the Falls’ as running up the Hobart Rivulet from Degraves Sawmill, onto the ridge at Fingerpost and then following directly up the Fingerpost ridge towards the Springs with a cross track at the head of the north fork of the Sandy Bay Rivulet. Another track, marked ‘Old Track’ is shown running directly up the mountain between the Hobart Rivulet and Guy Fawkes Rivulet.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1858 Plan shows similar 2 tracks as shown on Sprents 1846 map converging at about Fingerpost and leading up the mountain with this route labelled ‘the Springs’</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1859 Plan which shows similar route as shown on the 1846 and 1858 plans; letter discusses damage caused to Fingerpost Track below the Springs through timber being dragged across it and side-drains filled up.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1869 following the ‘mountain road’ after about quarter of a mile of level road one reaches a steep rise, having reached the</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Tasmanian Tramp 3 (1934), M. Wilson, pp28-30.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>de Quincey (1987, pp77-78)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chris Butler, Fern Tree resident (interview notes by G. Sheridan, 4/6/1998).</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>de Quincey (1987, p78)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Tasmanian Tramp 12 (1955), K. Aves, pp29-43</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Andrews (2006)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hobart Town Courier 4 February 1845 (pc)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Buckingham 44 (1846) map by James Sprent</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MCC 16/43/1, 1858 plan</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LSD1/72/7 Lands and Surveys Department (n and pc)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Guide for excursionists, Melbourne. H. Thomas,</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event/Comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 June 1873</td>
<td>Plan of tracks showing what is essentially the Fingerpost Track route which links to the track to Wellington Falls and with the Ice House track (which takes off some distance along the Wellington Falls Track).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 December 1898</td>
<td>Plan shows the 'Old Fingerpost Track' on route of current Fingerpost Track and labels what is now Radfords Track as 'New Fingerpost Track'.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Summary 2005:
Originally, the ‘Track to the Springs’ established 1830s (?). Shown on 1869 sketch plan by Piguenit. By 1880s was one of three tracks which pre-Pillinger Drive gave access to the Springs from Huon Road, the others being the New Finger Post Track (surviving in part as the present Radford’s Track), the New Track and the Bower Track. Radfords Track is resumed to have been named as such after 1903 to commemorate G.H. Radford who died near the track on the 'Go-As-You-Please Race to the Mt Wellington Summit in 1903. The Fingerpost Track was –

### Track to Wellington Falls

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event/Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20 May 1845</td>
<td>Track to Wellington Falls half finished – guides will start from the Britannia Inn at 6am or from the Springs at 9am. &quot;the New track, even at the present time is so much better, easier and shorter than by the summit that it is expected that pedestrians will find ample time to investigate the 'falls' and return before sunset'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 July 1917</td>
<td>Dobson writes that the track to Wellington Falls has been closed for 10 years [since the hotel opened?], but that request to have re-opened have failed even though he does not believe opening it for a short distance will have an impact on water quality. He further notes that tourist staying at the Springs have complained about the lack of level walks.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### References:
- 1869, p. 39 (n).
- MCC 16/43/4, 1873 plan (pc), Waterworks correspondence
- CSD 22/1/538-544 Chief Secretary's Department, Sketch Plan by G.A. Goddard 13/12/1898 (pc)
- McConnell & Scripps (2005, Inventory)
- Hobart Town Courier 20 May 1845 (pc)
- MCC16/72/1 Reserves Minutes
Dobson also requests that the Council settle on a plan 'for increasing the beauty of the Pillinger Drive and the locality of the Springs by planting wattles, sassafras flowering shrubs, berries and ferns in suitable places, erecting one or two ornamental rest houses and providing more seats both on the drive and the track to the Pinnacle'.

15 November 1927 Reserves Committee report that they 'examined portion of this track with a view to ascertaining if the reasons which led to its being closed some years ago still held' and that 'Some distance along the track are two basins into which City supply water is discharged and which then round through pipes to the Bower. One flow of water comes from a spring in the hillside and it appears to the committee that if the basins were enclosed the conditions would then be similar to the supply at the Bower, to which no exception is taken and no reasonable objection would lie against the track being opened up as far as the first basin'. The question of opening up the track was to be further considered

| Tracks - General | 15 November 1927 Report on condition of tracks and proposed upgrading | MCC16/72 Reserves Minutes (pc) |
| Woods/Woods Hut | Summary 2005: The first known long term habitation on the mountain; Henry Woods and family were given permission to occupy some land there in the 1850s. This is possibly the first cottage to be built at the Springs and the first residence on the mountain. The Mercury (1876) notes that by 1876 'Old Woods', the original hermit and guide of the Springs and his wife were becoming frail' (Macfie). Photos in the M. Knott Colln show that in the 1870s the house was a vertical plank walled and shingle hip roof, Georgian style small cottage with a stone chimney at the N end was built on the slopes – probably the upper slopes of the Springs – and looked out over Hobart. R&K Davies (2001) describe the hut as being located 'just above the Springs'. There is a barn/stables (a large building of log cabin style construction with a gable roof of planks, and with a window and door in the N end) below and S of the house. There is a smaller shed immediately downslope of the barn (with vertical plank (rough) walls and a shingled (?) gable roof, also facing N). There are 3 other photos. One (AL&M and dated 1886) appears to be slightly later as it shows possibly the same people in front of the house which is essentially the same but has a small shed with no windows adjacent on the N side. It also shows there is and a flat grassed area out the front of both buildings. At least the barn is still extant. The Cornish photo of the house appears to be later still (late 1800s?) as there are still 2 buildings but the house appears much rougher in style (more run down), the roof is of planks not shingles, and the buildings are surrounded by shrubby vegetation and grasses. 21 August 1859 Henry Woods (has been resident in Vauxhall Gully and a tenant of Mr McRobie and Mr Cooley for 10 years) applies to occupy land at Springs to build a ‘good substantial House for the accommodation of respectable Inhabitants visiting Mount Wellington and in case they should be benighted to give them shelter for the Night.’ Also points out his wife 'is a steadfast hard working industrious woman' and | McConnell & Scripps (2005, Inventory) | LSD 1/32/496 Lands and Surveys Department (pc) |
| 'will use her best endeavour to make the ladies as comfortable as she possibly can'. Undertakes to cultivate 'a few acres of land'. Approved on the basis that Woods does not interfere with the watercourse. |
| Spring 1866 – a description of a trip from Hobart to Wellington Falls by Robert Mather and nine others describes leaving in the evening for the Springs, where they "took up our abode at the hut, set apart by a man who lived at the Springs, for visitors. The only bedding we had was a little carpet, and a few pillows besides a rug or two, and a cloak. A small table stood in one corner of the hut, and two stools and a bucket of water for our use. There was plenty of wood for the fire, but the man did not seem to think that wet wood would not burn'; they then left at 4.30am to Wellington Falls via the summit. Returning that evening via the Springs they 'partook of tea', then headed home. |
| March 1868 page from Visitors Book kept by Henry Woods at Springs. |
| 1869 After reaching the summit of a rise on the 'mountain road' ‘the visitor comes upon a hut surrounded by a small garden in which nature and art are to be seen contending for mastery; the former, however, is triumphant judging by the dwarfed gooseberry bushes and cabbages.' Woods – the ‘old man of the mountain’. He and his ‘better half’ provide cooking utensils etc for a consideration. |
| 24 March 1870 Henry Woods to be told his services are no longer required at Springs as from 31 April – Corporation to make other arrangements. |
| 1871 Walks about Hobart Town includes Mount Wellington – refers to people staying overnight at Springs and making a trip to the summit next morning to see the sunrise. ‘At the Springs he will find the shelter of a cottage roof, and an obliging resident hermit of the place, who will boil a kettle or perform other kindly ministrations if required. The said hermit will also exhibit to the stranger a book wherein to inscribe his name and any memorial lines he may feel inspired to indite on the occasion. To judge from many of the mementoes herein penned, the invigorating breezes alone can scarcely be held accountable for the elation of mind and exceeding friskiness exhibited'. |
| 1873 Tommy Wood was collecting Blue Gum [?] seed at the Springs. At around this time Blue gum seed was collected for export to Southern Europe, South Africa, India, America, New Zealand and mainland Australia, and the timber was high demand as a building timber because of its size and strength, and the oil from the leaves was important |
| 9 October 1876 ‘The man of the mountain’ Henry Woods becoming old and less able to keep the track in repair – has been badly damaged by timber contractor. Woods hospitality an institution but on hard times, may have to give up the Springs – subscription lists now being distributed. Mountain being stripped of timber - suggests Woods could be appointed a caretaker over the timber. Describes a visitors view of the Springs and Mr & Mrs Woods – ‘In his ascent, but more particularly in his descent, does the mountain climber claim the |


de Quincey (1987, p68) |

Mercury 9 October 1876 (pc) |
acquaintance of "old Woods' of the Springs, and welcome the resting-place he there finds, giving him time to contrast the more limited view to be seen from the Springs. The aged couple who live in the little oasis on the side of the mountain, can perhaps claim to be known to more numerous acquaintances than perhaps any half dozen of the best known colonialists. Every Tasmanian and every visitor to Tasmania knows the garrulous pair, and have benefited more by their labours than they have perhaps been aware. Everyone will remember the alacrity of Mrs Woods in preparing a refreshing cup of tea. But everyone does not know that his toil up the hill has been reduced to a minimum by the labour of the old man in maintaining the track.

25 July 1879 Henry Woods at Springs destitute. Has one son living with him, aged 40, who acts as a mountain guide. Notes that Woods had walked into town to make the petition for a pension as 'the well-known white horse being dead'; and that the old man had no food left in the house for himself and his wife. A Dr. Hall expressed surprise at the application as 'he had understood for years that Woods was earning a very handsome living'.

28 July 1880 Woods applies for Benevolent Society pension.

1881 Marianne North, English artist, author and traveller describes her visits to Mt Wellington 'Another day I scrambled up a staircase of fallen trees and tree fern trunks by the bed of a half dry stream for 1500' till we reached the first ridge of the mountain where an old convict and his wife lived summer and winter by boiling tea-kettles for visitors ...'

19 September 1882 HCC agreed to renew Henry Woods lease on Springs huts for five years in exchange for him agreeing to 'keep the mountain race free from destruction and to report any necessary repairs.

1880s tourist guide notes that from Fern Tree one can climb to the Springs "and by this time the exertion of the walk will probably have produced a craving for a drink of the clear and tempting water which runs here over pebbly channels. ... Near the Springs is a hut, where cooking utensils, plates, tea cups, etc, can be hired by the excursionists, if they like to take their luncheon here on the way up or to take a cup of tea on their way down."

1880s tourist guide 'About half way up the mountain you reach the Springs, where there is a sort of accommodation cottage, under whose hospitable roof you may enjoy a refreshing cup of tea. A mountain rill close by offers crystal clear, icy-cold water ... some half a mile or so along level ground and thence by a steep and stony track [ice house track] ...'

23 November 1886 Perrin recommends 'The removal of the present unsightly buildings, and the establishment of a proper house of accommodation more befitting the requirements of visitors than the present wretched tenement.'

3 August 1923 Article about Woods, mentions 'After Woods' day the hut was occupied by an old man named Lacey and his wife' and also notes that Lacey died (choked) during a Mayoral visit in the 1890s.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wragge's Springs Observatory</th>
<th>1955 In an article on Mt Wellington, Aves describes Mr Woods as a 'hermit' who 'lived in a hut' near where the Springs hotel was, and who made a living selling ice from the icehouses.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Tasmanian Tramp 12 (1955), K. Aves, pp29-43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12 (1955), K. Aves, pp29-43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>de Quincey (1987, p29-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thwaites (1983)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thwaites (1983, 55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thwaites (1983, 56-57)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>de Quincey (1987, p29-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MCC16/65/2 Waterworks Minutes (n)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3

CONSULTATION SUMMARY
## INITIAL CONSULTATION
### PART 1 - STAKEHOLDERS CONSULTED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person/Organisation</th>
<th>Mode of Initial Consultation &amp; Date</th>
<th>Response Mode &amp; Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Fern Tree Community Association        | Letter of invitation to comment 1/9/06 | Phone call (Brian Wilson) 29/9/06 –  
  • have no additional comment to that in RPDC submission  
  • would like to comment on draft ICP. |
| South Hobart Progress Association      | Letter of invitation to comment 1/9/06 | no response                                                                         |
| Hobart Walking Club                    | Letter of invitation to comment 1/9/06 | Letter with comment 1/10/06 Wish to be consulted on final CMP.                        |
| Mountain Festival Inc.                 | Letter of invitation to comment 1/9/06 | no response                                                                         |
| Tasmanian Field Naturalists Club       | Letter of invitation to comment 1/9/06 | no response                                                                         |
| Tasmanian Society for Growing Native Plants | Letter of invitation to comment 1/9/06 | no response                                                                         |
| Tasmanian Conservation Trust           | Letter of invitation to comment 1/9/06 | 18/9/06 - phone call (Craig Woodfield) – discussion; will not make a written submission (are happy for WPMT to research historical files in relation to post-1967 gardens). |
| Tasmanian National Parks Association   | Letter of invitation to comment 1/9/06 | no response                                                                         |
| Wellington Park Bushcare Group         | Letter of invitation to comment 1/9/06 | no response                                                                         |
| Heritage Tasmania                      | Letter of invitation to comment 1/9/06 | no response                                                                         |

NB: Submissions to the RPDC hearings were also reviewed to assess social values – see Section 8 for a list of submissions reviewed.
### EXTERNAL – INDIVIDUALS WITH KNOWN OR PROBABLE SPECIAL INTEREST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person/Organisation</th>
<th>Mode of Initial Consultation &amp; Date</th>
<th>Response Mode &amp; Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John &amp; Maria Grist</td>
<td>Email via website 22/8/2006</td>
<td>23/8/06 – phone call – happy to be involved. 31/8/06 – AM met with J&amp;MG and visited the Springs Hotel site and possible dump on Fingerpost Track.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted Cornish</td>
<td>Phoned 23/8/06 Letter with map 4/9/06</td>
<td>23/8/06 – happy to help; has spent a lot of time at the Springs in youth; AM to write and send map for Ted to mark features and make notes. 20/9/2006 – letter from TC and copies of Tasmanian Tramp articles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Gadd</td>
<td>Emailed 4/9/06</td>
<td>8, 10, 11 &amp; 13/9/06 – emails from TG with information and comment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy Sprent</td>
<td>Phoned 25/8/06</td>
<td>Happy to participate. 25/9/2006 – AM interviewed JS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Cooper</td>
<td>Phoned 4/9/06</td>
<td>6/9/06 – phone conversation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony Bennett</td>
<td>no approach at this stage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### EXTERNAL – HERITAGE, LANDSCAPE & PLANNING EXPERTISE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person/Organisation</th>
<th>Mode of Initial Consultation &amp; Date</th>
<th>Response Mode &amp; Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gwenda Sheridan</td>
<td>Emailed 4/9/06</td>
<td>19/9/06 – attended Heritage &amp; Landscape Specialist Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leslie Gulson &amp; John Miller</td>
<td>Letter (as per emails) 4/9/06</td>
<td>19/9/06 – attended Heritage &amp; Landscape Specialist Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerry de Gryse</td>
<td>Emailed 4/9/06</td>
<td>29/9/06 – AM interviewed JdG (JdG)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person/Organisation</th>
<th>Mode of Initial Consultation &amp; Date</th>
<th>Response Mode &amp; Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bob Graham (Tasmania)</td>
<td>Letter (as per emails) 4/9/06</td>
<td>no response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Russell (Hobart, Tasmania)</td>
<td>Emailed 4/9/06</td>
<td>19/9/06 – attended Heritage &amp; Landscape Specialist Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ian Terry (Hobart, Tasmania)</td>
<td>Emailed 4/9/06</td>
<td>Unable to attend meeting &amp; no other response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Parham (Hobart, Tasmania)</td>
<td>Emailed 4/9/06</td>
<td>Unable to attend meeting &amp; no other response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindy Scripps (Hobart, Tasmania)</td>
<td>Emailed 4/9/06</td>
<td>19/9/06 – attended Heritage &amp; Landscape Specialist Meeting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MANAGEMENT AGENCIES WITH SPECIAL INTEREST**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person/Organisation</th>
<th>Mode of Initial Consultation &amp; Date</th>
<th>Response Mode &amp; Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>WELLINGTON PARK MANAGEMENT TRUST</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Easton (WPMT Manager)</td>
<td>Verbal advice Aug 2006.</td>
<td>Aug-Sept 2006 - discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HOBART WATER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Truscott &amp; Andy Crawford (Environmental Management Section)</td>
<td>Verbal advice Aug 2006.</td>
<td>7/9/06 – meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HOBART CITY COUNCIL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rob Mather (HCC Bushland Manager)</td>
<td>Verbal advice Aug 2006.</td>
<td>23/9/06 – meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Phillips (HCC Bushland Project Officer)</td>
<td>Verbal advice Aug 2006.</td>
<td>23/9/06 – meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Lumb (Group Manager – Civic Parks)</td>
<td>Verbal advice Aug 2006.</td>
<td>23/9/06 – meeting 19/9/06 – on-site meeting of HCC field staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivan Wolfe (HCC Mountain Park)</td>
<td>Organised by Brian Lumb</td>
<td>19/9/06 – on-site meeting of HCC field staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCC – Other Mountain Park Crew</td>
<td>Organised by Brian Lumb</td>
<td>19/9/06 – on-site meeting of HCC field staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brendan Lennard (HCC Cultural Heritage Officer)</td>
<td>Verbal advice Aug 2006.</td>
<td>5/9/06 – discussion.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INITIAL CONSULTATION
PART 2 - CONSULTATION SUMMARY

COMMUNITY GROUPS & INDIVIDUALS WITH A SPECIAL INTEREST
(PROJECT CONSULTATION)

Heritage Values/Significance

Physical Heritage (fabric based/archaeological) Values
- Lower Springs - the 2 stone shelters, shelter in western picnic area, walking tracks, rhododendrons at north end of western picnic area, large open area (former hotel garden), Exhibition Gardens, Lookout; Upper Springs – Milles Track/water race, start of icehouse track, Ranger's house, drystone walls and sandstone steps, long narrow bench to SW of cosmic ray observatory S of walking track (possibly Wood's hut site?), circular stone feature (well??) also SW of cosmic ray observatory on S side of walking track, Springs Hotel sites (including stuff behind terrace and a big dump in SW corner of site), cabbage tree palm on east side of hotel car park area.
- The area of the lower Springs between the main picnic area and the former hotel garden was originally [after the 1967 fires?] open and were visually linked.
- The grassy area on the loop road to the former hotel garden and just northeast of the lookout has concrete and other artefactual material around the edges – appears to be a site (nature not known).
- former Springs Timber Tramway (considered to be the Hotel tramway) – formation runs besides road [Grays Fire Trail?] and appears to continue on as the present day Lenah Valley Track.
- former Springs Hotel post-1967 bushfire clean up dumps – one in SW corner of the hotel site (behind the tennis court) and near the intersection of the Fingerpost and O'Grady Falls Tracks.
- Exhibition Gardens are of high significance.

Social (contemporary & historical) Values
- Springs was a fascinating place (mid 1900s), it had a certain attraction about it that, like a magnet, it drew people of all walks of life to itself.
- The combined attraction of both Mountain and the Springs (mid 1900s) absorbed regular groups of young people representing the scouting movement, schools, churches and clubs learning and appreciating the values of nature, healthy exercise and fun.
- The Springs (mid 1900s) was as much a central focus point for people visiting the mountain as was the summit and it was a welcome retreat for rest and refreshment and had the benefit of being more sheltered from the elements compared to the summit.
- The Springs was also a popular meeting place for walkers about to embark on the more challenging adventure walks as well as an excellent starting point for the less strenuous destinations while being at an altitude that at least looked like one had achieved something worthwhile.
- The Springs Hotel was valued by walkers for the kiosk shop where refreshments could be purchased and for the attractive gardens adorned with suitable flowers and mountain ferns, and the grass verges and lawns around the building were great places to picnic.
- On a clear night, the lights at the Springs [Springs Hotel] could be seen from quite a distance and would remind folk of perhaps an enjoyable day spent on the mountain, of fun and fellowship and aching limbs as well as the warmth and welcome of an open fire to warm heart and soul.
- The Springs is valuable community use space.
- The Springs generally has value as a convenient accessible safe place but interesting enough destination for teenagers to walk there on their own and use independent of adults for special events such as birthdays.
- Personal connection as family lived there historically.
- 'I've always felt a deep spiritual sort of attachment to the mountain';
- 'the Springs has always felt like a bit of a nexus as about 7 walking tracks start there and it is nearby Sphinx Rock which is one of my favourite places on the more accessible parts of the mountain' although I can no longer walk on the mountain because [due to a disability].
- One of the great things about the mountain is that it is not overdeveloped.

4 Historical information about the Springs has been included in Appendix 2 and is not included here.

Walking tracks and historic huts ruins of importance (including ice houses).

The former Exhibition Gardens are historically important and it was such a beautiful place before the bulldozing in the 1970s/1980s.

The former Hotel garden has been used for recreation by school groups – is a good space for this.

The loss of the Springs Hotel in the 1967 bushfire was one hell of a loss to bear, it was for many like the close of a chapter of their life [recalls much evidence of sadness and grief].

The Springs Hotel was a landmark – could be seen from a number of vantage points around Hobart.

The Springs Hotel site important as a memorial site – ashes are scattered there and it is used for weddings and memorial service.

The Springs Hotel site is important as a 'private public space' – a place people feel is their own and is valuable as it is sheltered - as such it is used for group functions, memorial services, camping, and to enjoy the views.

### Aesthetic, Landscape & Natural Values

- Views to the mountain from the Springs are important [mountain can be seen from all over the Springs].
- Upper Springs area has an 'incredible view over the world' (can look up and down), while the lower Springs view is more restricted (can only look up).
- Recognition of 3 parts to the Springs – upper Springs, middle Springs (picnic area), lower Springs (former hotel garden and Exhibition Garden area).
- The lack of commercial activity lends a lot of integrity to the natural values of the Springs - this is because you have to engage with the mountain – in too many places the experience of nature has been commodified (don't need to experience it – you can stay indoors, buy a photo or a windcheater with view).
- Water quality.

### Educational Values

- The Upper Springs area is an invaluable educational resource – can use ruins to re-imagine what it was like in the past and to try and reconstruct the historic environment form the historical remains and old photos.

### Management Matters

#### Current Use

- Lower Springs – barbeques used, picnic area only a focus because it had facilities (car park and toilets, western picnic area used in past for educational activities and workshops (related to the Springs); southern car park and area rarely used (car park mainly used as an overflow car park and to a limited extent for car camping as more isolated, former hotel garden paddock used for skiing when there is enough snow).
- Upper Springs – Springs Hotel site used as a 'private public space' for group events (eg. memorial services), camping, views, snow play, departure point for walks (car park used mainly by walkers – lower Springs is often full), meeting place for walkers, dance parties on (more than 1 in 2-3 years); upper Spring generally was used for summer ranger educational activities.
- Upper Springs – particularly former Springs Hotel site is mainly used by locals.

#### Issues & Opportunities

- There needs to be genuine stakeholder (including community) consultation and negotiation in any future development at the Springs.
- If there is to be public consultation it needs to be incorporated in the planning and management – not ignored.
- The Springs has full use at present why do they need to put more things in.
- The Springs is not appropriate for commercial opportunities – would hate to see someone selling fish & chips and snow cones'.
- Public space needs to be maintained.
- Commercial development related issues are water and sewerage (no contaminating), road widening (should not occur), car parking (shouldn't take up too much space and where will it go); issue of public safety and delivery trucks and traffic more generally especially with people crossing the road to access/continue on the walking tracks, all the above contribute to an impact on the amenity
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value to current types of users and user safety and will impact on wildlife.

- Against development other than the provision of historical information (eg such as what is currently there).
- Supportive of development but it needs to respect the conservation values.
- A visitor centre is a good idea and could be at Fern Tree or the Springs.
- If a Visitor's Centre is built at the Springs would prefer it located where the snowplough shed is as it is out of the line of sight [out of view of people who want to recreate, picnic, etc].
- Concerned that more infrastructure (and use) of the Springs will increase the local fire risk.
- Concerned about new development, in particular accommodation, and water quality risks.
- Concern about new developments taking too much water from the Browns River supply, hence the Fern Tree supply which relies on the Browns River catchment.
- Ground water and surface water supply and movement at the Springs is a major issue in relation to water supply and water quality, yet no studies of this have been done at the Springs – this needs to be done as a priority.
- Important to ensure any new plant species introduced are suitable for the Springs and are not invasive and will not compete.
- A lot of weedy species on east side of the former Springs Hotel car park – possibly management issue.
- Increased development is seen as creating an increased fire risk.
- Would be happy to see nature take over the upper Springs area again, as it is doing.
- The picnic area on the lower Springs is highly used (up to 80 people have been seen using it at one time) and is too small for the level of use.
- People don't use the upper Springs for general public use and picnics as there are no toilets or other facilities.
- Maintenance of public access to walking tracks and historic huts ruins desired.
- Two storey (or greater) buildings are inappropriate at the Springs as they will interrupt views to the mountain, and other large infrastructure may be an issue for the same reason at particular places.
- Interpretation at Lower Springs is important and should not be removed.
- Historical information provided should be unobtrusive and minimal impact.
- Would like to see some sort of historical marker/information panel (minimal impact) at the location of the former Springs Hotel and Gadd's Cottage.

**Long Term Management - General**

- Want to see maintenance of free amenities in the Springs area (toilets, barbeques, open space and parking areas).
- The value of the Springs as public/community use space needs to be acknowledged in the management of the area.
- Development needs to be suitable to the local environment (ie, blend into the landscape with colours and materials matching the local environment)
- If there is going to be development at the Springs it should be something small that is in keeping with the present use – for example a stage or sound stage (eg, similar to that at Tolosa Park).
- The Springs Zone boundary needs to be determined on the basis of sound water flow and catchment boundaries (based on studies).
- If there is to be commercial development there must non-commercialised space for people\(^5\), especially locals, so they can continue 'to enjoy the mountain/ have a mountain experience not mediated by a commercial development'.
- If there is to be commercial development would prefer to see it at the lower Springs, but away from the former Exhibition Gardens.
- Wants to see as little change as possible happen at the Springs.
- Walking track should be up kept.
- Happy to see historic walking tracks put back into use again, but filled with horror by the idea of a chair lift and the 'disgusting white object on the top [of the mountain] is a travesty'.
- Would like to see the Upper Springs managed as a distinct area as a base for adventure and a secluded place where incredible views are maintained; and to see the middle Springs (current picnic areas) as a base for day trippers.
- The Upper Springs is better for commercial development/visitors centre.
- Lower Springs should be reserved for picnicking and other day use.
- Day use facilities at the lower Springs should be improved.
- There should not be buses in the picnic areas.

\(^5\) Refer Glossary for explanation of term ‘non-commercial’.
Specific Heritage Site Management
- Concerned that the Child’s Grave at the upper Springs be preserved.
- The former Exhibition Gardens need to be preserved.
- Would like to see the stone shelter at the lower Springs picnic area kept as is (‘not messed up’).

Visions
- One day perhaps the Springs will echo once more with the sound of laughter emanating from a verandah with a little shop.
- As per the following Mercury letter to the Editor (R. Aulich, South Hobart, The Mercury 23 Aug 2004) – "I find it utterly incredible that any kind of extra development is being prepared for the site at the Springs. I walk there often, perhaps three times a week. Out of my backdoor, across the yard, up a fire trail, across the mountain road and up Radfords Track. People walk, ride or drive to the Springs, get out of their cars and either sit and look up to the organ pipes and down to Hobart or they begin to walk. Often bathed in sun it is a place of frequent use, not only by those visiting Tasmania but daily by those who live on the flanks, those who live in its shadow, and those who live outside its caressing contours. To suggest more extensive development is to suggest that the site is inadequate as it is, or that a demand for more facilities exists. I have never heard anyone, visitor or local, voice a serious need for a visitors centre or cafe on the mountain, ever. To build such facilities is to shift a person’s focus away from the mountain towards what can be bought and consumed, not what can be seen, smelt, touched, explored, even on the shortest of visits. Why not just upgrade the already existing picnic tables? Upgrade the existing Fern Tree Tavern which could include a visitor’s centre? And as for a cafe there is always the Thermos. Have Tasmanians forgotten the meaning of the term in perpetuity? It will change the mountain forever."

Project Specific
- Want consultation on the final conservation policy and any development proposals for the Springs (Hobart Walking Club).
- Want to be able to comment on the draft Initial Conservation Policy (x3)

PUBLIC (COMMUNITY) REPRESENTATIONS TO THE HCC, 2004
in relation to Draft Amendment City of Hobart Planning Scheme 1982 to incorporate the Springs Site Development Plan as a Local Area Plan, & planning permit for an accommodation and visitors centre at the Springs.
(Note: Only representations from groups and organisations that have not provided comment directly to the present project have been used to avoid duplication of comment and limit bias; 23 representations reviewed).

Summary of Issues Raised in Representations (taken from RPDC &HCC documents) relating to the proposed development (where related to the Springs)
- There will be an alienation of public space.
- There will be a loss of naturalness.
- There will be adverse environmental impacts
- No commercial activity should be allowed on the mountain.
- There is no public need for commercial activity on the mountain.
- A development of this nature at the Springs will affect the Fern Tree water supply and quality
- Traffic/parking impacts
- The heritage and cultural values have not been fully researched and documented.
- There will be adverse visual impact.
- There is inadequate infrastructure particularly relating to road capacity and water supply.
Heritage Values/Significance

Physical Heritage (fabric based/archaeological) Values
- The Exhibition Gardens site is seen as particularly significant.
- The Exhibition Gardens seen as highly significant with substantial remains of the hard elements. Stated significance includes that 'this small area can be seen to contribute to the entire garden history of Tasmania in that its design, conception and timing would appear to be an addition (specifically an indigenous one) to help beautify the state, adding to the earlier twentieth century vision of making Tasmania the 'Garden State'; a unique place; connections with Alan Walker and L.M. Shoobridge.
- The walking tracks are very much part of the cultural history of Hobart/are important (x 2).

Social (contemporary & historical) Values
- Socially valued as 'the largest public space remaining on Mt Wellington'.
- Valued public space (x2) – accessible, has great views and good facilities (toilets and shelters).
- Valued long term established use area for picnicking and BBQs.
- Springs is an escape from urban landscapes and consumerism.
- A non-urban environment that has value as an escape from city living (a stress reducer).
- A major value is that it is 'completely free of any kind of commercialisation' – 'a rare thing indeed these days'.
- The greatest value and significance of Mt Wellington (including the Springs) is that it is still largely wild and unspoilt (x 2).
- A clean, relatively tranquil environment.
- Current undeveloped state.
- Apparent remoteness from development.
- A valued largely natural and quiet area, particularly valued by walkers.
- Valued for its natural environment and accessibility for solitude and reverence on/for the Mountain.
- Holds special significance in the overall 'sense of place' that derives from the Mountain (in particular as the focus of most of the major walking tracks, the existence of substantial ruins and artefacts of historical and cultural significance, and for its significant vantage points to view Hobart, the Derwent Estuary, the eastern face of the Mountain and the Organ Pipes).
- Mt Wellington (including the Springs) has great psychological importance – it is a symbol of home and belonging [to locals].
- 'Mt Wellington (including the Springs) is a wonderful thing to have in our "backyard".'
- Knowledge of the mountain creates an attachment.
- Part of the iconic and inspirational nature of the mountain over the history of western settlement in Tasmania.
- Important as a site for community events, in particular the Mountain Festival.
- Valued for the ability to have wood BBQ fires – part of more natural outdoor recreational experience.
- A particular value of Wellington Park is the established network of tracks – they are narrow and twisty and rough, but they are tracks with a local history and much loved by those that use them frequently.
- The Exhibition Gardens has social value to the local community in its own right as a rare and historical site.

Aesthetic, Landscape & Natural Values
- Spectacular views (x2).
- Mt Wellington (including the Springs) is a magnificent natural feature and the essentially natural viewscapes in and out are important.
- Mt Wellington (including the Springs) is 'one of Hobart's most defining geographical features'.
- The quality that makes Mt Wellington so unique is its naturalness (x 2).
- 'Natural areas are fast becoming rare and endangered, and although I appreciate there has been development on this site previously, significant revegetation has occurred and the area is now very much part of 'the mountain'.
- Springs is a sensitive ecological area.
- The Springs has specific wet heathy habitat (on the sandstone bench) not found frequently on Mt Wellington.
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Educational Values

- The southern part of the lower Springs is often used by school groups as a safe area to show large groups of students the change of vegetation found on different soil and rock types and for tracking different animal species; and it is also a safe and scenic area of large groups of people to eat their lunch.

Management Matters

Current Use

- Mt Wellington/Wellington Park is primarily a day use area, is ‘used primarily as a viewing platform’; no apparent demand for overnight accommodation.
- Currently used for large scale community celebration – is favoured because of its values and is the most suitable space on the Mountain for this.
- The public open space is used for a range of activities including public gatherings for memorial services, birthday parties, performances, and for recreational activities such as playing in the snow, barbecues and picnics.
- Springs is a popular picnic spot for many Hobart residents and visitors.

Issues & Opportunities (related to the development/a large hotel development)

- Private commercial development seen as inappropriate in a public reserve (x11) – largely an equity issue – ‘the mountain belongs to all people’; a related concern is that commercial development is not a cost to the public, should be a financial return to assist other management.
- Loss of public space/alienation of public land is an issue (x 8) - in particular the old hotel site and the existing picnic areas, and public access also needs to be retained to the lookout.
- A commercial development is an appropriation of prime public space.
- The Springs is too valuable to be traded off for a ‘proprietary profit potential’ opportunity.
- Will result in a loss of picnic and BBQ space, hence impact on the established use.
- A commercial hotel on the mountain will greatly detract from its purpose as a wild place with intrinsic value.
- Commercial enterprise will completely ruin the value of the area as a public recreational space without commercial development.
- Concerned about the loss of naturalness.
- Concerned about the loss of peace and enjoyment with increased use, traffic, and a visitors centre.
- Potential for restricted access for ordinary families and parking – undesirable.
- A hotel on the outer edge of the lower Springs would have a significant viewfield impact (x3) – includes impacts on views to the Springs and down from near the summit, including on walking tracks.
- Concern about impacts on visual values (x4) – which are not yet adequately assessed.
- Concerned about impact of buildings (windows) on the scenic quality of the view from outside the Springs – more visual pollution on the Mountain.
- Development will place unsustainably high pressure on Pillinger Drive and the Pinnacle Road (x11).
- Development will result in constant traffic during the day and extend traffic use into evening (x5) and increase alcohol consumption related driving issues and decrease safety.
- Pedestrian safety seen as an issue – pedestrians need to be able to access the various sites in safety.
- Visible infrastructure in the area of key recreational features is unacceptable (eg sewerage pipeline along a popular walking track).
- Sewerage pipeline (buried) along a historically and socially significant track is inappropriate (2) – “I suggest that any existing track that is used as sewer route must be regarded as in danger of losing virtually all its value s a Mountain walking track”, and will create highly visible and other environmental impacts.
- Development will have an environmental impact even if sensitively designed, while current use is relatively low impact (x2).
- Concerned with pollution generally from the development.
- Potential for contamination of the drinking water catchment water with the proposed development (x5).
- Concern that the development will significantly diminish water supply to the local community and Hobart (x2).
- Concerned with waste management from such a large development.

6 Refer Glossary for explanation of term ‘non-commercial’.
- Ecological values need to be protected.
- Springs a classic high bushfire risk area – high potential of loss of buildings through bushfire.
- Concern about increased fire risks.
- Concern that the environmental values have not been fully assessed.
- There has been inadequate assessment of the flora and fauna values of the Springs as at 2004.
- Concern that the cultural heritage values have not been fully assessed, in particular the Exhibition Gardens site.
- Concern about the demolition of the 'workers hut' without adequate assessment.
- Concern about the siting of the water tanks on the former Springs Hotel tennis court area since the tennis courts are part of the Springs Hotel site and the water tanks would have a visual impact.
- There are adequate accommodation facilities in Hobart – not needed on the mountain (x2).
- There are alternative sites, eg, Fern Tree – the hotel development is not needed at the Springs.
- Concern about the economic impact on Fern Tree (x3).
- The argument that a hotel is a continuing use is not a sufficient reason for a new hotel development as the nature and scale of what is built to day and the environmental impacts will be much greater.
- Support for an appropriate hotel development (but not proposed development).

**Issues & Opportunities (general)**

- The Springs need to be maintained as a passive recreation area and development needs to be low key (x2).
- Sees the Springs key long term use as a free public space, in particular picnicking and barbequing, and also for the staging of public events such as festivals, theatre and social gatherings – comment son need for providing a dedicated space for this and perhaps developing a stage/facilities (not too hardened – eg grass seats).
- The Springs should be managed to be available and welcoming to the general public.
- Concern in relation to increased development about increased visual impact, noise pollution day and night, and vegetation removal around the site (x2).
- Buildings and associated hard surfaces will affect natural groundwater and surface water regimes, compromising normal flows and increasing the risk of pollution.
- Car parking space is an issue when the gate is closed above the Springs.
- Inappropriate to have a development at the Springs that will require full time access given winter snow closures – safety and public access issue
- To manage fire risk wants to see the Springs as a 'Fuel Stove Only' area and this status to be incorporated into the planning.
- Wants to see the retention of the identity of, and access to, historical tracks.
- Any significant new infrastructure development needs to be economically feasible and to be suitable for alternative re-use, otherwise left with a white elephant/costs (cites the Antarctic training centre at Lake Augusta as an example that this is a real issue).
- Large amounts of decaying infrastructure (includes heritage site in this category – cites the ice houses and Woods hut as examples) are a long term management issues as these require significant funds to remove or manage – therefore need to be very careful about introducing new infrastructure.
- An improved interpretation centre (in the current site) would be acceptable/appropriate (x2) – but with no kiosk (which will change site ambience and create a rubbish problem at the site).
- Support for an interpretation centre/cafe (x3) - in the present picnic area.
- There needs to be consultation and negotiation in relation to any future development of a performance area with those who have a particular interest.

**Long Term Management - General**

- Want to see the Springs left as it is (no further development).
- It is essential that management allows continued public access to the Springs.
- It is essential that management allows addresses the need for the continued use of the Springs for large scale public events.

**Specific Heritage Site Management**

- The former Exhibition Gardens should be preserved ('retained as discrete entity' and its historical integrity be preserved) because of its historical, scientific and social significance; call for a full CMP to be developed for the site.

**Visions**

- The general view from community representations is that the Springs should be left much as it is with an essentially natural feel, protection of the natural and cultural heritage values, guaranteed
public access to picnic areas and BBQs and basic other facilities (public toilets and shelter sheds) as well as the walking track network which should be maintained, with development limited to public facilities such as a dedicated low key event area and a small visitors centre, and with minimal visual impact from outside (above and below).

HERITAGE COMMUNITY

Heritage Values/Significance

Physical Heritage (fabric based/archaeological) Values

- The physical remains of the Springs are of heritage significance.
- The following sites are significant for their association with the Springs as a staging post for tourism and recreational use of the mountain - Lady Franklins hut, Woods hut, Gadds cottage, shelter sheds (series from 1840s?), Springs Hotel, and locus of tracks.
- The relations of the roads, and the location of the Springs depot, at the Springs is significant in relation to the Springs significant role as a staging post for tourism and recreational use of the mountain.
- The roads, walks and routes have significance as part of the experience of the Springs.
- Sites of Woods' and Gadd's dwellings and associated features and activity areas are particularly significant.
- Surviving water supply features are of significance.
- The icehouses are of significance because of the interrelationship with the recreational use of the mountain.
- The Springs Hotel site, including –
  - the hotel farm which was important in providing food for the hotel (ie, present day farm);
  - stone work [terraces and fences?] – historic lines are important;
  - visual impact of the hotel from Hobart (gives a sense of Mt Wellington as a worked and inhabited landscape);
  - Loop road - extension of the road can be seen as cutting through the grounds and reducing their integrity.
- Current shelters have value as a sequence of architectural building styles in rock (be good to know more about who designed them).
- The present toilet block is an example of good modern architecture – good outdoor design, good form, light and airy (who designed it?).
- Exhibition Gardens site needs to include the water pipe from the picnic area to the Gardens, and a 'structure to the left of field as arrive'.
- The cabbies area and building (ie, public vehicle facilities in early 1900s on the lower Springs).
- Possible remains of Springs Depot – some strange shapes around the ledge of the platform (ie, levelled area of eastern picnic area).
- Possibly historical tracks in the area between the eastern picnic area and the hotel garden paddock.

Historical Values

- The Springs is significant as a destination.
- The Springs is significant in relation to early development of tourism and appreciation of the local landscape.
- The Springs is significant as a staging post for tourism and recreational use of the mountain, as an access point to the mountain.
- Water supply was the focus of early activity and trigger for recreational use, and water supply has continued to be an important function.
- Historical water supply is of local significance in relation to improved quality of life for Hobartians, and significant in an Australian context.
- The Springs Hotels was part of an era of the development of rustic natural area resorts with good outlooks.
- Use of rocks reflects utilitarian and later Romantic and Arts & Crafts Tradition.
Social (contemporary & historical) Values
- The Springs has many layers of meaning and association - Stoddard book draws attention to these values; and value is also as demonstrated by the high level of present day use including for picnics and memorial and funeral services.
- There has been a strong social attachment over a long period for many different reasons.
- The mountain generally is of social significance as it gives Hobartians a sense of identity which is widely shared.
- A logical place to stop as it is protected (from weather).
- The Springs (and Pinnacle) have social value as relatively accessible (physically & financially) destinations.
- There much traditional use of the Springs by the local community.
- Naturalness of the Springs (lack of development & low key).
- Believes that intuitively the history suggests that there was a 'respect' for the place and also an appreciation of the Spirit of the Place (Genius loci).
- Fulfilled the human desire to look out from high places (as per Christopher Alexander).
- The mountain, and by association the Springs, is of landmark value.
- Snow days and ability to experience and enjoy the snow at the lower Springs.
- The Springs Hotel site is acquiring new contemporary value –
  - people who have an historical association are re-visiting the site of the former hotel as a nostalgic experience; and
  - it is becoming used for commemorative purposes.

Aesthetic, Landscape & Natural Values
- The landscape is iconic.
- The eastern face of the mountain is iconic.
- Intimate views.
- Views outwards.
- Unique relationship in an Australian context between a mountain and a city and the ability to look out over.
- The Springs has traditional (ie, continuously valued over a long time) visual values as a seen place (from above and outside), and for its views and sightlines.
- Springs plays an important role in achieving an important view of the mountain – it is a close up view and because you are ain the middle of the overall viewscape of value it strengthens the 'Sublime' aspect.
- The Exhibition Gardens site is a very focal point with views up to the mountain and outward.
- The Springs Hotel site has a particular relationship to the form of the face of Mt Wellington – the site is close to the mountain face which means that one looks up to the pinnacle and is humbled; not sure that this is typical of the Picturesque Romantic, although the drama of a landscape being accentuated by the sequence of experiences was a common device and is extremely well realised in this instance.
- A type of Depression landscape (as a focus of Depression employment works).

Other
- The values are multiple and closely interconnected (x 2), and the historical values are very complex.
Management Matters

Current Use
- Most people tend to drive through (and this is encouraged by the presentation, access).
- South end of the lower Springs is largely unknown to people.
- Lower Springs picnic area gets intensive use while the upper Springs area gets relatively little use.

Issues & Opportunities
- The values at the Springs are 'multiple' – need to consider in this light; and need to establish a values system rather than consider heritage as separate values.
- The range of heritage values needs to be respected.
- The historical, aesthetic, and recreational values and use are all closely interconnected for the 19th century.
- Springs needs to be considered as a heritage place which has a number of elements – it is more than a picnic area.
- Thinks the social values of the Springs Hotel site are overstated.
- Naming is important in reflecting history and becomes an important part of the place – important historical place names should not be lost (eg, Fingerpost).
- Less concerned about heritage protection if it stops us from living in/using the place.
- The Lower Springs has been used intensively by the public for at least the last 30 years and is more appropriately kept as a public use area.
- Doesn't see a need to retain the bushland between the picnic area and former hotel garden paddock at the lower Springs, but doesn't see a need to open up whole new areas of forest for new development when there is already so much developed space.
- The relationship between the Exhibition Gardens Lookout and the present car park is not clear so people are not encouraged to visit the lookout – this should be addressed.
- The naturalness of the Springs needs to be preserved, but there is a difficulty which lies in the historical planning of the Springs where it was seen (prior to historical research) as the place to develop – consequently it requires overturning a mental mindset for some.
- When tourism really started in earnest, the natural aesthetics were kept – eg, hut development, Exhibition Gardens. Structures were rustic, used natural materials and fitted into landscape – this is an important for future management.
- Unhardened areas are becoming progressively hardened – this is a negative impact on the natural and natural/rustic setting values of the Springs.
- Need to avoid a situation where the use and management of the Springs results in traditional user groups and groups who particularly value the Springs feeling as though the traditional values have been 'violated'.
- Free, public use space(s) need to be retained/preserved at the Springs (x 2) – it is part of the social values; this includes space that is not related to, accessed via or visible from commercial areas (including visitor centres – Mt Field given as an example of how not to manage the Springs) (x 2).
- Maintenance of equitable access (x2) – facilities need to be friendly to the range of users.
- Public space needs to retain views to the mountain.
- May need to consider seasonal difference in management (eg, summer versus winter).
- Snow play allows/attracts a wider or different range of people to the Springs and activities such as snow play and how this is managed needs to continue to provide for this more diverse community of interest.
- There is a road safety issue for foot traffic and also there are rocks that are too close to the road edge for cars – speed limit should perhaps be lowered from 60 kph.
- The upstanding rocks bordering the eastern picnic area car park are not frangible, hence are a liability issue.
- Re-aligning of the Pinnacle Road in the Springs area may ease traffic and parking issues particularly when the gate immediately above the Springs is closed.
- A key opportunity is to retain the feel of the Springs as a 'node' and a destination; to achieve this need to consider some subtle modifications, eg –
  - change the current through feel due mainly to the present very straight section of the Pinnacle road across the lower springs which gives a 'through road' feel – possibly change/reduce straightness of road or re-direct traffic via the hotel loop road which provides a better introduction to the Springs and upper Wellington with a clear view to the mountain as you come around the corner out of the trees and also with views out from in front of the hotel;
  - reduce speed on road in area; and
- something to create a focus at the hotel site.

- Particular opportunities for presenting heritage values –
  - 1) upper Springs above cosmic ray laboratory – feels old, recognisable wider interests/diverse historic use;
  - 2) uphill track from Springs Hotel car park to Milles Track/Pinnacle Track junction – has a nice feel as a sequence (moving through the Springs, and its history and heritage);
  - 3) eastern picnic area - still has rural feel and contains Alan Walker Chalet (?)

- In assessing the values there is a need to understand the linkages (historical and typological) with other off-site – local to international (eg, relationship to Fern Tree, Depression landscapes, Alan Walker and broader influence, as an Arts & Crafts landscape, part of early New World pattern of early use and appreciation of native flora).

- For effective management need to know the characteristics of the user base, especially who the community of interest is, and including recreational use by families and cultural/ethnic, etc use – need hard data.

- There is a need to understand the community of interest in making good management decisions – this is seen as particularly important in relation to determining appropriate development as people in lower socio-economic situations are often cut out/disenfranchised by developments that only cater for high socio-economic groups.

- Need to research the aesthetic/landscape values of the Springs – these are important but have not been previously researched.

- Need to identify the pattern and 'character' of the Springs and possibly the character of areas within the Springs if different areas are acknowledged – and need to know the 'defining character' of each of he areas identified to ensure sound management of the heritage values, particularly the landscape/aesthetic values.

- Pinnacle is not an appropriate site for development.

- Concerned that if a built visitors facility can't be made to work at the Springs it will happen at the Pinnacle which is not considered appropriate – Springs seen as a preferred site for development as it is a less prominent visual element than the Pinnacle.

- Not opposed to appropriate development at the Springs –
  - old Springs Hotel site is the most appropriate site for a new hotel development as it is slightly removed, a 'privatised' space, has good views, capable land, and visual impacts can be moderated by imposing acceptable design criteria;
  - space for parking for increased public use and/or a visitor centre at the upper Springs is inadequate; and
  - the lower Springs eastern picnic area is the most appropriate location for a visitor centre but it need s to be to one side and kept small and compact; and needs to provide for adequate vehicle parking – this allows for the preservation and development of unconnected public space.

- Springs Hotel site seen as appropriate for some facility – either explicitly reversible or with some resonance with the historic forms; reconstruction may also be an option as Alan Walkers drawing are still available.

- For a facility at the Springs Hotel site to be worthwhile/viable it will be necessary for visitors to be attracted to this off road destination.

- Would prefer to see development at the Springs in a zone where there has already been development – there might be an impact on archaeological values but there is a functionality, continuing use, cost to managing newly opened area, and creates damage to the natural environment.

**Long Term Management - General**

- The heritage values are a key constraint for management of the Springs; routes need to be included.

- Should be kept as a natural place and low key.

- Need to preserve and interpret the surviving fabric.

- a key direction should be to preserve and present the views to the mountain from the Springs in all uses.

- Different parts of the Springs require different management.

**Specific Heritage Site Management**

- Woods/Gadds occupation areas are particularly interesting – nothing should happen in this area.

- Need to confidently determine where the Alan Walker Chalet was constructed.

- Would be good to establish where the actual springs were.

- Historic water supply features need better mapping/recording.

- Former Exhibition Gardens –
  - part of the creation of the garden was by clearing only – it may still be possible as a technique if used compatibly with the natural values;
- some older plants that would be the same as those planted originally at the Exhibition Gardens may survive at 'Hortiac' in Fern Tree (also an Alan Walker garden),
- replanting the gardens is considered to enhance the value and a good idea in spite of the lack of information on what was planted (conjectural reconstruction may not be desirable for built fabric, but it is important for gardens as the plants are the key contributor to the sense of the place, hence the absence of the plants is what detracts significantly) – would have to accept that the replanting would be experimental.
- Sees the Exhibition Gardens as a botanical garden looking for an alpine garden – and sees scope for exploring this relationship.

**Visions**

(none noted)

**Project Specific**

(none noted)

---

**HCC MOUNTAIN PARK STAFF**

**Heritage Values/Significance**

*Physical Heritage (fabric based/archaeological)*

- Child's grave – a well formed mound of stones, originally with a cross on it; a short distance above the upper Springs shelter shed site.
- Garden area of former Spring Hotel on east side of car park had honey suckle, montbretia and broome.
- Current lower end of the Icehouse Track which was constructed recently is understood to have been the original start of the ice houses bridle track and did have old benching.
- The Pinnacle Road has some drystone walling on the downhill side between the Springs and the former start of the Lenah Valley Track – assumed to be part of the original construction.
- Coin hoard that was found during the construction of the Lenah Valley Track link section to the Springs in late 2000; coins were not old – they were all pre-decimal currency but c.mid-1900s [John Hughes, pers comm – hoard found only about 20m back form the Lenah Valley Track intersection].

*Social (contemporary & historical) Values*

- One instance of special value noted due to a family relationship with Springs (father also worked at the Springs (and in Wellington Park more generally) – a valued inter-generational established practice.

*Aesthetic, Landscape & Natural Values*

- A spring just below the snowplough shed – a wet patch in mown grass that is wet all year round.

**Management Matters**

**Current Use**

- Tourists (as opposed to locals) - very few stop or make the Springs their destination.
- Walkers – as many as 20-30 walkers at any one time, they park at the hotel car park and lower Springs and use the area as the walk start/end point.
- A surprisingly high number of people use the local walking tracks. Very high numbers of walkers – they park at Fern Tree, the lower Springs or Springs Hotel site car park to walk and stop, start or walk through the Springs area.
- Snow play – high level of use for snow play when there is snow; when the road is closed beyond the Springs most people who come up to the Springs walk up the road to enjoy the snow; some skiers ski up the road too; visitors at this time are a mixture of locals and tourists.
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- Camping – get a few people camping at the Springs (at hotel site, on lower Springs in grassed areas and in the shelters) and some overnight RV use (usually park in the lower Springs car park between the toilets and shelter shed).
- Lower Springs picnic two areas –
  - mainly in the two picnic areas;
  - not particularly high even on good days;
  - tourists mainly are in cars and stop to go the toilet on the way through then go;
  - huts and barbeques get a lot of use on weekends
  - some groups come up and have breakfast at the Springs on weekends.
- Snowplough grassed area (former hotel garden) only gets public use when there is snow – used for snow play.
- Road Lookout – gets quite a lot of use – mainly brief stops by people on their way up or down the road.
- Exhibition Gardens Lookout – quite often people park in the nearby car park and walk out for look; gets some use by school groups.
- Springs Hotel site gets occasional use for events (including parties) by groups during the day and night and sometimes involve overnight camping; sometimes other overnight camping on the main terrace – place is left pretty clean.

**Issues & Opportunities**
- Problems with current and former weeds around the Springs Hotel site (honey suckle, Montbretia & broom).
- The main issue for management at the Springs is irresponsible use – vandalism by hoons; mostly seems to be the same people – they come up and get drunk and get carried away; this mainly occurs at the lower Springs; main vandalism is from fires and burning wheelie bins and gas canisters in the stone shelter shed and attempted destruction of shed elements, particularly the perspex windows ad skylights; experience is that the people who carry out the vandalism will not be stopped by locked gates (they will cut/break the gates when the road is closed); a key concern is the vandalism/vandals and visitor safety.
- There is also a problem with frequent breaking and entering and theft from cars parked in the Springs area and more broadly in the Park.
- There is also a problem with the vandalism of signs in the Springs area and more broadly in the Park.
- The small amount of camping which occurs is not seen as a problem; and RV campers are seen as being useful in deterring vandalism at the Springs which mainly happens overnight.
- The walking tracks, which are heavily used, are standing up well – they get regular maintenance, and the HCC staff are assisted in dealing with maintenance issues by the public alerting them to specific issues.
- Bicycle control is an issue with illegal use of some tracks through the Springs – main illegal use is coming down the Zig Zag and Pinnacle Tracks (on bicycle).
- Feeling that the Springs (and Mt Wellington) is becoming more discovered and that visitor numbers are slowly increasing.
- General feeling is that there is enough infrastructure to handle present and increasing levels of visitation at the Springs.
- Feel the Springs could be better maintained.

**Long Term Management - General**
(none specifically noted other than addressing issues raised)

**Specific Heritage Site Management**
(none noted)

**Visions**
(none noted – general impression is that the area is considered to be quite adequate as it is and enjoyed by the range of users, but would like to see it a safer environment through control of vandalism and a with better day to day HCC management).

**Project Specific**
(none noted)
**STAKEHOLDER AGENCIES - GENERAL**

**Heritage Values/Significance**

*Physical Heritage (fabric based/archaeological)*
- Believed to be a line (pipeline) that collects water from the Springs to the north of the start of Millés Track and diverts it into the Silver Falls (Browns River) catchment; probably partly above and partly below ground; however likely that it is no longer operational and is unlikely to be renewed as there is too much human use north of the Springs.

**Management Matters**

*Current Use*
- Key use of adjacent area to west is as drinking water catchment.

*Issues & Opportunities*
- Interest in re-aligning walking track back to historic alignments where this is not the case.
- Potential fire management issues to consider.
- Potential native vegetation management issues to consider – mainly weed invasion.
- Water quality –
  - feel current drinking water catchment zone boundary in the Springs area is adequate; however
  - would be concerned if any development/activities occurred in the drinking water catchment zone; and
  - would be concerned by anything that directs contaminated water into the drinking water catchment zone.
- Springs Precinct boundary – there would be an advantage to this being the same as or similar to the Springs Zone boundary if appropriate.

**Long Term Management - General**
- Management of the Springs should be guided by conservation policy for the whole Springs area.
- All use and development at the Springs should be based on a sound Conservation Management Plan for the full Springs area.

**Specific Heritage Site Management**
- (none noted)

**Visions**
- (none noted)
# SUMMARY & REVIEW OF PUBLIC COMMENT
## DRAFT SPRINGS INITIAL CONSERVATION POLICY

The following summarises all comment received on the draft Springs Initial Conservation Policy up to the end of the public comment period in March 2007, and it includes an evaluation and recommendation in relation to finalising the Policy. In total eleven submissions were received.

It should be noted that comment on typographical errors and errors of fact are not included in the summary as these will be corrected. Additional historical information or queries will also not be included in this summary (but will be included in the final Policy) unless the review has found that they do not apply. Also, comments on matters that do not relate to the Springs Precinct are not included in the summary. These matters will be followed up separately.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submission/Comments</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>Recommended Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Individual 1 (10/1/07)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Generally happy with the policy being prepared and its ‘overall quality and attention to detail’.</td>
<td>• Supports draft ICP.</td>
<td>• No action required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Reading the document has engendered a change of perspective on the Mountain; and ‘has been like a walk back into history’.</td>
<td>• Supports draft ICP.</td>
<td>• No action required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Page 36 – in agreement that ‘the Springs represents a significant social value, in earlier days particularly, far more indeed than the Pinnacle area’ due to its extreme climate. Whole mountain could be deemed a social place because of sociability of people on the tracks.</td>
<td>• Confirms analysis in draft ICP</td>
<td>• No action required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Page 50 – strongly supports the idea of a visitor information centre – but it should be a sensitive development (including to social values). Makes suggestions for types of educational and informative displays.</td>
<td>• In keeping with policy.</td>
<td>• Include comment in 1. discussion of values (pp 36-38) and 2. discussion of issues &amp; opportunities (pp 54-55) - to effect some people in the community see the Springs as a suitable location for provision of visitor information (where done sensitively)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Page 50 – would not be opposed to a coffee shop with a verandah adjoining the information centre.</td>
<td>• Supportive of some commercial development (but subsidiary to an information centre)</td>
<td>• As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6 Pages 55-60 – very positive support for all points and issues (and in particular how the Springs is an integral part of Mt Wellington).</td>
<td>• Confirms analysis in draft ICP</td>
<td>• No action required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7 Page 62 – agrees that any new hotel at the Springs should not be a replica of the former hotel. We should move on. Any hotel development there should be done ‘for the right reasons and that best suits the requirements of the ICP.</td>
<td>• In keeping with policy.</td>
<td>• Modify discussion p62 to note support for Andrews (2003) position.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8 Page 64 – may have photos of the Springs hotel Tramway.</td>
<td>• Cornish was contacted to discuss this. Concluded that photos are of the NW Bay tramway.</td>
<td>• No action required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9 Appendix 2, page 19 – may have information (photos) of relocated Springs Workers Huts.</td>
<td>• The huts photos referred to by Cornish are understood to be of Luckmans Hut and the Wellington Ski Hut. These were not relocated Springs Workers Huts.</td>
<td>• No action required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Individual 2 (21/1/07)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.1</th>
<th>Questions the use of the term ‘non-commercial use’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Term used to reflect wording used by community. Should be taken to mean ‘use that has no cost to the user’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Clarify through definition in a Glossary and/or Explanatory Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Note use of some terms with specific meanings in ICP introduction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Refer also 3.3.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.2</th>
<th>Questions the use of the term ‘passive use’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Term used to reflect wording used by community. Should be taken to mean activities that are essentially quiet, informal and/or low key in nature, including recreation, family and educative activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Clarify through definition in a Glossary and/or Explanatory Notes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Individual 3 (29/1/07)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.1</th>
<th>Thorough document.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Supports draft ICP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No action required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.2</th>
<th>Query on 1888 date for Pillinger Drive (to the Springs). Suggested other research indicated it might be 1898.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Historic maps have been checked. These show the road was in place by the early 1890s and the 1888 date is used in a number of secondary references. Date thought to be best date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No change required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Individual 4 (30/1/07 & 18/3/07)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.1</th>
<th>Pleased to see a heritage policy document for the Springs. Such a document is well overdue (cites recommendations in previous planning &amp; assessment documents).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Supports draft ICP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No action required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.2</th>
<th>Notes that the WPMP also recommends an Aboriginal heritage study for Wellington Park and asks if this has been overlooked as the work has not been carried out</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Not relevant to current ICP but is relevant to broader management of the Springs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Comment to be noted in relation to broader management needs for the Springs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.3</th>
<th>Notes that the present ICP is only a draft document and is concerned that a more detailed conservation policy based on comprehensive research as proposed is completed before the historic heritage values of the Springs are further compromised (by a bureaucratic development agenda as has happened in the past). Further notes it is more important that historic heritage is saved rather than time. Further notes that a desire to conserve the historic heritage values of the Springs Precinct be the driver for heritage identification and assessment rather than development aspirations.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Policy 7.7.3 is an undertaking to complete the more comprehensive conservation policy for the Springs based on more detailed research) within 5 years of finalisation of the Springs ICP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Draft ICP is considered to adequately protect historic heritage values. The role of more research is to be able to provide more detailed level management advice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No changes to the draft ICP required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.4</th>
<th>Little consideration given to the former Hotel gardens/farm area on the Lower Springs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• This area has not been given less attention than other areas – the paucity of data in the draft ICP reflects a paucity of readily accessible information. More comprehensive research may provide some additional data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Buildings shown on air photo are noted in the draft ICP and interpreted as former Hotel farm sheds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• There is no evidence at any level that the Springs Workers huts were located in this area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Undertake more research into the history of the Lower Springs outside the Exhibition for the final Conservation Policy or Conservation Management Plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

/continued
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appendix - 54</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Springs Interim Conservation Policy</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>A Wellington Park Management Trust Report</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>McConnell, A. (August 2007)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 4.5 | The former Hotel gardens/farm area on the Lower Springs may be a suitable location for a low-key interpretation – Visitor Centre Day Use complex (somewhere near the snowplough shed) but the area deserves careful investigation/conservation/interpretation of cultural heritage. |
| 4.6 | Lower Springs present day picnic area is heavily used and highly valued sites for visitors to the Mountain and should not be alienated from users. |
| 4.7 | Lower Springs present day picnic area may need a little sensitive upgrading of facilities after careful investigation and assessment of heritage issues/ |
| 4.8 | The Springs Hotel Zone is of great historical importance and sensitivity and needs only careful investigation/conservation/interpretation of cultural heritage and no further buildings. |
| 4.9 | The Early Historic Zone is of great historical importance and sensitivity and needs only careful investigation/conservation/interpretation of cultural heritage and no further buildings. |
| 4.10 | Comments on the ongoing difficulty as a non-expert to get the historic heritage significance of the Springs recognised in the planning and decision making for the area, almost at the cost of one of the more significant sites |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>5. Individual 5 (2/2/07)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| 4.5 | The condition for all new development in Zone 3 to be preceded by detailed heritage survey &amp; assessment is designed to provide protection for potential heritage values in this zone. <em>Generally Supports recommendation 7.7.3</em> |
| 4.6 | The condition for all new development in Zone 3 to be preceded by detailed heritage survey &amp; assessment is designed to provide protection for potential heritage values in this zone. |
| 4.7 | This approach is provided for in the management policy/prescriptions for Zone 3. |
| 4.8 | The ICP assessment overall suggests the significance of the Springs Hotel Zone is such that limited new buildings that have a historically sympathetic function/use are not an incompatible use/development. |
| 4.9 | This approach is provided for in the management policy/prescriptions for Zone 1. |
| 4.10 | This raises a valid issue of how community input is treated in planning and assessment for Wellington Park, but is beyond the scope of the ICP. |
| 5.1 | Supports draft ICP. |
| 5.2 | The draft ICP does not prohibit private commercial development - refer 2.1 and 3.3 |
| 5.3 | The points raised are pertinent to the discussion of whether the former Exhibition Gardens should be reconstructed or not. To help in decision making in this area (should the matter arise), the comments should be included in the discussion. |</p>
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### 6. Individual 6 (2/2/07 & 5/2/07)

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>Document overall needs editing to make less vague and to improve clarity.</td>
<td>• Valid comment as draft report was not strongly edited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>Suggests a range of editorial improvements and specific areas which should be explained/made clearer.</td>
<td>• Useful comments to improve readability and understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>Section 3 (Methodology) - suggests the limitations/caveats on the project are reasonable, but suggests that comment should be included on what research still remains to be done for the Springs historic heritage.</td>
<td>• Supports draft ICP, with useful suggestion to clarify requirements for additional research for the final conservation policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>A deep and comprehensive study. The Initial Policy is well backed by the research.</td>
<td>• Supports draft ICP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>Queries whether the Springs does in fact have State level social significance. Also notes that in relation to this comment there needs to be some discussion of what makes something State level or not.</td>
<td>• For the draft ICP having State level social significance is used to mean being of significance to Tasmanians generally. The Springs is considered to clearly have regional social significance as a landmark and for its associations and meanings as a focus for use on the Mountain and as part of Mt Wellington, however this level of significance for the Tasmanians generally is hard to claim. Although it may be true (it is considered likely that there are a number of Tasmanians outside the region for whom the Springs has significance) the analysis to justify this claim has not been done.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>Concerned about references to specific aspects of development proposals as being anomalous in the setting as there are many different ways of looking at factors in proposals and the whole subject is about values. Suggests the ICP should not close off options unnecessarily.</td>
<td>• The draft Springs ICP has only commented on a very small number of proposed development design elements, as examples, where these are seen as being inappropriate in relation to the cultural heritage values as assessed. The assessment is considered valid. The comment however is not intended to indicate that the design elements discussed are inappropriate in relation to other considerations, and the draft ICP policy does not proscribe these design elements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7. Individual 7 (19/2/07)

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>Generally supports the Conservation Policy.</td>
<td>• Supports draft ICP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>Concerned however that, because of slavish adherence to the Burra Charter, the Policy will preclude the option of building a replica of the former Springs Hotel on the original site to house a valid use (eg. ranger centre or interpretation centre). Indicates that he supports such an approach and sees that it would serve to preserve the memories and associations with the former hotel.</td>
<td>• The draft ICP does not recommend against the construction of a building that replicates, at least in plan and externally, the former Springs Hotel building on the original site (see discussion p62) given that the original plans are available for use.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 7.3
Suggests that consideration should be given to siting an interpretation centre lower down the Mountain to serve as new ‘gateway’ to the Park. Suggests a location near the Park boundary on Pillinger Drive. Also suggests this may be an appropriate site for using the Alan Walker drawing to build a replica of the former Springs Hotel.

- This suggestion was also made elsewhere in the consultation and is an option that should be considered although it does not affect the draft ICP.
- No change to be made to the policy.
- Include mention of this view in the discussion on ‘Springs as Node for Use and Development’ in Section 6.2

### 7.4
Provides information that the Springs Hotel Timber Tramway was in fact built by the government to cut timber and not by the hotel and provides supporting archival information.

- It appears that the information that the tramway was associated with the hotel is incorrect and the historical information and assessment of the tramway needs to be reviewed. As a government built and run tramway of the early 1900s, the site is still considered to have the same level of significance, but in relation to the history of the government wood procurement in Mountain Park.
- Correct historical information relating to the site and revise the assessment of significance (still regarded as of moderate significance).
- Significance is such that the policy does not need to be altered.
- As it is unusual that the government was logging timber in a reserve, this site should be further researched for the final Conservation Policy or Conservation Management Plan.

### 8. **Individual 8 (20/3/07)**

#### 8.1
Overall considers the document logical and thorough and generally supports the approach.

- Supports draft ICP.
- No action required

#### 8.2
Questions statements in discussion of ‘Wider Setting’ (p61) re lack of clear historical or present day linkage between the former Exhibition Gardens and the area of the former Alan Walker Chalet and Springs Pinnacle Road Construction site.

- Andrews comment that the two areas are linked because they are all Depression employment schemes is true. However, the intent of the comment was to indicate that there is no indication that there is no evident purposive link –
  - in relation to the Pinnacle Road construction – this was a state level employment scheme while the gardens was a local government scheme, hence they are not closely related historically; and there is no evidence that the construction of the Pinnacle Road was influenced by the construction of the Gardens or any particular outcome of this;
  - although the Alan Walker Chalet is not included in the queried statement in the draft ICP, the chalet was built at some distance from the Gardens in a location that was visually and contextually isolated from the gardens by native vegetation.
- Revise the discussion of ‘Wider Setting’ (p61) to clarify meaning.
- No changes to policy required.

#### 8.3
Page 62 (Hotel Garden) - comments that 1. the hotel garden should also be seen as contributing to the significance of the former Springs Hotel; and 2. that the management implications or need for resolution of questions of significant period or boundaries should not decide its eventual fate.

- In relation to point 1 the contributory significance of the garden to hotel is not denied but is not assessed as ‘strongly contributing’ and if all aspects of significance are considered then this assessment is still considered valid (main associated significance is historical).
- As the comment does not disagree with the conclusions and policy no changes to be made.
- The assessment suggests that the comments in the draft are valid and can be retained without change.

/continued
In relation to point 2 –
• in determining policy for management of heritage under the Burra Charter it is valid to include consideration of matters such as ‘owners/managers needs/implications, physical condition and other external factors’; and
• the nature and extent of the garden does appear to have changed significantly over time and in the view of the draft ICP author some decision about what will be reconstructed will be required.

8.4 Page 62 (Springs Hotel) – queries appropriateness of reconstructing the Springs Hotel building (even with plans) on the basis that -
• this would create considerable confusion between the historical elements and the reconstruction; and
• as the internal details and historical use would not be able to be re-created the construction would not be able to meaningfully contribute to the public’s understanding of a way of life, customs, traditions, etc that authentic reproduction inside and outside could do;
• consequently there are implications for the authenticity of the site.
Suggests that any hotel on this site should either be totally faithful to the 1907 building as regards room layout, fittings etc. (but clearly interpreted as a new building) or of a new design which is clearly obvious as a new building (but which is sympathetic to the site). States a preference for the new building option.

The points raised are pertinent to the discussion of whether the former Spring Hotel should be replicated at the original site and were not included in the discussion in the draft ICP. To help in decision making in this area should the matter arise, the comments should be included in the discussion.
• The draft ICP does not proscribe either of the two options, nor does it opt for one option over the other. This decision is seen as another level of decision making – but which should be fully informed.

Broaden discussion to include points made in submission.
• No change required to policy.

9. Group 1 (25/1/07)

9.1 Document is comprehensive and useful
• Supports draft ICP.

9.2 Notes there is relatively little information on the more recent history of the site
• Valid comment. Lack of more recent history partly due to 1. lack of easily useable sources; and 2. relative apparent consistency of use from the 1940s on, and particularly post-1967.

9.3 Principle concern with Overarching Policy 7.1.3. Considers this overly restrictive and at odds with intent of the Springs Local Area Plan, and that the approach ignores a significant part of the heritage of the area. Recommend policies be amended to be more consistent with existing planning and less draconian to sustainable and appropriate future development
• Comment appears to mainly be concerned with the inclusion of the term ‘non-commercial’ (which is allowed for in the Springs LAP and was an historical use) as commercial development is allowed for in the draft ICP. The intent of the wording is not to prohibit commercial activity but it appears this needs to be clarified in the ICP.

• refer 2.1 & 2.2
• Ensure the views expressed are integrated into the discussion on Social Values.
• Reword Policy 7.1.3 to read: All use and management will recognise and respect the continued historical and contemporary uses of the Springs for 1. primarily low key, non-commercial, passive outdoor recreation, 2. provision of limited facilities for visitors to the Mountain, 3. water supply and, to a lesser extent, for 4. scientific work and 5. nature appreciation; and their strongly historically interconnected nature.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10.</th>
<th>Group 2 (29/1/07)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>The Springs area is of significance to Hobart Walking Club (HWC) members as an open space for recreation, as a meeting place with ample parking and available water for the commencement of walks and for its historic remains.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>The HWC supports the retention of all existing tracks and wish to be consulted before any track closures or re-routing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>Retention of the Lower Springs as an open space with amenities for picnics, barbeques and socialising (including toilets, BBQ sites, picnic tables and shelter and open lawns) is strongly supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>Retention of easy vehicle access and parking at the Upper Springs is supported.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>Tacit and perhaps erroneous underlying assumption that historic heritage values take precedence over contemporary values which is arguable not so in some cases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>Research should also include the contemporary and historic functions of the Springs area and its amenities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>Strongly support Policy 7.4.1 to retain the views from the Springs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>Strongly support policies 7.5.1 and 7.5.2 (Conservation of Social Values), but policy 7.5.2 ‘should note the semi-landscaped (cleared and terraced, manicured) state of the Springs rather than its natural state’.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10.9 Do not support the relocation of any of the current elements and want any future developments to be low key and non-commercial (this comment is made in relation to policies on the conservation of social values (7.5).  
- Relocation: the comment is understood to indicate that the HWC are not happy with the loss or exchange of any existing areas of public open space to other uses. A no-change position is noted already as one of the community views. However, given 1. the various needs/interests/values of the Springs and 2. that to date no case has been made for the spatial specificity of general recreational use of the public open space areas, it is recommended that the policies in relation to this (7.5.3 & Table 3) remain unchanged.  
- Commercial development: given the history and various needs/interests/values of the Springs some limited historically sympathetic commercial development is not seen as inappropriate hence it is recommended that the policies that provide for limited commercial development remain unchanged  
- Nature of developments: Provided for in the draft ICP  
- Retain policies in this area as are (as they are seen to provide flexibility and a balance for the conflicting views in relation to this).  
- Ensure the views expressed are integrated into the discussion on Social Values and the conflicting values in this area are explicit to aid managers and other decision makers.

10.10 There may be times in good weather or snow when there are large numbers of vehicles at the Springs but this should be acceptable as there are not better alternatives.  
- This is beyond the scope of the ICP.  
- Refer to WP Office for consideration as part of the broader traffic planning for Wellington Park.

10.11 Any developments for the Springs require strong community endorsement and community consultation.  
- Community consultation is keeping with the draft ICP.  
- Community consultation and engagement is a WPMP policy. However, while community endorsement should be sought there are some issues which attach and should be acknowledged by the community (eg. 1. many issues within the Park are complex and require many issues to be balanced; 2. ensuring all valid communities of interest are represented; 3. conflict between different community groups)  
- Level of prescription not appropriate to the ICP. Ensure comment is picked up in the final Conservation Policy or Conservation Management Plan.  
- Community engagement will be ongoing through the WPMP.

11. Group 3 (2/2/07)

11.1 Support the comments throughout the document regarding risks to natural values including drinking water and management concerns regarding any future developments in the precinct.  
- Supports draft ICP.  
- No action required