

152

Easton, Michael

WELLINGTON PARK  
MANAGEMENT TRUST

26 OCT

FILE REF. \_\_\_\_\_

From: Wellington Park [info@wellingtonpark.org.au]  
 Sent: Friday, 26 October 2012 10:59 AM  
 To: review@wellingtonpark.org.au  
 Subject: Draft Wellington Park Management Plan 2012 Public Submission

The following response was received to the Wellington Park Community Values survey.

-----

Your name: Nathan Carswell

Email:

Group (if applicable):

Address:

-----

1 Background

As a resident in the foothills of the mountain, Wellington Park is critically important to me.

-----

2 The Basis for Management

No issue.

-----

3 Management Zones

I have no issue for the reason for park management to exist. The existing mess of communications infrastructure at the summit is a disgrace and I applaud the acknowledgement for better care to be taken at the summit in future;

However, I disapprove of the prohibition that has scared off sensible development under previous management plans.

-----

4 Activities, Use and Development

Current activities are great and the increasing recognition of the mountain-biking community is excellent; however more can be done to make the most of our recreational resource.

-----

4A Springs Specific Area Plan

No issue with the Springs specific plan; however I disagree with the notion that The Springs should be treated as the primary visitor node within the Park, above or equal to importance with the summit.

The current approved development at The Springs should be split in two. The public amenity elements should be the responsibility of the Hobart City Council, and are long overdue. The commercial aspects would be better suited at the summit; if access can be improved and provided year-round without restriction.



-----  
4B Pinnacle Specific Area Plan

The Pinnacle Area plan highlights how disorganised treatment of the summit has been to date.

The new acknowledgement of the recreational potential of the summit, and intention to provide a discretionary means for a developer to submit a formal proposal with a level of certainty is welcome.

A cable car to the summit is a must, and makes a lot of environmental and economic sense; however the Park Trust should be heavily involved in steering the most appropriate cable car solution to not diminish the use and enjoyment of existing park values.

Private investment proposals should be encouraged and prioritised over any public spending.

Private development should be guided and given the conditions to include providing public amenity, such as better interpretation, comfort and shelter, as part or in addition to their commercial component.

-----

5 Threats and Pressures on Park Values

I don't agree that the road should be plowed (and turned into mush) during and after heavy snowfall, just to allow access to the summit. This is a public expense which could be avoided if an alternative form of transport to the summit was available.

The road, during snowfall, should be left unploughed to the enjoyment of visitors and tourists.

-----

6 Maintaining Park Values

I support a cable car and commercial development at the summit and do not believe that such a proposal is inappropriate or diminishing of existing park values.

The reason I support a cable car is that I believe it will reduce the carbon footprint currently expended providing access to the pinnacle, it could improve waste-management and it could provide a means to replace and replant the power-line easement that causes the scar across the eastern face. An associated restaurant or cafe would encourage visitors to stay and appreciate the summit for longer.

-----

7 Water Supply

No issue.

-----

8 Providing for Visitors

Current visitor amenity is a disgrace and embarrassment. The Trust should encourage private investment to find a suitable and appropriate means to improve the visitor experience and understanding of the mountain.

If private developers are keen to provide public and non-commercial amenity for all mountain visitors, then they should be given or offered assistance in their proposal to do so.

A cable car developer who respects the mountain for what it is, and can find a way to enhance the provision for visitors without diminishing the experience of the majority of local residents should be encouraged by the Trust and I would expect the Trust to work collaboratively with them to design the best solution.

-----

#### 9 Access, Track Recreational Usage and Track Management

Dedicated tracks for either walking or cycling would be safer and more enjoyable for both modes of use. Shared tracks are stressful.

-----

#### 10 Interpreting the Park

As mentioned in Chapter 8 and 4b; the interpretation offered in the Park is woefully inadequate for visitors. Heritage, both aboriginal and european is hardly acknowledged at either the Springs or the summit.

-----

#### 11 Park Boundaries and Tenure

No issue with this.

-----

#### 12 Monitoring, Evaluation and Adaptive Management

I would support the Trust working collaboratively with a commercial developer to continue and improve the preservation of the park.

-----

#### 13 Administration

It would be appreciated to better understand how particular board members are selected from the key stakeholders and land owners, and investigate whether or not this can be opened to a public vote.

-----

#### Other

Don't use the number of submissions to this draft plan as a consensus of whether the majority of Hobart want a cable car or not. I believe most people who support a cable car are simply too busy to bother submitting a response to you.

If you really want to know the answer, request a referendum at the next election!  
Otherwise, start talking with the Mt Wellington Cableway Company.

Find reasons to say YES to sensible development and not NO.

-----

