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Summary

This site plan covers proposed works to improve both the Wineglass Bay walker carpark and the track to Wineglass Bay lookout, including a new trackhead and lookout structure. The site is a critical component of the State’s tourism experience, and existing facilities are not able to cope with visitor demand. This plan first establishes a vision and development objectives for the site, followed by an examination of site values and the development of prescriptive measures to protect values or mitigate impact. The plan then presents specific development concepts including a proposed new, expanded carpark layout and a new (partial) loop track to the lookout.
Contents

Summary ........................................................................................................... ii

Section 1 Introduction .................................................................................. 1
  1.1 Context – the Management Issues ...................................................... 1
  1.2 Location and Extent of Site .............................................................. 1
  1.3 Relationship to other Planning Documents ................................. 2
  1.4 Scope and Structure of this Plan ...................................................... 3

Section 2 Vision and Objectives ................................................................. 4
  2.1 The Vision for the Site ..................................................................... 4
  2.2 Site Development Objectives ......................................................... 5

Section 3 Site Conservation ......................................................................... 6
  3.1 Geoheritage ..................................................................................... 6
  3.2 Aboriginal Heritage ......................................................................... 7
  3.3 Historic Heritage ............................................................................ 7
  3.4 Flora ................................................................................................ 8
  3.5 Fauna ................................................................................................ 9
  3.6 Pests and Diseases .......................................................................... 9
  3.7 Landscape and Visual Values .......................................................... 10
  3.8 Recreation and Tourism Values ..................................................... 10
  3.9 Education Values .......................................................................... 12

Section 4 Site Design .................................................................................. 13
  4.1 Carparking ...................................................................................... 13
  4.2 Trackhead ....................................................................................... 15
  4.3 Track Plan ....................................................................................... 15
  4.4 Lookout ............................................................................................ 17
  4.5 Relationship to other Tracks ............................................................ 17
  4.6 Site Furniture/Signs ....................................................................... 17
  4.7 Interpretation and Education .......................................................... 18
  4.8 Community Consultation ............................................................... 18

Appendix 1 Schedule of Comments ............................................................. 19

Figure 1 Carpark Site Design ................................................................. 14
Figure 2 Lookout Track Site Design ..................................................... 16
Section 1 Introduction

1.1 Context – the Management Issues

Currently the single most important attraction in Freycinet National Park is the view to Wineglass Bay from the saddle between Mt Amos and Mt Mayson. Visitors wishing to see this view leave their cars at the Wineglass Bay carpark and walk a 1.2 kilometre track, ascending 120 metres to the saddle lookout.

Inadequacies of this major tourist experience have been recognised for some time and relate both to the carparking facilities and to the track itself.

The carparking facilities at the Wineglass Bay carpark are insufficient to cope with demand. The carpark’s capacity was frequently exceeded by up to 100% between Christmas 2002 and Easter 2003, a period of 4 months. Since that time visitor numbers have continued to increase and the situation now requires attention. Visitors are often forced to park along the edges of the narrow approach road, creating traffic congestion and danger for themselves and other users.

The standard of the lookout track is also insufficient to cope with current and future predicted demand. In the busiest month of 2003 (January) there were more than 500 people walking the track every day. The trackhead is small, diffuse and unable to cope with numbers. The track is narrow, has a slippery surface, many high steps and is frequently crowded, presenting risk issues and impacting on the quality of the experience.

The Wineglass lookout, an integral element of the track, is also considered to be inadequate. Visitor numbers are often such that, from a comfort point of view, the existing viewing platform’s capacity is exceeded. Overcrowding severely impacts on the quality of the visitor experience. Secondary impacts include localised compaction and damage to flora, and significant risk management issues as walkers leave the track to escape the crowd, perching on a range of nearby rocks and vantage points.

This development specific site plan covers only those matters and sites directly affected by redevelopment of the Wineglass Bay carpark and lookout track.

1.2 Location and Extent of Site

The carpark lies at the foot of four prominent peaks known collectively as the Hazards, 200-300 metres back from the edge of Great Oyster Bay and adjacent to a small holiday village called The Fisheries.

The Hazards, comprising Mt Parsons (331 metres), Mt Dove (485 metres), Mt Amos (445 metres) and Mt Mayson (420 metres), rise sharply from almost directly behind the carpark. The lookout track ascends steeply from the carpark, passing up a valley between Mt Amos and Mt Mayson, a valley which, while wider at the bottom, gradually constricts to a narrow pinch directly before the saddle is reached. The lookout is located at the saddle.
1.3 Relationship to other Planning Documents

The most important planning document for the park is the Freycinet National Park, Wye River State Reserve Management Plan 2000. This is a statutory plan. Other supplementary documents include the draft Freycinet National Park Visitor Services Zone Site Plan May 2000, the Freycinet National Park Draft Management Plan 2004 and the recently released draft Freycinet Tourism Development Plan March 2004.

Carpark

Redevelopment of the carpark was not anticipated in either the park’s 2000 statutory plan or the 2000 visitor services zone site plan. This situation reflects the rapidity with which visitor numbers have increased in the last few years. The need for redevelopment of the carpark has however been recognised and embraced in the 2004 tourism development plan.

While the park’s statutory plan does not anticipate the need for redevelopment of the carpark, neither does it preclude this happening. The carpark, and any proposed enlargement to it, lies within the area zoned ‘Coles Bay Visitor Service’ by the plan. This zone is intended to be the main focus of visitor services to:

...provide a range of high quality visitor services and facilities while minimising impacts

Section 4.5 of the plan sets out a protocol for the management authority to assess development within the park. The protocol firstly requires an assessment of the scale of the project, based on scale, public interest or the potential for substantial impact. Depending upon the outcome of this process the assessment process is either an internal process, or one that is made available for public comment. The management authority has gauged the proposed changes to the carpark are of a scale where it is appropriate to develop a site plan that includes a comprehensive development assessment, and then seek the public’s comment.

Lookout Track

The Freycinet National Park, Wye River State Reserve Management Plan 2000 states:

The extremely erodible granitic and sandy soils of the Park mean that a track subjected to such high use is difficult to maintain, and is considered to be unsafe by many visitors. Visitors have slipped and fallen on the Wineglass Bay Lookout Track, injuring themselves and requiring rescue and medical attention.

The plan goes on to prescribe as follows

- Upgrade and maintain the entire Wineglass Bay track at ‘Walk’ standard.

While therefore endorsing a significant upgrade of the track, the zoning system in the plan severely limits the options the Parks and Wildlife Service may consider. The existing track occupies a narrow 100 metre wide corridor of land zoned for recreation, with the land either side of this zoned for conservation. The plan provides the ability to upgrade the track so long as it remains within this narrow recreation zone corridor, but expressly rules out new tracks in the conservation zone except in certain limited circumstances. Investigations have revealed a high desirability for this limitation to be relaxed, allowing the partial development of a looptrack to the lookout.

In anticipation of the need for a relaxation of the zoning rule to allow track development within the conservation zone (but only for the Wineglass Lookout track) an amendment to the 2000 statutory plan has been included in the Freycinet National Park Draft Management Plan 2004. This draft plan is

1 Prepared for the Coles Bay Steering Committee by Inspiring Place Pty Ltd.
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currently being referred to the Resource Planning and Development Commission for their review. If approved, the plan will have the effect of altering the Freycinet National Park, Wye River State Reserve Management Plan 2000 in two specific areas, including the zoning relaxation.

Please Note
This site plan is predicated on the assumption that the zoning relaxation will be approved. No track work extending outside the current recreation zone may be commenced until this approval is in place. However, like the carpark improvements, the track redevelopment is still subject to Section 4.5 of the 2000 plan (see above). The management authority considers the scale of changes proposed are such that it is appropriate to develop a site plan that includes a comprehensive development assessment, and then seek the public’s comment. It is also considered appropriate to run these processes in parallel, rather than sequentially.

1.4 Scope and Structure of this Plan

This site plan presents the public with the management authority’s proposed response to the specific visitor management issues as described in Section 1.1. The plan presents specific development concepts, and has been developed to satisfy the requirements of Section 4.5 of the Freycinet National Park, Wye River State Reserve Management Plan 2000 in respect to these works. Ahead of presenting redevelopment concepts this plan establishes a vision and development objectives for the site, followed by an examination of site values, and the development of prescriptive measures to protect values or mitigate impact.
Section 2 Vision and Objectives

2.1 The Vision for the Site

The following vision statements for the site provides a basis for defining the goals and specific objectives of the project.

Arrival Vision

Visitors arriving at Coles Bay gaze up towards the Hazards and enjoy the scenic panorama of this virtually untouched set of peaks. The only obvious development within the park, visible from this distance, is seen fringing the shoreline. Even this development, where it is located within the park, tends to blend with the natural scenery. Entering the park most visitors, after stopping at the visitor centre proceed by car to the start of the Wineglass track.

Carpark and Trackhead Vision

The start of the track is easily found and drivers have little difficulty locating a carpark. Drivers arriving with larger groups, or perhaps children, are able to drop them off at the track-head before proceeding onwards to park their car. Pedestrians moving around the carpark area feel safe and well oriented, knowing exactly where to go to begin the walk. At the track-head all essential facilities including walker safety information, toilets and water are all obviously located, well presented and functional.

Track Vision

The walk up to the lookout is a pleasant experience. Many visitors stop along the way to enjoy the relative solitude of the mountain, or perhaps listen to a bird-song. The gaze of walkers is drawn towards the healthy bush along the track, the magnificent boulders and the wonderful views. By contrast walkers tend to hardly notice the built infrastructure that makes their walk possible. The track climbs steadily, but its surface provides sure footing, there are relatively few steps, and these are not too high. At appropriate intervals along the track many people choose to sit and rest on seats provided for the purpose. At these rest stops some have their experience enriched by taking the time to look at the absorbing interpretation panels that help them to think about and understand the things around them.

Management Vision

Park staff who manage the site, when they stop to think about it, are often impressed at how easily the site is managed. They receive very few irate complaints from drivers stuck in traffic jams unable to find a carpark, or walkers unable to find the toilets, or upset because they had to go back to Coles Bay to find some water. Emergency call-outs on the mountain for twisted ankles, heat exhaustion or worse have dramatically reduced since the new track was built. The track itself, being well built, requires less maintenance, and ongoing damage and dieback of bush along the track edge has virtually stopped. Visitors are always telling staff just how much they enjoyed the walk and the magnificent view at the top.
2.2 Site Development Objectives


This plan elaborates upon and gives emphasis to these general objectives in the light of the particular circumstances, issues and values that prevail at the site.

Specific Development Objectives
To maintain the site values, and to achieve the site vision, management objectives are set out below. These objectives are fundamental to the long-term protection of the site. They underpin sustainable recreational and tourism use and are consistent with the management objectives for this national park.

Principal Objectives
- To minimise impact on all identified site values.
- To provide sufficient additional carparking spaces to cope with most demand situations over the next 5 years.
- To develop carparking and walker reception facilities that are intuitively useable, functional and promote visitor satisfaction and safety.
- To redevelop the walking track so that it is able to cope with demand over at least the next 10 years.
- To focus track improvements on enhancing experiential quality while handling large numbers of people.
- To develop a track that is safe to undertake by people with a wide range of fitness and skill levels.
- To develop appropriate interpretation opportunities.

Associated Objectives
- To develop a long-term visitor management strategy for the park so that, if and when the capacity of the upgraded carparking facilities can no longer cope with demand, alternate visitor transport arrangements can be implemented.
Section 3 Site Conservation

This section summarises the environmental, heritage, recreation, and education values and significance of the site and documents the specific protection measures required to protect them.

3.1 Geoheritage

Sites of geoconservation significance are listed on the Tasmanian Geoconservation Database. The Hazards are listed on the database as the most outstanding example in Tasmania of large-scale granite weathering and landform development due to joint control and exfoliation. While an outstanding feature, it is also robust and not easily damaged by the activities of man.

The Tasmanian Geoconservation Database also provides details of an area of palaeosol (fossil soil) immediately down-slope and to the west of the existing carpark. Overlying this palaeosol is a sand-sheet deposit, probably deposited by the wind during a previous interglacial period. The extent of the feature is unknown, its existence having only been noted at this single location. It is considered of outstanding significance at a State level and is potentially threatened by almost any overlying development.

Management Issues

Management issues include:
- the protection of vulnerable geoheritage values;
- the introduction of a range of organic and inorganic materials not currently present, as well as defacement and disturbance of site soils and rock outcrops, impacting on geoheritage values;
- creation of erosion and/or destabilisation issues as a result of poor technical considerations; and
- the difficulty of rehabilitating redundant sections of track given the highly erodable soils, shallow topsoil, track compaction and existing drainage problems.

Prescriptions

- Avoid development over the top of the significant palaeosol identified in the Tasmanian Geoconservation Database.
- Quarrying guidelines in the Walking Track Management Manual must be followed with regard to the supply of additional off-site fill material for track construction.
- Use of exposed rock for track construction should also follow the guidelines detailed in the Walking Track Management Manual. Generally there should be sufficient rock in the vicinity of the track depending on quantities required. Only granite of similar grain size and colour as is found on the site may be used. Further advice should be sought from the Earth Science Section once more detailed plans have been prepared if there is an intention to import major quantities of off-site rock.
- Wherever possible rock drilling or similar disturbance to outcrop surfaces should be avoided. Any other method available to attach boardwalk and
other structures to the major rock slabs without penetrating the rock slabs should be investigated and considered.

- Prepare a rehabilitation plan, documenting active rehabilitation works for any redundant areas of track including braided areas, in consultation with the earth science section of Nature Conservation.

- Key components of the above rehabilitation plan include:
  - drainage control,
  - ripping of compacted areas,
  - removal of all treated timber,
  - importation of compatible topsoil,
  - laying of jute, litter and slash,
  - possible additional seeding, and
  - ongoing monitoring and maintenance.

- All new track construction must carefully collect, stockpile and recycle all topsoil, litter and slash as part of the rehabilitation works

3.2 Aboriginal Heritage

Freycinet National Park has extensive Aboriginal heritage values. As a result a specific Aboriginal heritage survey was commissioned to assess the values and impacts of this project (Graham 2003). The ground and desk-top survey that was conducted revealed no known Aboriginal heritage issues on the site.

Management Issues

There is potential that works associated with implementing this plan may still reveal Aboriginal heritage places.

Prescriptions

- Report all Aboriginal places discovered to the Director, in accordance with the Aboriginal Relics Act 1975.

- Any Aboriginal heritage places discovered will not be deliberately disturbed unless the Director determines there is no practicable alternative and a written authority has been issued under the Aboriginal Relics Act 1975.

3.3 Historic Heritage

The site is not known to possess any significant physical record of historic cultural heritage value.

Management Issues

There is potential that works associated with implementing this plan may reveal artefacts of possible heritage significance.

Prescriptions

- Report any historic heritage artefacts discovered to the management authority’s heritage conservation staff for their advice.
3.4 Flora

The importance of the Freycinet National Park for flora conservation has been well established. As a result a specific fauna and flora study has been commissioned to assess the values and impacts of this project (North Barker and Associates 2004). The information presented below is drawn directly from that study.

The vegetation of the study area is primarily heathy and shrubby woodland. Coastal *Eucalyptus amygdalina* forest and woodland is the most extensive vegetation type occurring in the study area, covering most of the area. *Leptospermum glaucescens* is the most widespread tall shrub species and dominates almost to the exclusion of other tall shrub species at many sites. *Allocasuarina littoralis* is also a common small tree/tall shrub species while *Banksia marginata* and *Kunzea ambigua* are widespread but less prominent. This community is not threatened, being well reserved.

Within a 5 kilometre radius of the study area there are known to be at least 25 flora species that are listed under State or Commonwealth legislation. None of these species are known to occur in the area of the proposed carpark redevelopment but two occur in the areas of newly proposed trackwork.

*Caustis pentandra*, thick twist rush, listed as rare under the State legislation occurs as a patch of 10 plants about 300 m west and down-slope of the Wineglass Saddle on the proposed re-route of the track. This species is very localised in Tasmania but is reserved elsewhere in Freycinet National Park.

*Spyridium vexilliferum*, winged spyridium, listed as rare under the State legislation occurs in one locality on the upper reaches of the proposed Wineglass Bay track re-route. This species occurs in sandy heaths in the east, north and west of Tasmania. The species is reserved elsewhere in Freycinet National Park and Epping Forest Nature Reserve.

**Management Issues**

No flora conservation issues have been identified for the carpark works as the area contains no significant values (North Barker and Associates 2004). Potentially track works may result in the direct destruction of listed threatened species, but if these are avoided then the proposed track re-route is not expected to significantly impact natural values (North Barker and Associates 2004).

**Prescriptions**

- All colonies of rare plants identified by North Barker and Associates (2004) in the vicinity of the proposed track works are to be clearly taped before the commencement of track construction.

- Minimise direct impact on all flora associated with the site. In particular track re-alignments should be undertaken to avoid, wherever possible, disturbance of the listed rare place species as described above.

- If any of the listed rare plant species as described above must be disturbed/destroyed then a permit to disturb under the *Tasmanian Threatened Species Act 1995* is required.

- In areas of new carpark works, retain as many existing trees as possible, minimising root disturbance, and protecting from compaction both during and after construction.
• In areas subject to rehabilitation and direct planting, species use is restricted to native plants species found in the area. Plants used must be grown from local provenance seed stock.

3.5 Fauna

The information presented below is again drawn directly from the work of North Barker and Associates (2004).

The vegetation types of the site contain a range of niches for fauna cover and nesting such as dense under-growth, tree hollows, logs and areas of rock deposits. No aquatic habitats, cliffs or damp rotting logs are present. The habitat is fairly typical of relatively dry sclerophyll habitat to be found in eastern Tasmania. The general locale is known to support populations of fauna species that are listed under State or Commonwealth legislation including *Lathamus discolor* swift parrot, *Dasyurus maculatus* spotted tailed quoll, *Antipodia chaostola* chaostola skipper, *Pseudomys novaehollandiae* new holland mouse *Litoria raniformis* green and gold frog, *Aquila audax fleayi* wedge-tailed eagle and *Sterna nereis nereis* fairy tern. Of these species only the spotted tailed quoll, the chaostola skipper and the new holland mouse are considered to have any potential habitat on the site, and then only marginally so.

**Management Issues**

No fauna conservation issues have been identified.

3.6 Pests and Diseases

Site works, by their nature, are often associated with the introduction and/or spread of pests and diseases. Active management is required to limit this effect.

Indicators suggest *Phytophthora cinnamomi* is well established along the valley of the Wineglass Bay Track and the proposed re-route (North Barker and Associates, 2004). Indicators include a marked scarcity of small shrubs of the families Fabaceae, Epacridaceae and the graminoid genus Xanthorrhoea. The evidence is consistent with a long history of *Phytophthora* infection.

**Management Issues**

*Phytophthora cinnamomi* is not present in many other areas of the park and construction activities provide an opportunity for its spread.

New strains of *Phytophthora* and other pests and diseases may be introduced/spread in the park as a result of works.

**Prescriptions**

• Clean earth moving machinery and tools before entering the park to prevent the introduction of *Phytophthora*.

• Do not transport earth moving machinery and tools from the site to other *Phytophthora* free areas of the park without undertaking thorough cleaning.

• Ensure track construction crews do not walk out of the area of site construction in to *Phytophthora* free areas without thoroughly cleaning footwear.
Site Conservation

- Use gravel from quarries tested and proven free of *Phytophthora*.
- Build in sufficient side slope on tracks to ensure they are free draining.
- Locate, where possible, tracks uphill of current infections.
- Encourage users to stay on the track.
- Encourage users to brush shoes before they leave the Freycinet National Park.
- Install boot-brushes at the car park.
- Install an informative sign encouraging the use of the boot-brushes and indicating the threat posed by *Phytophthora cinnamomi*.
- Ensure the growing medium for plants brought in from off-site is free of pathogens

### 3.7 Landscape and Visual Values

The Hazards, characterised by steep slopes, sparse vegetation, exfoliating granite slabs and free standing boulders are one of the most visually striking aspects of the park, forming an impressive backdrop to the town of Coles Bay and a dominant landmark of the East Coast.

**Management Issues**

Works on the lookout track may impact on the visual and landscape qualities of the wider park by creation of infrastructure that is highly visible from a distance.

**Prescriptions**

- Minimise the traverse of open exposed areas of rock. Locate the track, wherever possible, in areas where existing vegetation and boulders will screen views.
- Avoid the use of reflective materials and colours that will contrast with the natural colours of the site.
- Minimise the visibility of any new lookout from Wineglass Bay Beach.

### 3.8 Recreation and Tourism Values

Two successive visitor surveys (1998/00 and 2002/03) have shown that the opportunity to view Wineglass Bay is the prime reason that visitors come to the Freycinet National Park. An exit survey completed in summer 02/03 indicated that sixty eight percent of the 200,000 visitors to the park, or 136,000 people, walked to the lookout.

From a State tourism point of view the site is one of the top ten visitor attractions in Tasmania. As such the site, and its further development is of immense strategic importance. The panoramic views of the bay have some fame even on the world stage, having been featured in international magazines and television programming.
However, as indicated in the introduction to this plan, problems exist with the attraction. The 2002/03 exit survey indicated visitor dissatisfaction with the condition of the track, the need for seats and better signage and problems with the current lookout capacity. It is considered the quality of the experience would be greatly improved if these matters, along with the parking issues, were addressed.

**Carpark**
In the short to medium-term the management authority believes the correct solution for carparking is to extend the current arrangements. However if visitor numbers to the site continue to rapidly grow in the coming years the management authority believes that the limits to the site’s capacity to absorb more parking will have already been reached. If carparking again becomes inadequate a new approach to transporting visitors to the track-head will be required, and a shuttle bus may be a solution. This approach is foreshadowed in the recently released draft *Freycinet Tourism Development Plan March 2004*.

**Trackhead**
Information and facilities provided at the trackhead are essential to the safety and comfort of walkers. The current trackhead is far too small and crowding is a constant issue. The current information booth is small, and is often surrounded by a knot of people waiting to sign-in and/or view the safety and directional information. Others, anxious to avoid the bottleneck, often neglect to view this important information. A new, much larger trackhead is required. The space must particularly be able to cope with the pulse loadings associated with bus arrivals, as well as at some future point, being capable of accommodating a facility for sheltering visitors waiting to be shuttled to their next destination.

**Lookout Track**
To address the issue of crowding on the lookout track, increasing track width is a partial solution, but creation of a one-way loop track is considered a superior solution. Visitors moving around a one-way loop track have a much lower incidence of encounters with other parties, greatly reducing the apparent level of crowding, providing a more relaxed experience, and reducing the risks associated with passing in this steep terrain. However providing a loop track is difficult and expensive precisely because of the steep terrain of the Hazards. This is particularly so at the high end of the track, on the approach to the lookout, where the valley constricts.

To address the general track condition, and maximise visitor safety, track standards need to be established and met.

**Lookout**
Similarly, to address the issue of overcrowding at the lookout the management authority believes a larger facility must be developed, incorporating seating and possibly interpretation.

**Management Issues**
Management issues include:

- possible impact on the quality of the experience by failing to adequately address crowding issues;
- meeting a duty of care through the maintenance of appropriate standards;
- creation of infrastructure that fails to sit well in the environment, drawing unnecessary attention to itself and, as a result, diminishing the users experience of nature.

**Prescriptions**

- Address, in the short to medium-term, the lack of carparking by expanding the current carpark, providing for an approximate doubling of numbers
• Ensure all roading, carparking and ancillary visitor facilities are in compliance with relevant Australian standards.

• Develop a long-term strategy for transporting visitors to the trackhead that involves no more expansion of carparking over that which is provided for in this plan (a shuttle system).

• Ensure, as much as possible, that development provided for by this plan is consistent with the above long-term transport strategy.

• Develop an expanded trackhead.

• Develop, where possible, a loop track.

• Redevelop the saddle lookout.

• Ensure all track-work meets appropriate Australian standards.

• Use natural materials wherever possible in the construction of new infrastructure, and particularly in the case of trackwork.

• Avoid the construction of raised boardwalks, lookout platforms, interpretation displays and other built structures on the lookout track that compete with the natural environment for the attention of the viewer in their style or approach to presentation.

3.9 Education Values

The sheer numbers visiting the site provides high potential educational values. People making the steep climb to the lookout quite naturally want to rest at intervals. The provision of rest areas along the track provides an opportunity to present a wide range messages to the public. These messages may explore many of the values present in the physical environment of the site, or even wider issues, such as approaches to conservation management across the entire reserve system.

Management issues

Interpretation displays require careful, professional crafting to present material in an interesting, engaging and stimulating way.

Prescriptions

• Develop a series of interpretation/rest nodes along the length of the track.

• Ensure interpretation materials are professionally prepared.
Section 4  Site Design

This section presents the site designs developed for the site on the basis of the values assessment and prescriptive material presented in the previous section. The carpark redevelopment site design is presented graphically in Figure 1, while the new track route site design is presented in Figure 2.

4.1 Carparking

Proposed extensions to the carpark (see Figure 1) are located to the north of the present parking area, avoiding a significant palaeosol identified in Section 3.1, and located over an area of previously disturbed vegetation of low conservation significance (see Section 3.4). Nearly all the significant trees of the site have been retained, softening the impact of new works. In addition, once the new earthworks have been formed up there will be extensive revegetation of disturbed areas, using plants that are native to the area.

The total number of carparks is increased about 100% to 206 cars. Carparking is broken up into 4 separate terraces, which are in turn broken up by existing and proposed trees. The separate carparks are connected by a vehicular circulation system that leads drivers through until a vacant park is found.

An essential aspect of the design is a clearly visible start to the walk. Drivers will pass an easily identifiable and sign-posted track-head before they reach the carpark. A passenger drop-off zone is provided for both bus and car arrivals at this point. Once parked, visitors will automatically know they must make their way back to this area. Pedestrian movement around the carpark is facilitated by a path system, minimising conflicts between drivers and walkers, maximising safety.

The plan provides some limited separate parking areas for buses and in addition there will be a limited number of ‘long vehicle’ carparks to cater for people with motor-homes.

In the coming years, if a shuttle bus system is introduced, it is envisaged that the eastern-most carparking areas (those already existing) will be removed and revegetated. Experience is showing that some carparking will always be required and it is anticipated that the new areas will best be able to fulfil this role.

Environmental and Visitor Management During Construction

The sensitive environments of the park raise a requirement for special protection measures during the construction process. As well, because the park cannot be closed during construction, specific measures need to be developed to minimise conflicts and ensure visitor safety. Accordingly, the construction engineer will develop an environmental and visitor management plan to provide site-specific guidance to contractors on a range of issues including:

- Responses for protecting the local environment and visitor safety while locating construction related facilities and operations including:
  - temporary site office and amenity buildings,
  - construction staff parking,
  - material/equipment storage, and
  - bulk material depots.
- Safe storage of hazardous materials.
- Disposal of site wastes including liquid and chemical wastes.
- Temporary stormwater drainage and silt capture provisions.
• Phasing and staging of works to accommodate visitors.
• Visitor risk assessment and response development for each phase/stage.

4.2 Trackhead

Just as at present, the trackhead will have an information booth presenting essential information for walkers, along with space for meeting and resting, registration facilities, water taps and toilets. The space proposed for these facilities is much more generous than the present arrangement, being able to cope with much larger numbers before crowding becomes apparent.

Both the current and newly proposed trackheads service not only the Wineglass Lookout Track but a number of other tracks (see Section 4.5) and it is essential that appropriate, clear and easily understood signs provide guidance for visitors.

4.3 Track Plan

A major design intention has been to find a one-way loop system to the lookout, as well as investigating routes that rise more gradually and consistently than the existing track. The provision of regular rest stops and capitalisation on available views are also important design criteria. In view of the difficulties imposed by the terrain in developing a full return loop track, a compromise partial loop is being proposed (see Figure 2).

While the route up to the lookout shown in Figure 2 is close to finalisation, the actual conditions encountered during construction are likely to result in minor deviations.

The return route shown in Figure 2 will, for much of its length, follow the existing track, but it will be subject to major upgrading to comply with the new standards. It will be slightly shorter and steeper than the route up. While an anti-clockwise circulation pattern is currently being proposed, a final assessment of the correct circulation pattern will be made once construction has been completed.

The major issue presented by a loop system is how to ensure most visitors use it in the way envisaged. In the management authority’s experience signs alone will rarely achieve the desired circulation pattern. It is however considered that appropriate design can facilitate intentions.

Track Standards
The track standards will conform to AS 2156 Class 2. The following specific standards will apply:

• all one-way track sections will have a design width of at least 1.2 metres, with only minor exceptions allowable;
• periodic passing bays will be built into the one-way sections;
• all two-way track sections will have a design width of 1.8 metres with only minor exceptions allowable;
• all termini and junctions will receive professional design attention to help ensure the intended circulation pattern is achieved.
• all steps will go full width across the track and have a consistent rise not exceeding 150mm, but preferably of about 120mm;
• the track surface will be stabilised with hotmix or similar, preferably of a colour that minimises contrast with natural surfaces;
• a minimum of six nodes will be developed along the circuit, providing rest spots for a variety of group sizes.
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Figure 2 - Lookout Track Site Design
Environmental and Visitor Management During Construction
Just as for the carpark work, the sensitive environments of the park raise a requirement for special protection measures during the construction process. As well, because the lookout track cannot be closed during construction, specific measures will need to be developed to minimise conflicts and ensure visitor safety. Accordingly, the track specification materials will include an environmental and visitor management plan to provide guidance to contractors on a range of site specific matters (see Section 4.1).

4.4 Lookout
A lookout has been conceptually considered and surveyed. The design greatly expands the available viewing area, presenting a cascading sequence of viewing platforms linked with steps, that draws the viewer around a one-way loop and back on to the walking track. The platforms will include generous seating areas and the potential for interpretation. Professional site design, engineering and interpretation skills will be used to finalise the details of this structure.

4.5 Relationship to other Tracks
This plan has thus far treated the Wineglass Lookout Track as an isolated piece of infrastructure, however in reality this is not the case. The trackhead for the Wineglass Lookout Track is also the trackhead for most of the important short and long distance walks of the park including the Mt Amos Track, the Hazards Circuit and the Peninsula Circuit. Indeed the Wineglass Lookout Track is part of the Hazards Circuit, with one leg branching off not far from the carpark and the other leg continuing on from the saddle down to Wineglass Beach.

Visitor numbers on these other tracks are much lower, particularly for the long distance walk, and the management authority accordingly has no immediate plans to upgrade or change them. However from time to time visitors undertaking the lookout walk are confused and disoriented by the track junctions. In addition redevelopment of the Wineglass Lookout Track as a circuit walk will alter some of these connections.

A significant change will occur as a result of closure of the bottom part of the existing lookout track (see Figure 2). This will result in the need to construct a short piece of track reconnecting the Great Oyster Bay side of the Hazards Circuit to the trackhead. This, and all the other connections and junctions require careful, professional design consideration.

4.6 Site Furniture/Signs
Generally site furniture is limited to the provision of seats, which, under this plan are required at many locations. The design of furniture requires care to ensure it both fulfils its intended function and fits within the natural environment in which it is placed. Seats used in this redevelopment will be comfortable and look to the local environment for inspiration for their form, colour and texture.

Good signs provide visitors orientation, building confidence to head out and enjoy the natural beauty of the park. The development of the site will include the development of a comprehensive, consistent sign system.
4.7 Interpretation and Education

Each of the six rest nodes required per the previous section will also be used to present interpretation for visitors. Nodes will be appropriately spaced, sufficiently large to accommodate seating without impeding other walkers who choose not to stop, and capitalise on views and other natural features that may lend themselves to interpretation. Professional design and interpretation services will be employed to assist site and develop each node appropriately.

4.8 Community Consultation

Community consultation on the works proposed in this plan has already been initiated through several processes, viz:

- the Freycinet National Park, Wye River State Reserve Management Plan 2000, which established the need to improve the lookout track;
- the Freycinet National Park Draft Management Plan 2004, which seeks to established the basis for a loop track;
- discussion have been held with the Freycinet Coast Tourism Board which has been extremely supportive of the concepts proposed;
- the recently released draft Freycinet Tourism Development Plan March 2004, which sets out the desirability of the works proposed in this plan; and
- a recent, comprehensive display, mounted at both the Freycinet visitor centre and at the Wineglass Bay trackhead, presenting all the works proposed in this plan and requesting comment from interested persons.

With respect to the recent public display, community interest was low, but generally supportive. Thirteen responses were received. Most thought the carpark improvements and a loop walk were a good idea, but opinion was split on whether the track should be ‘improved’ in other ways. Some suggested there should be better information indicating the track is only at ‘bushwalk’ standard, and that the unfit should be more encouraged to enjoy the Cape Tourville view of Wineglass. Three respondents suggested a shuttlebus would be a good idea, even though they were not specifically asked to comment on this future orientated suggestion.
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on

Public Representations Received on the Freycinet National Park Draft Wineglass Bay Carpark and Lookout Track Site Plan 2004

Freycinet National Park Draft Wineglass Bay Carpark and Lookout Track Site Plan 2004 was written in response to requirements of the Freycinet National Park, Wye River State Reserve Management Plan 2000, specifically (Section 4.5 policies 7 and 8) that:

• for all major developments and for proposed site developments or changes that will, while permitted by the zoning, appreciably alter the existing use or character of a Zone, a development specific site plan will be prepared.
• All site plans will be made available in draft form for public comment for a period of not less than thirty days prior to finalising and approving them, and subsequently whenever significant modifications are proposed to them.

The draft site plan was written and made available for comment by the public from 15 May 2004 until 18 June 2004. The individual comments made in these representations are summarised in attachment 1 which also provides recommendations in relation to these comments.

Summary of Representations

Nine representations were received. Three of these were generally supportive of the plan but the rest expressed major reservations.

Four respondents took issue with aspects of the loop system, saying either the loop system was a flawed concept (two respondents) and/or that the two tracks proposed should both be for two-way traffic (three respondents). The project team agrees that a loop system will present some problems/challenges to some users in its implementation, but on balance still considers this is the correct way forward.

The overcrowding issues alluded to in the site plan were strongly confirmed, either directly or indirectly by many respondents. Three respondents indicated a belief that increasing the size of the carpark was an inadequate response to these issues. The limitations of the road to the carpark were particularly highlighted by two of these respondents, who also strongly supported the immediate introduction of the mooted shuttlebus. The project team believes that alternate approaches to handling increased visitor numbers are well beyond immediate grasp, and that this solution is well justified. Consideration has been given in the design to the movement of visitors from any future shuttle service.

Three respondents were concerned enough about the current standard of directional and informational signs in the park to reinforce the requirements of the site plan, which seeks to improve matters. The project team endorses these comments.

Three respondents expressed concern for the visual impact of the carpark from various walker viewpoints on the Hazards. While the project team acknowledges the site plan did not adequately address this issue, it does not consider it serious enough to require a project rethink.

These matters and many others are responded to in some detail in the attached schedule.
Conclusions

On the basis of the consultation process undertaken it is believed that, notwithstanding the concerns revealed, generally the Tasmanian community is supportive of the improvements to visitor infrastructure set-out in this plan. On this basis it is recommended you approve finalisation of the plan. In preparing a final plan it is proposed that this report and attached schedule be appended to the site plan to inform site plan users. Additionally it is proposed that a number of specific issues raised by respondents (see responses to comments # 13, 20, 42, 56 and 59) be forwarded to the appropriate design team for comment and, if required, action.

The Project Team
FREYCINET NATIONAL PARK - VISITOR ACCESS IMPROVEMENTS PROJECT
# ATTACHMENT 1

## Schedule of Public Comments and Proposed Responses to the Freycinet National Park Draft Wineglass Bay Carpark and Lookout Track Site Plan 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Proposed Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Representation 1. Joan and George Masterman**  
Directors  
Freycinet Experience | It is considered that many of the provisions of the site plan, particularly of Section 3.8 ie:  
- Use natural materials wherever possible in the construction of new infrastructure, and particularly in the case of trackwork. And  
- Avoid the construction of raised boardwalks, lookout platforms, interpretation displays and other built structures on the lookout track that compete with the natural environment for the attention of the viewer in their style or approach to presentation.  
Adequately respond to these valid concerns. |
| 1. **General Comments**  
Opposed in principle to the proposed development, most particularly the loop track, believing it presents too much ‘human interference and manufacture’ and will ‘…sanitise the National Park experience and is a complete antithesis of what it means to be outdoors in a national park.’ |  |
| 2. **Phytophora**  
Agree with the prescriptions in Section 3.6 but feel they should be absolute not voluntary | Only three of the eleven measures include the word ‘encourage’, and these are in relation to visitor behaviour (staying on tracks and using boot-brushes). The other eight measures are directive. It is only in the most serious circumstances that such an authoritarian approach is taken with visitors. |
| 3. **The Lookout**  
Agree that the present Lookout needs upgrading, and should be to the same standard as Cape Tourville | Noted. |
| 4. **Conclusion**  
Hope that a strong line will be held against further development in this park, and that the existing wineglass carparking will be removed and revegetated in the long-term. | Noted. |
| **Representation 2. Hans-Joachim Mueller DC**  
Coles Bay, TAS |  |
| 5. Frequent walker in the park | Noted. |
| 6. **I. The plan fails to recognise the substantial impact the expanded carpark will have on landscape and visual values. The carpark expansion will lead to:**  
‘substantially increased visibility of cars and alienated ground from numerous higher vantage points, eg from the Mt Amos track.’ | It is accepted that the plan, in considering visual sensitivity, focussed on views to the Hazards and failed to consider views from the Hazards. The carpark will be visible by walkers looking down from the many vantage points on the Hazards, and will impact on the overall naturalness of views obtained. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Proposed Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| In considering this issue several ameliorating aspects are apparent, viz:  
- The carpark is right next to a fairly intensely developed holiday residential area at the Fisheries, and will, when seen from above, read as an extension to it.  
- The new carpark will be sealed, providing a much lower reflectivity and visual contrast to an unsealed carpark. It is however accepted then when the carpark is full the vehicles themselves are highly reflective.  
- The existing large trees across the new carpark site have been, to the extent possible, incorporated into the carpark design. They will provide substantial screening when viewed from above.  
- In the long-term it is planned to reduce the amount of carparking at the site, thereby reducing the overall impact. | In conclusion, while accepting that the carpark will impact on views from above, it is believed the issue is not sufficiently serious to warrant a major rethink of the current approach. |
<p>| 7. <strong>II.</strong> The site plan says the current carpark capacity is frequently exceeded by 100%, and visitor numbers are increasing. Therefore a doubling of the carpark size, as proposed in the site plan, is already insufficient. A shuttle-bus service should be implemented immediately. | Carparks are rarely built to cater for peak demand. Doing so results in expensive public infrastructure being under-utilised for most of the time. In deciding the appropriate size of the expansion many competing factors were considered including available space, environmental concerns, budget limitations and expected future life. While the shuttle bus has definite merits – implementing it successfully in the Park will be more complicated than at Cradle Mountain because there is more than one destination point and because the time taken to reach those destinations will be much longer. As a result its introduction would represent a fundamental shift in the visitor experience requiring detailed planning, major capital works (far bigger than that which is proposed here) and securing of commitment to major funding. The Parks and Wildlife Service believes that these issues require careful investigation and will take several years to satisfactorily resolve. In the short to medium term (a three-five year timeframe) an expansion of the carpark is urgently required. |
| 8. <strong>III.</strong> Disagree with the development of a partial loop-track as it will result in a bottle-neck at the top. It should go all the way or not at all. | It is considered the wider design standard of the two-way section will ensure this issue is adequately addressed. This proposed design standard far exceeds what the existing tack delivers. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Proposed Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. The plan fails to consider an impose limits on the development of further parallel tracks.</td>
<td>This remote desire on the part of the management authority is adequately protected against by the existing statutory management plan and its proposed amendment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. IV. Strongly disagree with a one-way traffic system on the loop track, it being too regimented and also increasing the frequency of overtaking encounters.</td>
<td>See response to comment #11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Respondent prefers to walk against the traffic on a one-way system. The respondent finds being stuck behind a large group of people is frustrating. This problem would be exacerbated by the introduction of shuttle buses. Passing bays are an inadequate response. Both tracks should be two-way.</td>
<td>It is noted that the proposed changes may cause the respondent some frustration. However the creation of one relatively short length of one-way loop track in a park that has many more kilometres of two-way track is considered acceptable. The Wineglass Lookout is one of Tasmania’s premier tourism icons. As visitor numbers increase it is important that the experience be carefully managed to maintain quality. Feeling overcrowded has been demonstrated to reduce the quality of natural area experiences. Development of a one-way loop track system is a well-recognised approach to managing this issue. At the heart of the concept is a major reduction in apparent level of crowding. Parties move around the system at approximately the same speed, minimising encounters with each other.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Representation 3. Ray and Paula Bevan**

The Fisheries, TAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Proposed Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12. The increase in carparking will not cater for the absurd number of visitors in peak periods</td>
<td>See response to comment #7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Very concerned for the proposed coach parking area between the two Fisheries turn-offs. It will obstruct the view of traffic exiting the fisheries, creating a dangerous situation.</td>
<td>This comment will be referred to the carpark’s design engineer for his comment, and, if deemed appropriate, design amendment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Good signage for the area is needed. The current signs are very inadequate, leading to dangers.</td>
<td>This comment is noted, although it is considered the site plan adequately addresses the issue, particularly through Section 4.6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Many people seem to assume Freycinet Drive is a one-way system, driving in the centre of the road. Suggest two-way reminders are put up at intervals.</td>
<td>While beyond the scope of this site plan the comment is noted. The management authority is likewise concerned that approaches to traffic management on this road carefully weigh up the road conditions, traffic levels and the wide ranging skills of drivers. These matters have been the subject of ongoing dialogue with Glamorgan/Spring Bay Council (who manage the road infrastructure) and the Department of Infrastructure, Energy and Resources (who are responsible for assigning speed limits to Tasmania’s road system). These concerns will be raised with these organisations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Proposed Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16. Consider the speed limit on Freycinet Drive is too high at 60 kph and should be reduced to 50 or 40. This is the speed limit for the Cape Tourville road, which is no more hazardous.</td>
<td>See response to comment # 15.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Representation 4. Diana and Albert Jongbloed**

Coles Bay, TAS

| 17. 1.1 | Agree that a solution to the overcrowding is required with urgency. | Noted. |
| 18. 3.7 | Have some concerns for the visibility of the new carpark from the tracks above. | See response to comment # 6. |
| 19. 4.1 | People overnighting in the park should be catered for by alternate carparking arrangements. | This would likely require the implementation of a shuttlebus system – see response to comment # 7. |
| 20. | The space set aside for emergency vehicle parking should be better signed… it is frequently improperly used. | This concern will be raised with those responsible for preparing the sign plan for the site. |
| 21. 4.3 Track Surface | Agree that the track surface needs stabilising with hot mix or similar | Noted. |
| 22. Track | Like two tracks, but think both should be two-way, one fast and the other more gentle. | The management authority disagrees with the notion of duplicating the existing track to develop two two-way tracks. It considers the environmental and financial costs could not be justified by such an outcome. Also see response to comment # 11. |
| 23. With the root problem being overcrowding, the respondents suggest an alternative is to develop alternate viewing sites, other than the excellent lighthouse track. | The management authority is only in small part responsible for visitor demand to undertake the walk to the Wineglass Bay Lookout. External forces drive most of this demand. There are many other existing attractions in the park, including alternate walks and viewing spots, that receive only a fraction of the use this site receives. Developing still further sites may, as a result, completely fail to address the root problem. Development of alternate sites, even when they are very successful as for instance the recent Cape Tourville walk, seldom works to decrease visitor pressure. Additional attractions simply add to the experiences available. Many visitors undertake an increased number of activities rather than limiting themselves. |
| 24. Suggest another walk to one of the other peaks, perhaps Baudin. | See response to comment #11 above. |

**Representation 5. Coles Bay Foreshore Preservation Group Inc**

Diana Jongbloed

Secretary

<p>| 25. | The overcrowding is a matter that requires urgent action. | Noted. |
| 26. 1.1 | The road connection to the carpark cannot cope with the traffic volumes. It is suggested alternate attractions be developed. | See response to comments #15 and 23. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Proposed Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27. 4.1 Disagree with doubling the current carpark size. It will have visual impact, and its overall effectiveness is questioned. The numbers put up in the site plan indicate the limit requiring alternate solutions has already been reached.</td>
<td>See response to comments #6 and 7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Should upgrade the quality and efficiency of the current carpark, introduce a shuttlebus and limit overnight parking.</td>
<td>See response to comment #7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Trackhead Definitely needs enlarging and improving to make it work properly.</td>
<td>Noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Track Plan Rather than a mostly one-way system, suggest two 2-way tracks, one slower and gentler, the other faster. The reason for this being that there are many users who progress very slowly, causing frustration for fitter, faster walkers.</td>
<td>See response to comment #11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Passing bays do not seem to work unless passing traffic is facing each other.</td>
<td>Noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Concern expressed for the possible bottle-neck where the two tracks join.</td>
<td>See response to comment #8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Site furniture Agree with the comments in the plan.</td>
<td>Noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Signs These may need improving (example of why given). Use of pictograms is particularly supported where appropriate.</td>
<td>See response to comment #14.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Irrespective of changes contemplated many visitors will still be unprepared for the walk to Wineglass, requiring ongoing, proactive management.</td>
<td>This comment is noted, although it is considered the site plan adequately addresses the issue, particularly through comments under the heading ‘Trackhead’ in Section 3.8 along with Section 4.2.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Representation 6. Hobart Walking Group Inc**

Andrew Davey  
Vice President

36. Has little problem with the plan and welcomes the upgrade.  
Noted.  
37. The track should be improved right through to the beaches, in line with visitor numbers and expectations.  
While this comment is noted, current funding streams preclude consideration of this at the present time.  
38. Solitude is not an aspect of concern to the Wineglass Bay track.  
The management authority strongly disagrees.

The word is used in the vision statement of the plan in Section 2.1. The perception of solitude and crowding varies greatly between individuals and cultures. Most visitors to the lookout are from large urban centres interstate or overseas, and generally have a vastly different expectation, and therefore experience, to that of a Tasmanian bushwalker.

As a result the Wineglass Bay Lookout Track can and does provide an experience of relative solitude to many visitors. However our ability to deliver on this experience is certainly being heavily eroded during the summer period.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Proposed Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Through appropriate design it is believed that more of this experience can be restored, even during the busiest periods. This is the rationale behind the loop track, see response to comment #11.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Signs and a hand-out map should make the facilities and their locations clear.</td>
<td>See comments # 14 and 35.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. If the track is to be upgraded it should be done well – to last for more than 10 years.</td>
<td>While it is expected the upgraded track will last for more than 10 years, the time reference was in respect of the ability of the track to cope with visitor demand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. There is no problem, in principle, with rock drilling.</td>
<td>While this view is noted, the views reflect those of scientific staff on how to best conserve the values of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. It is recommended, for safety on a tourist walk, the track be built with minimal or nil side slope, using other drainage means.</td>
<td>This comment will be referred to the track design team for comment, and, if deemed appropriate, design amendment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. We are opposed to the introduction of a shuttle bus, as it creates problems for long-distance walkers. If a shuttle bus is introduced then: give priority to private car parking for long-distance walkers include the cost of the bus in the normal park entry fee.</td>
<td>This is a matter that is well outside of the current plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Little problem is expressed for the concept of a raised footpath.</td>
<td>It is assumed this comment is made in respect of the prescription in Section 3.8 that reads: - Avoid the construction of raised boardwalks, lookout platforms, interpretation displays and other built structures on the lookout track that compete with the natural environment for the attention of the viewer in their style or approach to presentation. This prescription seems to have been misinterpreted. It is not signalling that raised boardwalks should not be built, but rather they should not be built in an excessively ‘man imposed’ or ‘engineered’ way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. If the palaeosol were to prove locally extensive then it should not unnecessarily encumber the construction of the carpark. Research should be instigated to determine the answer.</td>
<td>While this comment is accepted, there is currently no major need to disturb this feature.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. The plan appears to be contradictory, suggesting no interpretation while at the same time embracing elements of interpretation. The latter is supported.</td>
<td>Again this statement appears to have wrongly interpreted the prescription quoted in response to comment #44 above. The management authority firmly embraces the need for good interpretation on this walk.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Representation 7. David Baker**

Mt Nelson, Tas

47. Commenting on basis of extensive experience as a track worker. | Noted. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Proposed Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>48. Track locations should follow natural routes, not force themselves upon the landscape.</td>
<td>Noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. This was the philosophy behind the Hughes and Schmidt identified ‘pink route’.</td>
<td>Noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. The partial loop track is a bad idea. The Freycinet environment provides many opportunities for a wide track, with separation of up and down hill walkers.</td>
<td>See response to comment #11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. Applying this method to the ‘pink route’ would lessen environmental impact and maintain the ‘destination’ character of the walk.</td>
<td>These comments seem to reflect a belief that the loop-track route shown in the site plan does not utilize the ‘pink route’. In fact the loop-track route identified in the plan utilises a combination of the route of the existing track and the ‘pink route’. John Hughes has endorsed the proposed route.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. Why weren’t Hughes and Schmidt consulted from the beginning on this proposal, rather than after the loop track proposal had gathered momentum. There is no greater source of expertise available to the Department.</td>
<td>In fact John Hughes was hired as a consultant almost from the inception of route investigations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Representation 8. John Garrett**
Northbridge, NSW

53 Thanks for opportunity to provide further comment. | Noted. |
54. **Carparking** Plan already covers previous comments. | Noted. |
55. **Trackhead** As for comment # 54 | Noted. |
56. **Track Plan** Support the loop system, but disagree with making the return downhill loop the shorter, steeper leg. For safety it should be the other way round. | The management authority acknowledges this concern and considers the respondent may well be right. This is the reason for the wording of Section 4.3 which says: While an anti-clockwise circulation pattern is currently being proposed, a final assessment of the correct circulation pattern will be made once construction has been completed.

In any case these comments will be forwarded to the track design team. |
57. **Track Standards** It should be a ‘bit rough’ so that it is more challenging and worthwhile. But you must make people aware beforehand and provide alternatives. | Noted, these comments will be forwarded to the track design team. |
58. Concerned about erosion and environmental damage of high standard tracks. Suggest lower standard tracks that can be shifted periodically. If this is not possible then go for a really well built track to protect environmental values. | Experience has shown that the natural rate of environmental recovery of this area is very slow, precluding the former approach. This is the reason for adopting what we consider to be the ‘really well built’ approach |
59. **Lookout** Good idea but make sure each platform has two accesses to facilitate movement. | This comment will be forwarded to the design team. |
60. **Relationship to other Tracks** Agree, and reinforce the need for very clear signs. | See response to comment # 14. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Proposed Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Representation 9. North West Walking Club</strong>&lt;br&gt;Doug Harris&lt;br&gt;Conservation Convenor&lt;br&gt;Ulverstone</td>
<td>Noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61. Supportive of the site plan.</td>
<td>Noted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>