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Executive Summary

The Wellington Park Management Trust is reviewing the Wellington Park Management Plan 2005. One of the key areas under review is the current mechanisms and approval processes for activities, use and development in the Park.

The Trust seeks to ensure their approval processes are transparent, consistent and clear. The Review consists of two key elements:

- **Audit** of relevant sections of the Management Plan
- **Consultation** with stakeholders, users of the approval process and the community

Role of the Trust and the Management Plan

The Wellington Park and the Wellington Park Management Trust were established through the Wellington Park Act 1993 (WPA).

Wellington Park was reserved for the following purposes:

- **a)** the provision of recreational and tourism uses and opportunities consistent with the purposes specified in paragraphs (b) to (e);
- **b)** the preservation or protection of the fauna or flora contained in or on the land;
- **c)** the preservation or protection of the natural beauty of the land or of any features of the land of natural beauty or scenic interest;
- **d)** the preservation or protection of any features of the land being features of historical, Aboriginal, archaeological, scientific, architectural or geomorphological interest; and
- **e)** the protection of the water catchment values of the land.

The Trust regulates the conservation, use and development of the Park through its Management Plan which is a statutory planning document. In addition, the Trust has a number of strategies to manage specific uses, activities or areas such as mountain biking.

The consultation tasks part of this review with various stakeholders suggests that the Trust’s primary focus is managing and regulating use in the Park and preserving its values, and not so much promoting and supporting development, which refers to a more active role (purpose a).

The Trust’s (future) resources, capabilities and efforts regarding its role of promoting activities, use and development in the Park needs to be clearly articulated. This should also be reflected in the next Management Plan and be communicated to stakeholders.

Dual Approvals Process

The Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993 (LUPAA) applies to use and development in the Park provided they comply with the Plan (and the WPA). Amongst other things this means that any development proposal (involving new built structures) requires approval from both the Trust and its approvals process and from the relevant planning authority through the local planning scheme.

The necessity of a dual development approvals process, one through the Trust and one through Council, is a reality that needs to be stated and clarified in the next Management Plan.
New Model Planning Scheme

The introduction of the new model planning scheme for Southern Tasmania has consequences for the zonings and use requirements of land in Southern Tasmania. The future Plan should consider and align with the model planning scheme where appropriate. The model’s Specific Area Plans’ may provide an opportunity for the Trust and Council to align their Site Development Plans (Trust) and Local Area Plans (Council) as Specific Area Plans. One of the consequences of the new model planning scheme is that it requires the consideration of climate change impacts on the values, management and use options of the Park.

Zoning

The zones that are applied in the park reflect the varying features and values of the park in different locations (purpose based zoning). Wellington Park is a unique national park because of its close proximity to the City, the number of land managers and the range of values it includes and preserves. In its uniqueness the zoning mechanism that is applied works effectively according all stakeholders that were consulted. The zoning is also logical and understandable. No significant issues in regards to the zoning mechanism have been identified.

Approvals Processes

In regards to the appropriateness, transparency and easiness to understand the Plan and its approvals process for activities, uses and developments the following issues play a role:

- The Plan and specifically the Chapter on the Approvals Process is not easy to read and understand for a potential operator, developer or the general public. The Plan currently makes references of how the current Plan is different from the previous Plans. An unwanted consequence of it is that the ‘flow’ of the text tends to become patchy and the order sometimes illogical.
- Clear definitions and descriptions of the differences between a permit, license, lease, development application and project proposal form are required.
- Flow charts and written explanations in regards to the approvals processes should be included in the Plan.
- In Section 6.3, Clauses 3 and 6 should be made conclusive in order to eliminate any uncertainties this may give to a potential operator or developer about the feasibility of any proposal, and to prevent any concerns about arbitrariness.
- Currently, an applicant is referred to the Management Plan and any other strategies to ensure their proposed use/development complies with the Plan. It is recommended to provide applicants guidance regarding what plans should be checked.
- A cable car is not mentioned in the plan. Due to its’ contentiousness it would be beneficial for potential developers, operators and the general public if the Trust could provide some guidance on the implications of the Management Plan for a possible cable car proposal.
- While commercial operators are generally happy with the approvals process for Commercial Visitor Services, two key points for improvement are the current (flat) fee structure and the timeliness of the process, which in one case took three months. It is noted that the approvals process is administered through PWS.
Currently, land managers need to fill out Project Proposal Forms for most works including many standard and recurring maintenance works. It would be simpler and quicker if the Trust and the land managers would agree on standards and work schedules for which the land managers would only be required to provide the Trust with notice (two weeks or so) prior to undertaking the works.

**Uses and Development**

In regards to the zonings and uses that are permitted and not, the audit did not find any inconsistencies in the Plan.

The tables reflect an approach that combines prescriptive and performance based planning. It is prescriptive in relation to the exempt and unpermitted uses in the sense that it names specific uses and activities. It is performance based in relation to ‘Discretionary uses’ (not exempt or prohibited) by listing Acceptable Solutions and Performance Criteria, on the basis of which permissions may be granted.

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

The consultation tasks with different stakeholders show that there are no existing uses that need to be curbed or constrained. The exception lies with some of the NRM representatives that were consulted during a focus group meeting, who would like to see more restrictions.

The key stakeholders mentioned that the Plan should be multi-user focussed. Several stakeholders indicated that for a long time the needs of mountain bikers were insufficiently recognised.

Additional uses that were mentioned by stakeholders include:

- More active promotion of the Park in general,
- More tracks (designated user groups),
- More linkages with tracks outside the Park,
- Camping opportunities for multiple day activities,
- Events
- Infrastructure items such as signage, visitor information, active promotion of the park and its use options, use group specific tracks.

In regards to the provision of uses and infrastructure, it is important to note that resources may have acted as a restriction in the past and may continue to do so. More tracks and linkages require more enforcement, weed control and maintenance.

**Previous Research**

The review included a review of past research regarding community and visitor perceptions of the levels of activities, use and development should be allowed in the Park. The conclusion is that so
far there has been no broad, quantitative social research based on a random population sample to establish what the community views are in regards to activities, use and development of the Park. Most research in the past was user group or subject specific, qualitative and focussed on the values of the Park.

Broad quantitative and statistically valid research on community views would provide a useful basis for promoting and supporting more activities, use and development in the Park.

Again, consideration should be given to the point raised earlier about the Trust’s role, capabilities and resources in relation to promoting and supporting use and development in the Park. The future Plan should be clear about how and to what extent it aims to fulfil all of its’ purposes:

- “the provision of recreational and tourism uses and opportunities consistent with the purposes specified in paragraphs (b) to (e);
- the preservation or protection of the fauna or flora contained in or on the land;
- the preservation or protection of the natural beauty of the land or of any features of the land of natural beauty or scenic interest;
- the preservation or protection of any features of the land being features of historical, Aboriginal, archaeological, scientific, architectural or geomorphological interest; and
- the protection of the water catchment values of the land.”

**Consultation**

On the basis of the findings there are no direct requirements for further consultation as part of this review. Follow-up interviews with commercial operators have so far been kept on hold. The survey results were clear.

Depending on the Trust’s strategic considerations in regards to its future role and capabilities in promoting use and development in the Park in line with the Park’s values, it may be appropriate to initiate quantitative social research among the population. This research would be aimed to gain a valid rating of community views in relation to the perceived appropriate levels of activities, use and development in the Park.
1 Introduction

The Wellington Park Management Trust is reviewing the Wellington Park Management Plan 2005. The Trust will be preparing a Consolidated Issues Paper. One of the key areas under review is the current mechanisms and approval processes for activities, use and development in the Park.

In Tasmania, the Commercial Visitor Services (CVS) Unit of Parks & Wildlife Service Tasmania (PWS) operates a licensing system for commercial activities on public land. It was introduced in 2000 and set up in consultation with the tourism industry. The service operates for reserved land under the authority of PWS, Crown Land, Forestry Tasmania and the Wellington Park Management Trust.

For some uses and development, the Trust applies an alternative permit system for commercial uses on reserved land. And there are situations where a potential commercial operator in addition needs to gain a permit from the relevant planning authority.

1.1 Project Aim

The Trust seeks to ensure their approval processes are transparent, consistent and clear.

The aim of this consultancy is (as per Brief) is “to ensure that the new Management Plan provides best practice goals, objectives, outcomes, policy statements and assessment processes, in relation to the promotion of activities, use and development in Wellington Park, consistent with the values and purposes for which the Park is reserved.”

The consultancy is required to:

a. Measure the effectiveness of the existing approval processes, gain understanding of any issues with these processes and how they may relate to the Management Plan;

b. Inform decision making\(^1\) by the Trust by providing understanding of community’s perspective on what levels of activity, use and development are perceived as appropriate for the Park.

1.2 Report Structure

The remainder of the report is as follows:

- Section 2 describes the methodology adopted for the review,
- Section 3 contains the findings of:

\(^1\) Decision making in regards to the assessment and approval process, the level of activities, use and development, and zoning.
The audit of the relevant sections of the current Management Plan: zoning mechanisms, approval processes for use and development, the use and development tables and the project proposal form.

Consultation with key stakeholders (management agencies and NRM and recreation groups), the wider community and the users of the approval process.

- Section 4 is an overview of the conclusions and recommendations.

1.3 List of Abbreviations

The following is a list of abbreviations that are used throughout the report:

- CVS: Commercial Visitor Services
- HCC: Hobart City Council
- LAP: Local Area Plan
- LUPAA: Land Use Planning & Approvals Act 1993
- PWS: Parks and Wildlife Service
- S&R: Sport and Recreation Tasmania
- SDP: Site Development Plan
- STCA: Southern Tasmanian Councils Authority
- SW: Southern Water
- TALSC: Tasmanian Aboriginal Land and Sea Council
- TPC: Tasmanian Planning Commission
- TT: Tourism Tasmania
- WPA: Wellington Park Act 1993
- WPMP: Wellington Park Management Plan 2005
- WPMT: Wellington Park Management Trust
2  Methodology

The Review consists of two key elements:

- **Audit** of relevant sections of the Management Plan
- **Consultation** with stakeholders, users of the approval process and the community

The review covers points 1.1 to 1.5 as outlined in the Brief:

- 1.1 **Review and synthesise the existing Management Plan** in relation to how it provides for all activities, use and development within the Park, within the context of the values and purposes for which the Park is reserved under the Wellington Park Act 1993.

- 1.2. **Evaluate the existing zoning mechanisms** in the existing Management Plan (see especially s 2.3.3 of the plan) and their effectiveness as a best practice management tool for a multi-use, natural area consistent with the Parks values and purposes.

- 1.3. **Evaluate the current assessment processes** for activities, use and development in the Park in terms of (where relevant) their: clarity; timeliness in decision making; transparency; consistency with the Land Use and Planning Approvals Act 1993; and ease of use.

- 1.4. **Evaluate the Use and Development Tables** and the existing levels of Permitted, Discretionary, Unpermitted and Exempt activities, uses and developments, including the degree to which the tables help achieve the management goals and objectives for each zone as well as protecting the values for which the Park is reserved.

- 1.5. **Evaluate the existing Project Proposal Form** and associated assessment process in terms of clarity, ease of use and the appropriateness of the information requested.

The aim of the audit is first to fully familiarise ourselves with the existing Management Plan, zoning mechanisms, assessment processes, use and development tables and project proposal form.

The audit has helped to frame the consultation questions. The findings of the consultation have informed Point 1.2 to 1.5.
3  Review Findings

The review of activities, use and development in the Park involved an audit of the relevant sections of the Plan and consultation with stakeholders, users and the community. This section reports on the findings of these activities. Each subsection is divided into a part that reports on the audit findings and another part that reports on the consultation findings. The Section concludes with an integrated assessment of findings.

The consultation for this audit and review covered three groups:

- Interviews with key stakeholders including land managers:
  - Andy Crawford, Southern Water
  - Rob Mather and Richard Greenhill, Hobart City Council
  - Mark Pharaoh and Peter Cusick, Parks and Wildlife Service
  - Caleb Pedder, TALSC, Heritage Body for the Aboriginal Community
  - Deb Lewis, Tourism Tasmania
  - Brian Risby, TPC and formerly involved as planner of a proposed development in the Park
  - Luke Chiu, Sport and Recreation Tasmania

- Focus group meetings (2) representing volunteer natural resource management and recreation groups in the Park (full research report by Myriad in Appendix C)

- Survey of commercial operators in the Park and an interview with one operator (full report by Myriad in Appendix B)

This section will report the review findings in regards to:

- Existing zoning mechanisms (Section 3.1)
- Current Assessment and Approvals Process (Section 3.2)
- Use and Development Tables (Section 3.3)
- Project Proposal Form (Section 3.4), and;
- Research into community and visitor attitudes in relation to use, activities and development in Wellington Park (Section 3.5)

However, before attending to the review this section provides a short discussion about the role of the Trust and its relationship with other planning authorities with land and responsibilities within Wellington Park. Although not strictly part of the Brief, we consider the following important for understanding the Trust’s role and position.

**Role of the Trust, Management Plan and Site Development Plans**

The Wellington Park and the Wellington Park Management Trust were established through the *Wellington Park Act 1993 (WPA)*.

Wellington Park was reserved for the following purposes:

- the provision of recreational and tourism uses and opportunities consistent with the purposes specified in paragraphs (b) to (e);
- the preservation or protection of the fauna or flora contained in or on the land;
- the preservation or protection of the natural beauty of the land or of any features of the land of natural beauty or scenic interest;
The preservation or protection of any features of the land being features of historical, Aboriginal, archaeological, scientific, architectural or geomorphological interest; and
the protection of the water catchment values of the land.

The Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993 (LUPAA) applies to use and development in the Park provided they comply with the Plan (and the WPA). Amongst other things this means that any development proposal (involving new built structures) requires approval from both the Trust and its approvals process and from the relevant planning authority through the local planning scheme.

The requirement for dual approval for reserved areas is not uncommon in Tasmania and other states. It was challenged in Tasmania, where a National Park sought to have their approval process being accepted as sufficient. A court ruling concluded that LUPAA also applies in national parks and that local governments should also approve development proposals. At the Trust’s request, LUPAA was amended to specifically apply to Wellington Park.

In case of commercial visitor proposals, operators require to gain a license which can be gained through the Commercial Visitor Services unit that is run by Parks and Wildlife Services (PWS). For some uses that fall within this category the development application process also applies.

The Trust regulates the conservation, use and development of the Park through its Management Plan which is a statutory planning document and the Wellington Park Regulations 2009. In addition, the Trust has a number of strategies to manage specific uses, activities or areas such as mountain biking. Then there are also Site Development Plans for the Springs and the Pinnacle in order to manage use and development in these specific zones. The SDPs are required by the Management Plan and provide a more detailed and vision based description of the use and development of the zones.

While the approval process is primarily described in Chapter 6, there are two particular clauses in Chapter 5 in regards to the Springs (5.3.20) and Pinnacle Site Development Plans (5.3.28) that are of importance. The clauses indicate that: "Where a development has been approved by the Site Development Plan and is to be implemented by private enterprise, expressions of interest will be invited for the detailed design, construction and operation of the development. An application will be lodged after the developer has been selected (refer Chapter 6)."

The Trust can call for ‘expressions of interest’ where any development has been approved by the Site Development Plan and is to be implemented by private enterprise (commercial or not). The Trust has Guidelines for calling for an EoI.

While in general the Trust’s primary role is to regulate use and development in the Park, in regards to the Springs and Pinnacle especially, the Trust has a more pro-active and ‘shaping’ role in terms of the development of the two zones.

The SDPs do not have a statutory status, but they do comply with the Plan. The Trust can take the initiative to change a SDP. The Trust will do this in cooperation with key stakeholders. For potential

---

2 The court case was in regards to Pumphouse Point at Lake St Clair (Brian Risby will forward exact details)
developers or operators in the Park it is important to have some surety about what use and development may and may not take place in these areas in the future.

Parallel to the SDP, Hobart City Council has a Local Area Plan (LAP) in place for these zones. While the LAP mimics the SDP, if an SDP is changed, it does not automatically change the LAP, which can only be changed through a Planning Scheme amendment. The LAP has a statutory status. The existence of two concurrent processes makes it hard for potential developers to appropriately assess the risks of any development proposals. Introducing changes in the local plans (SDPs and LAPs) is also complex.

Ideally, both the Trust and Council would adopt one identical local plan for the areas. Potentially the new Model Planning Scheme including the Specific Area Plans provides opportunities to achieve this (see more in Section 3.1.1). It would improve the transparency and simplicity of the approval process for potential developers/operators.

3.1 Existing Zoning Mechanisms

3.1.1 Audit Findings

The Plan’s management zones are introduced in Section 2.3.3, following a section that defines the values and the significance of these values to the Park. The values identified are categorised as: environmental, cultural, tourism and recreation and water supply.

The zones that are applied in the Park reflect the varying features and values of the park in different locations. For instance, the key value of the Drinking Water Catchment Zone is drinking water and its protection. The key values for the Springs Zone are recreation, visitation and heritage. The purpose for each zone reflects the protection and promotion of the key values in that zone. As a result, the zoning is logical and provides a solid starting point for managing use and development in the different parts of the Park in line with their specific values and tourism and recreation opportunities.

The six zones are:
- The Springs Zone
- Pinnacle Zone
- Recreation Zone
- Natural Zone
- Remote Zone, and
- Drinking Water Catchment Zone.

The zones’ objectives clearly indicate the preferred use and development of the areas.

The zoning boundaries do not necessarily coincide with the boundaries for different land managers.

Purpose based zoning is common use in most local government areas and in some national parks as well. Examples include Booderee National Park (South Coast NSW), Kosciuszko National Park.
In Canada Parks Canada applies a standard zoning for National Parks. The national parks zoning system classifies land and water areas according to ecosystem and cultural resource protection requirements, and their capability and suitability to provide opportunities for visitor experiences. Management plans map national parks into zones that strike a balance between the capability of areas to sustain use and their need for protection.

While many national parks do not apply land zonings, in the case of Wellington Park with its many values, uses and land managers, it is an obvious mechanism.

In regards to consistency with LUPAA it is important to note that in May 2011 the State has released a standard planning scheme template to streamline Tasmania’s 36 planning schemes. Amongst other things, this means that an identical set of use zones will be introduced state wide.

The Southern Tasmania Councils Authority (STCA) has developed a Draft Implementation Document for the Southern Tasmania Land Use Strategy (Draft). It includes the zoning framework with specific purpose statements and principles for development control which will become applicable to Southern Tasmania once the strategy and implementation plan have been endorsed (expected before end of 2011).

It is important to ensure that the new zonings and their Use Classes and Use and Development Standards align with the requirements of the Management Plan. The new model planning scheme has been developed in consultation with a wide range of key stakeholders in Tasmania, including representatives and/or managers of natural areas, such as NRM South. It will improve the transparency, consistency and clarity of the approvals processes if the revised Plan is aligned where possible with the new model planning scheme. The following standards Zones may be applicable to (parts of) the Park (from Regional Model Planning Scheme – Draft June 2011 by STCA):

- **Recreation Zone.** The general purpose of the zone is:
  - To provide for a range of active and formal recreational use or development and complementary uses that does not impact adversely on specific recreational focus and amenity.
  - To provide for a limited range of other small scale uses to support the recreational purpose.

- **Open Space Zone.** The general purpose of the zone is:
  - To provide for the management and use of areas of natural or landscape amenity for passive recreation and other low impact community purposes.
  - To encourage open space networks that are linked through the provision of walking and cycle trails.
  - To provide for the safe and convenient access to open space areas.

- **Environmental Management Zone.** The general purpose of the zone is:
  - To provide for the protection, conservation and management of areas with significant ecological, scientific, cultural or aesthetic value, or with a significant likelihood of risk from a natural hazard.
  - To only allow for complementary use or development consistent with any strategies for protection and management.
  - To minimise the risk from the impacts of climate change and natural hazards.
- To ensure use and development within the water catchment areas do not result in the degradation of a clean water supply.
- To protect, maintain and/or enhance existing coastal processes and landforms

It is anticipated that the majority if not all of the Park would fall within an **Environmental Management Zone**. This zone requires, amongst other things, to minimise the risk from impacts of climate change and natural hazards.

The Plan currently identifies that any uses and developments in areas with natural hazards should take account of climate change impacts (Table 2, Issue 8. Natural hazards). Apart from that the Plan does not further consider climate change and its potential impacts. Climate change may therefore be a subject that requires additional consideration in the next iteration of the Management Plan. A starting point would be to identify any potential impacts of climate change and any research required to establish a clear understanding of this.

Any areas that fall into the **Open Space Zone** would require the Plan to consider accessibility and network linkages of bicycle and walking tracks with surrounding areas. It was also raised during the stakeholder consultation (3.3.2) that the Park should improve linkages with surrounding areas and nearby attractions. However, in considering network linkages it is important to note that access points also require some level of enforcement in the Park. Resources for enforcement, was raised as a point of concern during the consultation with land managers.

The **Recreation Zone** purposes are in line with the current Plan.

The Model Planning Scheme allows for 'Specific Area Plans’ or site development plans which refer to plans prepared by a suitably qualified person which outlines future use or development of a site or area based on consideration of:

(a) vehicle and pedestrian connectivity, desired traffic speed and behaviour and existing and future streetscape characteristics;
(b) cost-effective & efficient servicing of the land including opportunities to apply water sensitive urban design principles;
(c) the physical features of the site include topography, drainage, and watercourses;
(d) the natural and heritage values of the site and directly adjoining land;
(e) existing stands of vegetation and habitat corridors including significant stands of vegetation and habitat corridors to be maintained or, where appropriate, are proposed to be offset;
(f) potential hazards and risks;
(g) the built character of any adjoining area;
(h) solar orientation;
(i) potential conflicts between adjoining land in an alternative zone;
(j) the need for additional public open space;
(k) the relevant values and objectives for future development under Section 2.0 of the Planning Scheme; and
(I) the relationship between the subdivision of the subject site and the future subdivision of adjoining land with respect to the matters described by (a) to (k) inclusive.

The Plan’s site development plans for the Springs and the Pinnacle should preferably comply with the above definition. The Model Planning Scheme implementation may also provide an opportunity for the Trust and Council to unify or integrate their concurrent Site Development Plans and Local Area Plans (3.2.1).

3.1.2 Consultation Findings

The current zoning mechanisms are clear and effective (‘spot on’) according to most key stakeholders or land managers. Contrary to that it was also argued by one agency that the water catchment zones are too expansive especially in the Glenorchy area (S&R). It was argued that as a result large areas of the Park are restricted for use. It was stated this is not consistent with catchment areas elsewhere in Tasmania where parking and picnic areas are located in meters from catchments. However, it is not the zoning but the restricted area overlay that restricts use within this zone. Therefore it should be the overlay that may need to be reconsidered to ensure it is line with comparable areas elsewhere in Tasmania – if deemed appropriate.

The aim to concentrate tourism and recreation at the Springs zone is widely supported.

The other consultative tasks (focus group meetings and operators survey) have not demonstrated any issues with the current zoning mechanisms.

3.2 Current Assessment and Approval Process

3.2.1 Audit Findings

Chapter 6

Chapter 6 ‘Assessing and Managing Use and Development’ of the Management Plans describes the approval process.

Overall, it should be observed that the section was not easy to read and understand for a possible operator or the general public. The Wellington Park Commercial Visitor Services Guidelines (April 2007) provides a comprehensive and clear overview of the approval process. It may be useful to incorporate such an overview in the Plan. The Plan currently provides an overview of previous changes that have been made to the plan. An unwanted consequence of it is that the ‘flow’ of the text tends to become patchy and the order sometimes illogical. While it is important to document previous changes to the Plan, the Plan itself is not the obvious place to do so3. The Plan should focus on current objectives, processes, policies and actions.

3 It is noted that amendments to a Planning Scheme tend to be documented that way, but if a new Planning Scheme is introduced this is not the practice.
This section highlights issues raised as part of the audit.

In section 6.1 called Approval Procedures:
- While it is said that LUPAA 1993 applies to use and development in the Park and provides for an appeals process, at the same time it is stated that the Trust retains control over issuing permits, leases, licences to occupy and commercial trading licences. What status does this appeal option then have?
- The text is not entirely clear about the process steps and decision points. However, the flow chart in Appendix C provides more clarity.

The section in 6.1 called Licences, Leases and Permits:
- The clause does not provide a clear definition of and distinction between a License, Lease and Permit; the annual report (2009-10) and the Consultants’ Brief for this consultancy provide clearer descriptions.
- It does not provide a step-by-step-process of the application process. It is however noted that the Park’s CVS Guidelines provide more clarity.

The section in 6.3 called Assessment Requirements – General:
- Under clause 3 (p.57), there is mention of additional requirements by the Trust ‘from time to time’: it is unclear what the status or basis would be of these requirements and how a potential operator/developer can know about the existence of these requirements. It provides an operator or developer uncertainty about the feasibility of any proposal. It is not transparent and may raise concerns about arbitrariness.
- The impression exists there is doubling with other sections of the MP, most notably zoning and use and development tables.

The section in 6.3 called Licences, Leases and Permits:
- Does not provide a clear description of what (licence, lease or permit) is required for what type of uses: it merely states there are different types of permissions
- Clauses 14 and 15 are also covered under exempt and unpermitted uses and use tables 1 and 2.
- Under clause 17 another type, namely ‘concessions’, is introduced without any further explanation.

The section in 6.3 called Development Approval Procedures
- In regards to development of new built structures, an potential developer/operator needs to go through both the Trust’s approval process and the Council’s planning approvals process. While it is mentioned in the Plan, a flow chart of the process would greatly improve the Plan’s transparency and would make it easier to understand.
- It would have been clearer if earlier on a description is given how development applications relate to use permissions (Licences, Leases and Permits). A chart explaining this would improve the clarity of the Management Plan to potential operators and the general public.
- Reference is made to the Project Proposal Form. While it is our understanding that the PPF is to be filled out for all types of use or development except for routine maintenance or emergency works, the form is first introduced here and this suggests the form is only required in relation to Development Approvals.
The section in 6.3 called Referral of Development
- Would Clause 27 not be covered by the Planning Authority? If so, it may be worth considering taking it out.
- The same is true for Clause 29. And Hobart Water should be replaced by Southern Water.

The Chapter then continues to discuss unpermitted, exempt and discretionary uses. For a potential user/land manager it would be more accessible to start with Appendix C and a written explanation of the chart. The flow chart of this appendix is crucial to understanding the process and should be placed in the main text.

The section in 6.3 called Use and Development – Unpermitted:
- Clause 36(a) refers to ‘a planning strategy in accordance with this Management Plan’. Potential operators may have to go through many strategies to ensure their proposed use/activity or development may be permitted. The Trust has (logically) chosen for the Plan to provide guidelines and to not go into a great level of detail. Otherwise, the Plan would need to be reviewed whenever minor changes or updates were applicable. It should however be considered to provide potential operators with more guidance. Potentially the approvals process could include a step (before when the application is being lodged) where the Trust provides advice on any relevant strategies that need to be considered.

The section in 6.3 called Use and Development – Exempt:
- Clause 37(e) indicates that maintenance of vehicular tracks is unpermitted. It would be clear to refer to the objective of the Trust to let pre-existing tracks overgrow.

The Management Plan does not consider a cable car as a development. It is correct and logical that the Management Plan focuses on principles for use and development and is not specific about particular uses. However, many other specific uses are mentioned in the Plan (Table 1). The cable car is a contentious subject and it would be beneficial for potential developers, operators and the general public if the Trust could provide some guidance on the subject. It may be justified to include a section that describes the implications of the Management Plan for a cable car proposal.

In addition, it may be worth investigating:
- Community views regarding a cable car
- Any benefits to the Park
- Any concerns in regards to the conservation of the key values of the Park
- Any guidance in regards to opportunities, i.e. route, whether a cable car to the top can expectedly be done in accordance with the Management Plan
- Any research required to inform these aspects.

It should also be considered for land managers to not have to fill out a Project Proposal Form for exempt uses such as maintenance works, but merely a notification to the Trust about planned activities and a declaration the users/land managers will operate according to the standards and requirements of the Plan. The Trust and the land managers would need to consult and agree on the types of works and any additional standards (to the current Plan) for undertaking these works.
3.2.2 Consultation Findings

Key Stakeholder Consultation

The approval process works well in the sense that no unwanted uses are being approved (Southern Water, HCC).

Referral of applications to relevant land authority is working effectively according to key stakeholders. All applications for use or development are effectively run past the relevant land owners/managers for approval. One exception may be the Aboriginal Community, although TALSC indicated relationships are being re-established. The Plan does describe rules and referral in case of uses or development that may affect Aboriginal heritage. A key issue in this regard is probably (also highlighted by TALSC) that many heritage values may be unknown as limited research has taken place. The Plan does provide for steps in case of unexpected findings and refers to the Aboriginal Relics Act 1975.

The Management Plan refers to the drinking water strategy by Southern Water. The approvals process refers to Southern Water when required and adequately protects water quality. Hobart City Council also notes that all activity proposed within the municipal area is always referred to Council.

Key issues with the current approvals process are:

- Two approval processes are to be taken into account in case of new built development. This makes the entire approval process quite complex. It is however acknowledged and accepted this is unlikely to be changed. (Southern Water)
- The coordination and streamlining of the process is not as clear as desired, there need to be clearer agree hold point and referrals. (Southern Water, HCC, S&R)
- It is unclear what type of project proposals are refused as they may be filtered out before an application has been lodged. (TT) The current process (according to Appendix C) indicates that an application cannot be made if they are listed as 'not permitted' uses (Clauses 36 and 37). As a result there is a pre-selection of project proposals before an application is made. For reasons of transparency and general information gathering the Trust should consider registering cases for which an application was discussed but not lodged.

Key users of the approval process should be given the opportunity to respond to changes in the process before it is agreed to and implemented. (SW)

One of the parties consulted pointed to Clause 6 on p57/58 as did the audit (Clause 3 on page 57 is similar). It says effectively that even if a development proposal complies with the Plan and the Site Development Plan for the Zone, the Trust can add ‘any supplementary standards, guidelines and conditions which the Trust or Planning Authority may apply from time to time’. A proponent of a development can therefore never ensure its proposal complies and manage the risks effectively. (TPC)
In case of proposed commercial development involving the construction of buildings and/or infrastructure (which can only occur in the Springs and Pinnacle Zones), the process may become extremely complex:

- A proposal needs to comply with the Plan and the relevant Site Development Plan
- The proposal also needs to comply with the relevant Planning Scheme and any Local Area Plans
- There is no assurance there are no conflicting requirements between a SDP and a LAP
- Southern Water is also involved.

For a development proposal for a cable car, the process would be even more complex involving more land managers, i.e. all land managers over which the route of the cable car would cross, either within or outside the Park.

The viability of any development may be undermined by developments at other sites. The cable car was brought up as an example during stakeholder consultation. Surety about the range of development on the mountain will help potential proponents of development managing their risks and costs.

**Commercial Operators**

As part of this review Myriad has undertaken a survey amongst existing commercial operators in the Park. The findings relevant to the approvals process are summarised here. A full report with details of the results is provided in Appendix B.

The survey of Wellington Park commercial operators was designed to assess the effectiveness of the Commercial Visitor Services (CVS) licensing system, and to engage with operators in relation to other potential uses, activities and development within the Park.

The figure below shows the satisfaction ratings for preparing the application for the CVS license process (Figure 1). It summarises responses in terms of the satisfaction rating for each aspect (rating 1 to 5 on a 5 point scale, where 5 = very satisfied, 1 = very dissatisfied). Overall, the operators are content with the current process where it comes to guidelines, advice, the application form, required operator qualifications and supporting documentation. The key weakness is the license fee structure. Unsatisfied operators indicate the fees are too high especially for small operators. The flat fee structure does not allow for the intensity of use of the license: the fees for an operator touring four people on the mountain are the same as for a coach company taking 30 odd people up. It was suggested that the fee structure should be reflective of the intensity of use. It is noted however that the fees for commercial licences within the Park are in line with those set by the PWS under the state-wide system.
The figure below rates the satisfaction with the approval process after the application was lodged. The overall satisfaction rate is reasonably positive with 61% of respondents responding to be satisfied or very satisfied. On the other side, about 21% of the respondents were dissatisfied.

The lowest level of satisfaction was measured in regards to the timeliness of the assessment; with 28% of respondents answering the process took too long. Several respondents mentioned it took months.
The respondents made suggestions on how the process could be improved:

- Adjustment of the fee structure: fees should be lowered and/or reflect the intensity of use of the license;
- Simpler process;
- Two suggested having tourism operators exempt from the CVS licenses.

### 3.3 Use and Development

#### 3.3.1 Audit Findings

Section 6.3 contains two tables for use and development:

- Table 1 Exempt Use and Development
- Table 2 Standards for Use and Development

Table 1 refers to the exempt uses. Table 2 refers to use or development that is not exempt and not prohibited.

Unpermitted uses are not listed as a table. For the reader it would logical and consistent to place the unpermitted uses in a table too.

Overall the use and development tables are clear and logical. The tables reflect an approach that combines prescriptive and performance based planning. It is prescriptive in relation to the exempt and unpermitted uses in the sense that it names specific uses and activities. It is performance based in relation to ‘Discretionary uses’ (not exempt or prohibited) by listing Acceptable Solutions.
and Performance Criteria, on the basis of which permissions may be granted. This is contained in Clause 31: "Unless listed in Table 1 as an Exempt use or development, an application must meet either the acceptable solutions or the performance criteria for all applicable standards in Table 2, and any other applicable objectives and policies as contained in the Management Plan."

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

### 3.3.2 Consultation Findings

**Key Stakeholder Consultation**

In regards to what additional activities could be considered and views on the preferred location of these activities, the stakeholder interviews reveal:

- There is no discussion on the cable car in the Plan (SW, TALSC, TT). There are few alignments for the cable car that are acceptable to Southern Water (SW).
- Most key stakeholders are happy with the existing range of uses and development (HCC, SW, PWS).
- It is recognised that the level or intensity of activity especially in the Springs and Pinnacle could be higher and include (interpreted) walking tours, concerts, visitor centre, art works and events. Any such activities depend on organisers (commercial or public).
- There may be opportunity for a standing camp near the East-West Trail to be run by a commercial operator. (PWS)
- Most stakeholders would like to see more action to support the use of the Park. Greater promotion of the Park and its uses and possibilities would be encouraged, including mountain biking, walking camping and events. (PWS, TT, S&R)
- More walking trail links to attractions outside the Park such as Women’s Factory or the South-West wilderness. (TT)
- The Trust is not seen as an active promoter of uses and activities (in the sense of initiating projects and providing infrastructure), but more as a regulator (is a particular use allowed or not). (S&R, TT, TPC) Development seems to be very slow and may be due to shortages in the Trust’s resourcing or due to the precautionary principle taken too far. An example that was referred to in this regard was mountain biking. It has taken 13 years of planning to get some real development going, and still the development of tracks has been little, below demand. (S&R)
- The development of the Park and the range of uses and activities in it should reflect community and visitor demands. Among some stakeholders there is the perception that use and development focuses on certain groups which is not reflective of needs (TT & S&R). Again reference was made to mountain biking compared to bush-walking: the infrastructure provided is not relative to the participation rates for mountain biking (estimated to be around 7% of the population) and bush walking (9%).

In regards to what current activities raise concerns the stakeholders expressed that:
• There are generally no activities that should be further limited, better controlled or excluded (SW, HCC, PWS, TT, S&R).
• Worrying to some is the occurrence of anti-social behaviour (dogs off lead, trail bikes, unpermitted camping) and vandalism. Enforcement by the existing rangers is perceived as very effective within the limited resources and time available. (SW, PWS)
• Maintenance of the Park and vegetation is seen by several key stakeholders primarily as an activity that should (in most cases) be exempt from permits as the approval process can be time consuming and the works are often recurring and standard. See more on this subject under PPF (HCC). Hobart City Council raised the question whether they needed to gain approval every year to clear saplings at the Springs. There may be an opportunity for a standing permit with an extended time limit.

The key stakeholders expect that mountain biking will continue to increase in the Park. While this increase is widely supported, one does recognise the need to better manage and coordinate conflicting uses. The funding of infrastructure and other measures may require consideration of implementing user pays fees. (SW, PWS, TT)

Focus Group Meetings

The recreation group workshop was attended by organisations involved in a range of activities on the mountain, including mountain biking, (dog) walking, horse riding, rock climbing, 4WD, hang gliding and general recreation.

Key concerns in regards to current use options of the Mountain are:
• Lack and diminishing number of tracks available for 4WD
• Lack of parking
• Different user types, travelling at different speeds and varying levels of noise, are using the same tracks
• Passive management of hang gliding
• Lack of appropriate/suitable mountain bike tracks
• Active uses such as mountain biking have been approached as issues that need solving instead of opportunities to recreate and enjoy the Park.

Future use opportunities recognised by the recreation group include:
• Linkages with other trails in and outside the Park. It was recognised that more linkages means more maintenance (and enforcement which was not mentioned in the session)
• More active accommodating rock climbing including mapping access routes and suitable sites
• Dedicated tracks for user groups (walking tracks, horse riding tracks, etcetera) and supporting signage
• The mountain bike strategy is a real opportunity and recognition of the user group, which has been growing significantly over the last decades

More detailed reporting on the focus group meeting are found in the report prepared by Myriad (Appendix C).
The natural resource management group meeting was attended by representatives of different bush and land care groups. This group greatly values the natural and pristine attributes of the Park. The group expressed concerns in regards to activities, development and commercial uses in the Park, most notably the Springs development, a cable car, mountain biking, 4WD, horse riding and new tracks introducing weeds.

The group expressed some concerns in regards to water collection and protection of the water quality and activity levels at the fringe of the Park.

The future Plan should take account of parking at Springs and the Pinnacle, feral animal species management, dogs off lead (only below pinnacle road), climate change, bush fire management, camping (by walkers, preferably not commercially organised), recognition (signage?) for unusual and threatened species and weed management.

Other minor nuisances were mentioned and are contained in the focus groups report by Myriad (Appendix C).

**Commercial Operator Survey**

In regards to use and development of the Park the commercial operators made a range of suggestions. About 29% (13 of the 45) operators had direct contact with the Trust mostly in regards to road conditions and closure updates. Ten out of thirteen were satisfied with the service provided.

In regards to uses and/or activities in the Park 6 of the 45 operators would like to undertake other activities in the Park including:

- Combined bus and bike tour;
- Cable car
- Bushwalking and trekking and/or longer walks and night time activities
- Ski slope

Infrastructure needs for operators and visitors mentioned by the operators include:

- Bus access
- Parking
- Food outlets
- Traffic safety and/or road upgrade
- Snow access
- Shelter / heating, and
- Visitor information
- More tracks
- Cable car
- Platform
- Picnic tables
Detailed reporting of the survey results are provided in Appendix B

3.4 Project Proposal Form

3.4.1 Audit Findings

It appears that a PPF is required even for exempt uses. This may pose an unnecessary administrative burden on land managers/users/operators. Possibly a notification of works/use and a declaration that all standards will be met by the prospective user to the Trust could be sufficient. Apart from that, the PPF asks for relevant information and the requirements are clear.

3.4.2 Consultation Findings

In regards to standard maintenance works it is felt that the process is over-regulating. Even if a permit is not required, land managers would still need to fill out a project proposal form, which is a detailed form. It was suggested that land managers could agree to standards in regards to maintenance works and other minor works in the park. Operators in the park, as opposed to land owners/managers would still follow the standard process. (HCC)

In relation to this point, one land owner/manager says it does not submit a PPF in case of some maintenance works that do not create a new disturbance to the environment. (PWS)

The Form is generally clear and in case of exempt uses, delays the process (of the land manager) by about two weeks. (HCC)

3.5 Community and Visitor Attitudes – Previous Research

A wide range of research has been undertaken to assess the attitudes and values the community and visitors have for the Park.

This research encompasses surveys to assess general attitudes and what we would call consultation or invited responses and/or submissions to ideas, discrete user groups and proposed plans. So far, most research has focussed on the consultation and specific subjects (Omineca, 2010), including the following studies:

- McConnell & Scripps (2005), *Focus on the Fringe: Wellington Park Historic Heritage Inventory and Audit Project*

---

4 Omineca (2010), Wellington Park Visitor Research and Monitoring Program: Visitor Research Audit, for WPMT
McConnell (2007), *Initial Springs Conservation Policy*
McConnell & Evans (2007), *Myrtle Forest Historic Heritage Conservation Policy*
Inspiring Place (2007), *Springs Master Plan*
WPMT (2009), *Sustainable Transport System Invitation for Ideas*

While community and stakeholder consultation is a key component of the planning process, as part of a broad review of activities, use and development in the Park, the focus in this report should be on the broad quantitative research on attitudes and values.

Key social research (as opposed to subject specific consultation) in relation to the Park was undertaken recently (2010) by the WPMT under the name **Wellington Park Landscape Community Values Assessment, Stage 1.**

The Project brief to this project mentions that "the social values of the Park however have not been formally assessed to date". This study intends to be the first broad social research study undertaken to measure attitudes and values of the community and visitors.

The study aims to measure the community values of the landscape of the Park, and not specifically activities, use and development of the Park.

The questionnaire which was undertaken as part of the study involved a two-page survey (Appendix A) with the following structure (as per brief):

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

The survey questions are mainly of a qualitative nature, there are no questions that ask for valuations and/or importance against a scale (such as from 1 to 5).

The target population is the local community for which no further geographical specification is provided. The sample and response was drawn as follows (avenue, target group):

- WPMT Website, general / electronic media users
- Insertion in Mercury, regional community
- Insertion in other local newspapers, regional community / neighbours
- Stand at local government offices (poster and forms), regional community
- Stand with small poster at select POs and shops near Park, neighbouring communities
- Mailout to Glenorchy Precinct Groups, Glenorchy residents
- Insertion (loose) in HCC mailouts, community groups such as Bushcare
- Handouts at Summer Interpretation Events, additional coverage
- Limited age based focus groups, young and old community
- Other focus groups, if required to address imbalances
Consecutive stages of the study would encompass:

- Historical landscape appreciation assessment (literature review)
- Visual character / management assessment (field work)
- Synthesis and management analysis (desktop research)
- Community mapping (community consultation, qualitative)
- Related research projects (research in conjunction with UTAS)

While a formal written analysis of the survey responses has not been completed to date, the following broad outcomes have been summarised as follows (from the total response of 400 to 500 completed survey forms):

The key values of Wellington Park were categorised as being:

- Landscape
- Aesthetic
- Sense of place
- Personal connections and meanings
- Personal function: use and activities
- Places of importance within the Park
- Essential community function

The community values project provides a useful avenue for community input regarding the values that Tasmanians attribute to Wellington Park. The survey instrument provides an opportunity for community input which is primarily qualitative in nature, i.e. verbatim responses to open ended questions. There are some closed questions which provide quantitative data – importance of Wellington Park and respondent demographics.

This consultation essentially provides a community forum for Tasmanians to express the range of values that Wellington Park represents. There is some opportunity to aggregate and analyse the qualitative response by respondent demographic and to obtain a measure of the perceived importance of the mountain (yes/no/don’t care/don’t know). It also gathers potential respondents for follow-up with a more detailed questionnaire.

The community values project does not provide a valid barometer of community view in relation to Wellington Park. The key limitations are as follows –

- The target population is not defined.
- Respondents self-select from the multiple avenues provided – rather than being a random probability sample.
- Respondents may have completed multiple survey returns.
- The key question is open ended and does not provide measurable data in a quantitative sense.
- The survey instrument covers the values aspects. It does not cover the broader range within the scope of the Management Plan Review – uses, activities and development.

A structured survey of the target population, eg. residents of Southern Tasmania or Greater Hobart (as proposed in our response to the Project Brief), will provide valid measures of community views in relation to Wellington Park, in particular:

- rating of importance
• main values
• visitation
• current and future use/activities/development
• perceived strengths/weaknesses/opportunities/threats
• community engagement regarding Trust activities
• relevant demographics for secondary analysis, eg. by age group, SES, residential location, visitation profile, gender, household type, etc

It will also provide a respondent resource for follow-up contact as required, eg. for more in-depth discussion about key issues.
4 Key Issues and Recommendations

Role and Position of the Plan and the Trust

The objective of this consultancy was to review activities, use and development in the Park as part of the Trust’s review of its Wellington Park Management Plan 2005. In that regard it is relevant to consider the Trust’s role and position too. It is the Trust’s role to ensure the purposes of the Park are realised. Apart from preserving and protecting the stated values, the Parks’ purpose is also to provide recreational and tourism uses and opportunities consistent with the values of the Park.

The consultation tasks part of this review with various stakeholders suggests that the Trust’s primary focus is managing and regulating use in the Park and preserving its values, and not so much promoting and supporting development, which refers to a more active role. The slow development of plans and tracks for mountain bikers was referred to by several stakeholders as an example. The level to which the Trust actively promotes use and development may be a consequence of the resources available. The Trust’s (future) resources, capabilities and efforts regarding its role of promoting activities, use and development in the Park needs to be clearly articulated. If resources are and expectedly continue to be constrained in the future, this should somehow be reflected in the next Plan and communicated to stakeholders.

The necessity of a dual development approvals process, one through the Trust and one through Council, is a reality that needs to be stated and clarified in the Plan.

The introduction of the new model planning scheme for Southern Tasmania has consequences for the zonings and use requirements of land in Southern Tasmania. The future Plan should consider and align with the model planning scheme where appropriate. The model’s Specific Area Plans’ may provide an opportunity for the Trust and Council to align their Site Development Plans (Trust) and Local Area Plans (Council) as Specific Area Plans. One of the consequences of the new model planning scheme is that it requires the consideration of climate change impacts on the values, management and use options of the Park.

Zoning

Wellington Park is a unique national park because of its close proximity to the City, the number of land managers and the range of values it includes and preserves. In its uniqueness the zoning mechanism that is applied works effectively according all stakeholders that were consulted. The zoning is also logical and understandable. No significant issues in regards to the zoning mechanism have been identified.
**Approvals Processes**

In regards to the appropriateness, transparency and easiness to understand the Plan and its approvals process for activities, uses and developments the following issues play a role:

- The Plan and specifically the Chapter on the Approvals Process is not easy to read and understand for a potential operator, developer or the general public. The Plan currently makes references of how the current Plan is different from the previous Plans. An unwanted consequence of it is that the ‘flow’ of the text tends to become patchy and the order sometimes illogical.
- Clear definitions and descriptions of the differences between a permit, license, lease, development application and project proposal form are required.
- Flow charts and written explanations in regards to the approvals processes should be included in the Plan.
- In Section 6.3, Clauses 3 and 6 should be made conclusive in order to eliminate any uncertainties this may give to a potential operator or developer about the feasibility of any proposal, and to prevent any concerns about arbitrariness.
- Currently, an applicant is referred to the Management Plan and any other strategies to ensure their proposed use/development complies with the Plan. It is recommended to provide applicants guidance regarding what plans should be checked.
- A cable car is not mentioned in the plan. Due to its’ contentiousness it would be beneficial for potential developers, operators and the general public if the Trust could provide some guidance on the implications of the Management Plan for a possible cable car proposal.
- While commercial operators are generally happy with the approvals process for Commercial Visitor Services, two key points for improvement are the current (flat) fee structure and the timeliness of the process, which in one case took three months. It is noted that the approvals process is administered through PWS.
- Currently, land managers need to fill out Project Proposal Forms for most works including many standard and recurring maintenance works. It would be simpler and quicker if the Trust and the land managers would agree on standards and work schedules for which the land managers would only be required to provide the Trust with notice (two weeks or so) prior to undertaking the works.

**Uses and Development**

In regards to the zonings and uses that are permitted and not, the audit did not find any inconsistencies in the Plan.

The tables reflect an approach that combines prescriptive and performance based planning. It is prescriptive in relation to the exempt and unpermitted uses in the sense that it names specific uses and activities. It is performance based in relation to ‘Discretionary uses’ (not exempt or prohibited) by listing Acceptable Solutions and Performance Criteria, on the basis of which permissions may be granted.

The Park has a range of intrinsic natural, scenic and heritage values that require protection by the Management Plan while at the same time it allows the Park’s recreational values to be used and developed. This requires a fine balancing act and the use and development tables reflect that.
The consultation tasks with different stakeholders show that there are no existing uses that need to be curbed or constrained. The exception lies with some of the NRM representatives that were consulted during a focus group meeting, who would like to see more restrictions.

The key stakeholders mentioned that the Plan should be multi-user focussed. Several stakeholders indicated that for a long time the needs of mountain bikers were insufficiently recognised.

Additional uses that were mentioned by stakeholders include:
- More active promotion of the Park in general,
- More tracks (designated user groups),
- More linkages with tracks outside the Park,
- Camping opportunities for multiple day activities,
- Events
- Infrastructure items such as signage, visitor information, active promotion of the park and its use options, use group specific tracks.

In regards to the provision of uses and infrastructure, it is important to note that resources may have acted as a restriction in the past and may continue to do so. More tracks and linkages require more enforcement, weed control and maintenance.

**Previous Research**

The review included a review of past research regarding community and visitor perceptions of the levels of activities, use and development should be allowed in the Park. The conclusion is that so far there has been no broad, quantitative social research based on a random population sample to establish what the community views are in regards to activities, use and development of the Park. Most research in the past was user group or subject specific, qualitative and focussed on the values of the Park.

Broad quantitative and statistically valid research on community views would provide a useful basis for promoting and supporting more activities, use and development in the Park.

Again, consideration should be given to the point raised earlier about the Trust’s role, capabilities and resources in relation to promoting and supporting use and development in the Park. The future Plan should be clear about how and to what extent it aims to fulfil all of its’ purposes:

- “the provision of recreational and tourism uses and opportunities consistent with the purposes specified in paragraphs (b) to (e);
- the preservation or protection of the fauna or flora contained in or on the land;
- the preservation or protection of the natural beauty of the land or of any features of the land of natural beauty or scenic interest;
- the preservation or protection of any features of the land being features of historical, Aboriginal, archaeological, scientific, architectural or geomorphological interest; and
- the protection of the water catchment values of the land.”
Consultation

On the basis of the findings there are no direct requirements for further consultation as part of this review. Follow-up interviews with commercial operators have so far been kept on hold. The survey results were clear.

Depending on the Trust’s strategic considerations in regards to its future role and capabilities in promoting use and development in the Park in line with the Park’s values, it may be appropriate to initiate quantitative social research among the population. This research would be aimed to gain a valid rating of community views in relation to the perceived appropriate levels of activities, use and development in the Park.
Appendix A WPMT Community Values Survey
QUESTIONNAIRE

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

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

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

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

Is Wellington Park, or any part of it (including Mount Wellington) important to you in any way?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Don’t care ☐ Don’t know

Why is Wellington Park important/not important to you?

☐ Please answer in your own words – we want to know what you think.

☐ Please comment on places within Wellington Park that are important to you, as well as the whole Park.

☐ Please use the map overleaf to show us the places you mention.

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

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

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

Answer here:

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

Questionnaire continued over page

Please return your completed form to Wellington Park Management Trust, GPO Box 509, Hobart, Tasmania, 7001

Please return the completed questionnaire by 31st December 2010 where possible.
### Community Values Project

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

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

To assist with the analysis please complete the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (optional):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ Male   □ Female</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residential town/suburb:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If you do not live near Wellington Park now, have you in the past? □ Yes □ No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>If yes, where?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age group:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ 0-20 years □ 21-40 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ 41-60 years □ 60 years +</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you for completing this questionnaire. General information about Wellington Park can be found on the Trust’s website at: www.wellingtonpark.org.au
Appendix B Commercial Operator Survey – Report

Provided as separate document.
Appendix C Stakeholder Workshops – Recreation and NRM Groups

Provided as separate document.