



Residents Opposed to the Cable Car response to Wellington Park Management Trust Visitor and Recreation Strategy Draft paper (Nov 2022)

Firstly, we would like to commend this document and the community consultation that went into it. It accords very much with our own views and what we believe to be the views of the majority of Park users.

As we are in broad agreement we will only comment by exception:

1.

At 1.2 (page 5) you list the action “Engage with tourism agencies to include Wellington Park as an iconic offering”

We would caution that as coping with large visitor numbers is one of the challenges of managing the Park, it would be preferable to avoid actions which would tend to increase numbers. It should also be noted that promotion of tourism places and experiences has a tendency to attract those who place a lower value on the place/experience and therefore adds to pressure to change the place to suit the visitors.

In our view engagement with tourism agencies should be educative rather than promotional.

2.

At 2.6 (page 5) you list action “Refine the Management Plan zoning to ensure a more seamless visitor/user experience”

Following on from the 2015 amendment the Pinnacle Specific Area encompasses not just the highly modified area of carpark, buildings and communication facilities but also a large slice of relatively undisturbed periglacial terrain on the Eastern slope. In our view the boundary for the Pinnacle Specific Area should be redrawn so as to include only those buildings, communication facilities, carpark and associated disturbed area.

3.

Although arguably a little out of the scope of this strategy, we would like to see consideration of a redesign of the Pinnacle observation shelter to be less visually intrusive.

4.

At 6.2 (page 11) you list the action “Undertake with the City of Hobart a feasibility study of alternative transport arrangements between Hall’s Saddle and the Pinnacle”. We agree, but think that the timeframe of medium term is too long. We think this action should be commenced immediately and placed in the 2 year column on page 5, instead of the 5 year column.



5.

On page 16 you say:

“Beautifully designed and connected hubs focus visitor activity.

High use areas are masterplanned to inspire and connect visitors to the Park, providing a seamless experience. These provide a transport nucleus, toilets, information, food and beverage and possibly commercial operators.”

We are of the view that food beverage and commercial operators whilst a reasonable component of hubs outside the Park are not necessarily appropriate in any of the hubs within the park.

6.

On pages 24 to 30 your section “Understanding Our Visitors” makes an ambitious attempt to categorise visitors into five types. We wish to point out that although this may be a convenient sketch the reality is far more nuanced. Many Hobartians and indeed some tourists would fit into multiple categories. (It is not clear which category local rock climbers would fit.) That is not to say that we think we can improve on your categorisation, just to point out that it has limitations.

We thank you for the opportunity to comment and wish you well in your further development of this strategy.

Philip Stigant
for Residents Opposed to the Cable Car