

**Fortescue Bay Draft Site Plan 2002**  
**How your representation was assessed**

The Branch Manager, Planning and Visitor Services, Parks and Wildlife has considered all the representations made with respect to the Fortescue Bay Draft Site plan 2002 and has made alterations to the draft plan having regard to these representations.

Twenty seven representations were received in respect to the Draft Site plan from members of the general public, interest groups and state government agencies, they are listed in Appendix 1.

As a general guide, and depending on all the circumstances, the draft plan has been amended if the representation is in accordance with the following criteria:

- (1) provides new information relevant to planning and management;
- (2) indicates proposed policies and actions are misunderstood and need clarification;
- (3) clarifies or proposes policies and actions that would better achieve the management objectives;
- (4) identifies a lack of policies or actions for particular issues; or
- (5) corrects errors, omissions or lack of clarity.

**Similarly, the draft plan has not be amended if a representation:**

- (6) contradicts planning proposals for which there is widespread support;
- (7) conflicts with government policy or approved management plan;
- (8) is contrary to the intention of relevant legislation or national or international conventions and agreements;
- (9) is among widely divergent viewpoints better handled or balanced by the proposed approach to policies or actions;
- (10) addresses issues beyond the scope of the plan; or
- (11) ignores or contradicts relevant established facts.

Each of the criteria are numbered between 1-10. One or more of these criteria may have been used to assess the merit of the representations received. They are listed in the last column of the summary below detailing the public representations received in respect to the draft site plan.

| Respondent<br>Number                                  | Section of Site Plan and<br>Comment  | Response  | Assessment<br>Criteria<br>Reference |
|---|--|---|-------------------------------------|
| <b>Issue 1: Strategy or vision and Sustainability</b> |  |   |                                     |
| 1   | 2.4 Retention of the area's qualities should be the first priority and any changes must safeguard the low key, informal nature of services and infrastructure. | Noted. The aim of the site plan is to retain the semi-natural setting of the campground and informal nature of use, but also maximises the opportunities presented by the site. | (2)                                 |

## Summary of Public Comments on Fortescue Bay Draft Site Plan 2002

| Respondent Number | Section of Site Plan and Comment  | Response   | Assessment Criteria Reference |
|-------------------|---|--|-------------------------------|
| 2                 | 3.6.2 Believes that allowing commercial accommodation would impact adversely on the informal recreational setting.  | Areas designated for commercial accommodation have been sited away from the main camping area in order to minimise their impact on the existing camping area so that the informal recreational setting can be maintained.  | (2)                           |
| 8                 | 3.5 Strongly believe that parks are for nature conservation and any commercial accommodation is inappropriate and will erode the natural values of the park and the economic advantage that Tasmania has over the rest of the world with it's pristine national parks.  | Noted.   | (2)                           |
| 9                 | 3.5 Proposal for cabin accommodation is a move away from the traditional use on the area and will place stress on the natural environment.  | The aim of the site plan is to retain the character of the campground so that traditional users do not feel displaced.   | (2)                           |
| 10, 11, 12, 13    | See 'Camping area design and expansion' below.  |  | (2)                           |
| 14                | Tourism and recreational opportunities can be balanced with conservation ideals, provided that the natural values are not compromised to further the tourism industry. Objective of the plan is to minimise the impact of recreation and tourism on significant natural and cultural values. Demonstrated value of the Little Penguin as one such value. See 'Fauna' below. | Noted. Refer to Issue 6 (Fauna) below for more detailed response.  | (4)                           |
| 15                | 2.3 I would like to make a strong recommendation that any actions resulting from the site plan strive to preserve both the natural qualities and informality of the location.   | Noted. Two of the objectives of the visitor services zone are to protect and conserve the family and recreational atmosphere and character and to minimise the impact of recreation and tourism on significant natural and cultural objectives. In order to meet these objectives the proposed development nodes have been located well away from the existing campground and in well reserved forest type with limited cultural sensitivity. Site specific impacts will need to be assessed if developments are proposed for these locations. | (2)                           |

## Summary of Public Comments on Fortescue Bay Draft Site Plan 2002

| Respondent<br>Number | Section of Site Plan and<br>Comment  | Response   | Assessment<br>Criteria<br>Reference |
|----------------------|--|--|-------------------------------------|
| 19                   | The Greens do not agree that the rezoning of Fortescue Bay as a Visitor Service Zone (VSZ) automatically necessitates possible private commercial enterprises in the form of buildings or licensed camps at Canoe Bay, or the area south of the Fortescue Bay.   | Noted. There was no rezoning exercise undertaken in the draft site plan. The TNPMP 2001 has always identified a Visitor Services Zone for the area between Fortescue Bay to Canoe Bay.   | (7)                                 |
| 22                   | Please do not crowd out and spoil this beautiful small place (day use area) at the site or deter the still frequent visits of resident bush birds.   | It is the intention to re-design the current visitor arrival area and the day use area to allow for better traffic flow but also for revegetation and better definition of pedestrian only areas.  | (4)                                 |
| 23                   | <p>2.3 Strongly agree with the last paragraph "...amongst the users there is a strong desire to retain the existing formal setting for Fortescue Bay".</p> <p>2.4 First paragraph is spot on, well done. Don't agree with the second paragraph. The VSZ is not suitable as a valuable tourism resource, despite its remote setting and outstanding natural scenery. The 12km access road, the forestry related activities on the way in and the restricted space available in the VSZ for associated infrastructure expansion are not complementary to tourism promotion of the Fortescue Bay section of the Tasman National Park.</p> | <p>Proposed sites for commercial accommodation have been selected so that they do not impact on the recreational setting of the main Fortescue Bay VSZ.</p> <p>The State Government through an interagency working group identified Fortescue Bay as a possible site for tourism infrastructure in natural area. The Government intends to pursue the concept of nature based tourism in the Fortescue Bay area.</p> | <p>(2)</p> <p>(7)</p>               |
| 24                   | 3.6.2 All this talk of accommodation can only take place bearing in mind the increasing pressure on the beach and those nesting birds. Sustainability is the key factor.   | Noted. It is proposed to amend the plan to require that an appropriate monitoring program is put in place to provide a reliable baseline from which to measure any impacts from increased visitation on beach nesting birds, raptors and little penguins prior to any commercial development being approved. Other measures may also include appropriate signage and best practice guidelines.                       | (4)                                 |

## Summary of Public Comments on Fortescue Bay Draft Site Plan 2002

| Respondent Number | Section of Site Plan and Comment  | Response  | Assessment Criteria Reference |
|-------------------|---|---|-------------------------------|
| 25                | <p>The site as currently constituted is restricted in area, rendering the location and extent of camping somewhat cramped. As tourism increases this will pose a number of problems, so the site plan should indicate where overflow areas or supplementary facilities could be sited. If it is intended to limit visitation to a threshold 'sustainability' limit, prospective rationing or limits should be stated at the outset, to remind people of what the site can bear and avoid later complaint.</p> | <p>Consideration will be given to providing additional parking to cater for overnight users of the Tasman Coastal and the Cape Pillar Tracks. The number of campsites in the VSZ will be limited to what is currently available. As capacity is only reached during the busiest period, it may be necessary to employ strategies to inform visitors before they arrive at Fortescue Bay that the campground has reached its capacity.</p> | (4) (5)                       |
| 26                | <p>Perhaps the brief was too limiting - biggest issues are the roading, car/bus parking, conflict between traditional users and discerning campers and limited campsites within a fragile site. Camper and day visitors are rapidly increasing.</p> <p>The carrying capacity of the site needs to be determined before any further campsite development takes place.</p>  | <p>These issues are currently being addressed through the re-design of the existing infrastructure within the VSZ including roads, parking and campsites.</p> <p>There will be no expansion to the existing campground, but the existing camping areas will be re-designed to make better use of the available space. In this process some sites will be reduced in size to increase the number of available campsites.</p>               | (4)<br><br>(4)                |

## Summary of Public Comments on Fortescue Bay Draft Site Plan 2002

| Respondent<br>Number                       | Section of Site Plan and<br>Comment  | Response   | Assessment<br>Criteria<br>Reference |
|--|--|--|-------------------------------------|
| <b>Issue 2: Land Tenure and boundaries</b> |  |  |                                     |
| 22   | <p>1.2.2 Incorporate within the Fortescue Bay Visitor Services Zone and presently unacquired areas that would improve the protection of important natural values such as Swift Parrot eucalypt habitat ie. the Canoe Bay block.</p> <p>3.4 What is meant by "the zone between the high tide mark <i>and the beach</i>". (sic) The high tide mark is located <i>on</i> (sic) the beach. Was it the intention to say "between the high tide mark and the waterline"? The "beach" comprises all zones between the waterline and the beginning of the dune system.</p> | <p>This issue has been identified as an implementation task in the <i>Tasman National Park Management Plan 2001</i> (TNPMP) whereby suitable parcels of Crown land are being offered in exchange for the private land at Canoe Bay. This exchange is still being negotiated with the landowner.</p> <p>Noted. This has been corrected in the final version of the site plan.</p>   | <p>(10)</p> <p>(5)</p>              |
| <b>Issue 3: Bushfire management</b>        |  |  |                                     |
| 2  | 3.6.2 Wildfire risk needs to be taken into account in any commercial accommodation proposal.   | Agreed. The wildfire risk will need to be assessed for any commercial operation seeking development approval through Tasman Council. It is likely that vegetation control buffers would be required around any structures at these locations, however these could be easily reduced for commercial style operations through the use of behavioural measures. The details of these measures would need to be determined for both the site and the operator. | (4)                                 |
| 4  | 3.6.2 Is unable to support the plan unless fire and/or emergency management planning issues are addressed - other relevant documents should be referenced.   | A draft fire management plan for Tasman National Park has been developed. This does not identify emergency procedures for the evacuation of visitors from the Fortescue Bay site, in the event of wildfire. However it is important that this aspect be considered when the fire management plan is finalised.   | (4)                                 |

## Summary of Public Comments on Fortescue Bay Draft Site Plan 2002

| Respondent Number                                   | Section of Site Plan and Comment  | Response   | Assessment Criteria Reference |
|---|---|--|-------------------------------|
| <b>Issue 4: Geodiversity</b>                        |   |  |                               |
| 3   | 2.1.2 Wants to see the terms <i>Geology</i> and <i>Geomorphology</i> used instead of 'Geodiversity'. Questions location and existence of thick colluvial deposits- offered assistance.  | Geodiversity is a term used by specialists to include the natural range or diversity of geological, geomorphological and pedological features, systems and processes.  | (11)                          |
| <b>Issue 5: Fore dune management and protection</b> |   |  |                               |
| 10  | 3.4 Like to emphasise the value of the dune system which is in very good condition - has retained it's natural profile and vegetation. Also has high faunal conservation values but depends on the maintenance of natural fore dunes. Requires year-round protection and control of marram grass. | Noted. The removal of marram grass and rehabilitation of dunes has been addressed in the site plan.  |                               |
| 22  | 3.11 We applaud the recommendation that marram grass be removed from the dunes of Fortescue Beach.  | Noted. See response above.   |                               |
| <b>Issue 6: Fauna (protection and management)</b>   |   |  |                               |
| 3   | 2.1.4.1 Devil..and..quoll <i>live</i> not "occur" in the park.  | Noted. The site plan has been amended accordingly.   | (5)                           |
| 8   | 2.1.4 & 3.5 Believes that the proximity of the two potential commercial accommodation nodes may result in impacts on the penguin rookery.   | Noted. The site plan will recommend under Sections 3.2, 3.8.2 & 3.15 that a monitoring program needs to be in place for at least two breeding seasons (to take account of seasonal fluctuations) prior to any development proceeding. If monitoring indicates that penguin numbers are decreasing then remedial action will need to be taken. Interim measures will include best practice guidelines for walkers and commercial operators. The construction of raised walkways will also be considered if there is any evidence of walker induced damage to penguin burrows. | (4) (5)                       |
| 9   | 2.1.4 & 3.5 Believes that the proximity of the two potential commercial accommodation nodes may result in impacts on the penguin rookery which has not been adequately studied.   | Noted. See response above.   |                               |

## Summary of Public Comments on Fortescue Bay Draft Site Plan 2002

| Respondent<br>Number | Section of Site Plan and<br>Comment   | Response  | Assessment<br>Criteria<br>Reference         |
|----------------------|---|---|---|
| 10                   | <p>3.6.2 Noted that the proposed location of lodge development is close to the penguin colony and no development that impacts on the colony should be permitted.</p> <p>2.1.4.3 The plan should refer to the colony of threatened seastar <i>Patriella vivipara</i>.</p>  | <p>The proposed locations for these walker lodges are well above (50 metres altitude as a minimum) and some distance along from the penguin rookery. However it would lead to increased pedestrian traffic along this section of the track that passes through the penguin rookery. Any increase in pedestrian traffic would need to be carefully monitored to ensure that it is not having an impact on the penguin colony.</p> <p>Noted. The site plan will be amended to include this species.</p>   | <p>(2) (3)</p> <p>(1)</p>                   |
| 14                   | <p>2.1.4.2 Provided substantial additional information about the significance of the Little Penguin colony. (ie. largest remaining rookery on mainland southern Tasmania; double clutching; use of wet and dry sclerophyll forest for breeding including hollow logs and stumps up to 200 metres from shore; important source of recruits for other colonies due to successful breeding).</p> <p>Threats: 40-50 Little Penguins were drowned in grab-all nets in November 2002 - currently there are no restrictions on netting.</p> <p>Weed infestation (nettles) needs addressing.</p> <p>Development near the colony (in development nodes) may cause problems through increases in noise level (construction and people), unmonitored viewing of penguins at night, and increased foot traffic along the Canoe Bay track.</p> | <p>Additional information and protection measures for the little penguin colony has been included in the final site plan under Sections 3.2, 3.6 &amp; 3.12.</p> <p>PWS has written to the Director of Marine Resources to bring this event to their attention and to request that in the Review of the Scale Fish Plan due 2003-4 that the use of gill nets in the vicinity of the penguin colony in Fortescue Bay be prohibited.</p> <p>These nettles are a native species and provide cover for penguin burrows.</p> <p>These are issues that would be need to be considered as part of the environmental impact study required for any development proposal at these locations.</p> | <p>(1)</p> <p>(1)</p> <p>(3)</p> <p>(3)</p> |

## Summary of Public Comments on Fortescue Bay Draft Site Plan 2002

| Respondent<br>Number | Section of Site Plan and<br>Comment   | Response  | Assessment<br>Criteria<br>Reference |
|----------------------|---|---|-------------------------------------|
| 15                   | 3.6.2 Provision of accommodation at Fortescue Bay locality will have an impact on the penguin rookeries in the locality, which will need to be protected with the anticipated increased use of the area and the walking tracks. | Marine fauna specialists have recommended that a monitoring program needs to be in place for at least two years prior to any development proceeding in order to have a reliable baseline from which to measure any impacts from increased foot traffic along the Tasman Coastal Track. This monitoring program should be established irrespective of whether the commercial development proposals go ahead in order to monitor the impact of an overall and anticipated increase in visitor number using the walking track. | (4)                                 |
| 17                   | The penguin rookery between Fortescue Bay and Canoe Bay needs continued and enhanced protection from further human disturbance.   | See response above.   |                                     |
| 19, 20, 21           | The penguin rookery between Fortescue Bay and Canoe Bay must be protected from further human disturbance. This is the area where an accommodation development might be placed according to the site plan.                       | See response to comment #10.  |                                     |

## Summary of Public Comments on Fortescue Bay Draft Site Plan 2002

| Respondent<br>Number | Section of Site Plan and<br>Comment  | Response   | Assessment<br>Criteria<br>Reference |
|----------------------|--|--|-------------------------------------|
| 22                   | <p>2.1.4.2 It is pleasing that birds were highlighted as a fauna sub-section of their own, however all advantage has been lost due to the superficial treatment and the many omissions in this section. The following features are needed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A brief reiteration of the relevant policies from the Tasman NPMP with regard to the Fortescue Bay site fauna habitats and adverse mitigation,</li> <li>• A re-requirement of the two Tasman NPMP actions for birds at Fortescue Bay, and</li> <li>• An introductory requirement that the shorebirds, bush birds, seabirds and raptors of the Fortescue Bay site all require protection and freedom from human pressure, especially during breeding periods.</li> </ul> <p>2.1.4.2 This section is totally inadequate for the purposes of developing the fauna management policies, actions and priorities needed to counter adverse impacts from increased visitor traffic.</p> <p>3.6.2 Further assessment should be sought on the present condition of the little penguins colony, and an assessment of the wisdom of proceeding with a building at this location</p> | <p>The policies and actions listed in the TNPMP 2001 will apply to the visitor service zone as to all other zones in the park. However, it needs to be acknowledged that due to the greater visitor pressure at this location will require site specific strategies such as signage and other forms information for visitors and commercial operators to reduce their impacts on fauna using the beach, forests and other habitats within the VSZ.</p> <p>This section of the site plan has been re-written to incorporate additional information on fauna found within the VSZ. Section 3.2 (Natural Values) has been added to the final site plan which details relevant policies and actions with respect to fauna protection.</p> <p>The final site plan will recommend that a monitoring program be in place for at least a year (preferably two) prior to any development proceeding in order to have a reliable baseline from which to measure any impacts from increased foot traffic along the Tasman Coastal Track on the little penguin population.</p> | <p>(4)</p> <p>(1)</p> <p>(3)</p>    |
| 23                   | <p>3.4 I am sick of hearing about Hooded plovers everywhere I go, it won't be long &amp; beaches will become human exclusion zones (sic).</p>  | <p>Noted. The primary purpose of a National Park is for nature conservation. Human use of the area should be consistent with these objectives.</p>   | (6)                                 |

## Summary of Public Comments on Fortescue Bay Draft Site Plan 2002

| Respondent<br>Number           | Section of Site Plan and<br>Comment   | Response  | Assessment<br>Criteria<br>Reference |
|--------------------------------|---|---|-------------------------------------|
| 24                             | <p>2.1.4.2 Little penguin colonies <i>on or near the coast</i> between Fortescue Beach and Canoe Bay NOT on the beach.</p> <p>Both Hooded Plovers and Pied Oyster Catchers nest on Fortescue Beach. Increasing the numbers of people using the beach pushes the birds closer to the point of giving up.</p> <p>There is an active White Bellied Sea Eagle nest near the northern shore of Canoe Bay. I note that the northern development node on Map 5 is only 300 metres from the nest. I also note that paragraph 6 on 3.6.2 recommends that new developments should be 500 metres away from existing developments to avoid disturbance. On the face of it eagles are being rather less favourably treated that accommodation development. Given that we are talking about a National Park the eagles should have a clear preference. This so called Development Node in this area is out of the question.</p> | <p>The plan has been amended to clarify the location as identified by the Bell <i>et.al</i> 2000 report.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. The location of this nest will need to be verified. The potential for disturbance to this nest will need to be assessed as part of any environmental impact study for any proposed developments.</p> | <p>(5)</p> <p>(4)</p> <p>(4)</p>    |
| 27                             | <p>The increased numbers of visitors a commercial accommodation could, and I stress 'could' attract would place the penguin rookery along the northern foreshore ie. between Fortescue Bay and Canoe Bay in jeopardy.</p>   | <p>It is recommended that a monitoring program needs to be in place for at least a year (preferably two years) prior to any development proceeding in order to have a reliable baseline from which to measure any impacts from increased foot traffic along the Tasman Coastal Track.</p>   | (3)                                 |
| <b>Issue 7: Rehabilitation</b> |   |   |                                     |
| 1                              | 3.11 Strongly agrees with proposals.  | Noted.  |                                     |

## Summary of Public Comments on Fortescue Bay Draft Site Plan 2002

| Respondent Number                              | Section of Site Plan and Comment  | Response  | Assessment Criteria Reference |
|--|---|---|-------------------------------|
| 3  | 3.11 Doesn't agree with proposal for fencing off the track (sic) to the weir as this will restrict access to the signal station site. Suggests fencing off the weir only in order to retain access to the signal station. | At present this track is a flagged route only meaning that it is not a suitable walk to develop and promote. Any decision to change the classification of this route is dependent on the recommendations from a risk assessment study being undertaken by PWS. The cultural heritage aspects of the weir and the signal station would also require a full assessment as part of this study. | (6) (7)                       |
| 6  | 3.10 Doesn't believe the danger from unsupervised children drowning in the weir is any higher than unsupervised children swimming in the sea.   | See response above.   |                               |
| 22   | See 'Foredune Management and Protection above'  |   |                               |
| <b>Issue 8: Introduced species</b>             |   |   |                               |
| 9  | Would like a study done on the extent of feral cat activity and their impacts.  | Noted.  | (4)                           |
| 10   | <i>Undaria pinnatifida</i> has become established not far from the boat ramp.<br><br>Agree with plan that marram grass needs to be eradicated to maintain the natural values associated with the fore dune system.        | Noted. This information has been included under Section 3.6 in the final site plan.<br><br>Noted.   | (1)                           |
| 14   | Weed infestation (nettles) near penguin colony needs addressing. If removal reduces the number of available nest sites then use artificial nest boxes.  | These nettles are a native species and provide cover for penguin burrows.   | (3)                           |
| <b>Issue 9: Cultural heritage - Aboriginal</b> |   |   |                               |
| 3  | 2.2.1 Believes that stone arrangement is a sculpture of more recent origin  | Confirmed that the archaeology report was incorrect. Reference to the stone arrangement has been removed from the final site plan. Advice has been provided to the Cultural Heritage Branch to remove the record from the Tasmanian Archaeological Site Index (TASI).   | (5)                           |
| 6  | 2.2.1 Believes that stone arrangement is a sculpture of more recent origin  | See response to the above.  |                               |

## Summary of Public Comments on Fortescue Bay Draft Site Plan 2002

| Respondent<br>Number                          | Section of Site Plan and<br>Comment  | Response   | Assessment<br>Criteria<br>Reference |
|---|--|--|-------------------------------------|
| 25  | Part of the Mill Creek campsite is an aboriginal site (artefacts around campsite 33)   | The southern end of Fortescue Bay has been identified as having high cultural sensitivity. Any future development or visitor facilities within the area will be confined to previously disturbed areas (where it can be demonstrated that no Aboriginal cultural material is present). To assist in determining the location, extent and constraints on any future development an Aboriginal Heritage Officer should be engaged to provide on-site advice. | (1)                                 |
| <b>Issue 10: Cultural heritage - historic</b> |  |  |                                     |
| 6   | 2.2.2 Mentions strategic importance of signal station on Mt Fortescue. It should not be omitted as part of the described heritage. See Information and Interpretation section below.               | It is proposed to amend the site plan to consider the incorporation of the signal station located on Mount Fortescue into the interpretation provided at the day use area on the convict history of the area.  | (5)                                 |
| 19  | 3.2 The Greens endorse the need for future 'discovery' (sic) of remaining structures of other cultural sites to be identified, assessed and protected in accordance with the appropriate statutes. | Noted. This is in accordance with the policies contained within the TNPMP 2001.  |                                     |



## Summary of Public Comments on Fortescue Bay Draft Site Plan 2002

| Respondent Number                           | Section of Site Plan and Comment  | Response   | Assessment Criteria Reference |
|---|---|--|-------------------------------|
| 22  | 2.1.4.2 Without baseline data, it will be very difficult if not impossible to monitor change in species abundance and diversity of Fortescue Bay bush birds due to visitor impact, development of infrastructure and modification of the forest habitat in the VSZ. Baseline data needs to be collected immediately and incorporated into the Fortescue Bay Site plan Policies/Actions. | It is the aim of the site plan that very little forest habitat will be disturbed in the campground as the re-design of the day use, parking and camping areas will be limited to the existing developed area. With respect to the two commercial development nodes, the modification of forest habitat will need to be considered as part of the environmental impact assessment required for any development proposal.  | (4)                           |
| <b>Issue 12: Standard of Fortescue Road</b> |   |  |                               |
| 3   | 3.9 Suggests that PWS ask Forestry Tasmania to meet Forest Practices Code standards for an arterial forest road and widen it to a seven metre width. (Add to Table 1)   | The road into Fortescue Bay is generally referred to as a Class 2 Road for which is 5.5 metre width is recommended under the Forest Practices Code 2000. The road has been used for decades as a log haulage road and the existing road width surface conditions are considered adequate for the carriage of tri-axle log trailers. However, if the standard of the road is to be improved for regular tourist traffic this will depend on increased state government funding which is outside the scope of this plan. | (5) (10)                      |
| 6   | 2.11 States that the access road is unsafe and does not meet the Forest Practices Code standards nor that required for accessing the national park's (main) visitor services zone.  | The access road into Fortescue Bay is only unsafe if people do not drive to the road conditions. There is a speed limit and signs with regard to wet and slippery conditions.  | (10)                          |
| 7   | 2.11 Requirement "causes excessive wear" is unsubstantiated and should be deleted. The sentence "The fact that the road is unsealed..." offers no insight or action and should be deleted or reworded.  | This requirement has been deleted from the final site plan as it is only conjecture.   | (5)                           |
| 16  | Commercial activity will lead to an increased amount of road traffic on an already poorly maintained road.  | Noted. However this is outside the scope of the site plan.   | (10)                          |

## Summary of Public Comments on Fortescue Bay Draft Site Plan 2002

| Respondent Number   | Section of Site Plan and Comment  | Response   | Assessment Criteria Reference    |
|---|---|--|----------------------------------|
| 23  | <p>2.11 At the entry point to the Fortescue Road PWS should request Forestry Tasmania to indicate by signage periods when log trucks are carting logs.</p> <p>2.11 The road at the Agnes Creek bridge has a pronounced dogleg, regular removal of scrub cover beside the bridge would improve the line of sight for approaching traffic.</p>  | <p>Forestry have indicated that heavy traffic uses the road all year round, therefore a sign indicating specific periods of activity would not be of any benefit. Forestry intend to review their interpretative and advisory signage in the area and may consider re-locating existing signage to sites where it is more likely to be seen by visitors.</p> <p>The final site plan has been amended to give consideration to widening the road just before the single lane bridge over Agnes Creek (on the campground side) to enable vehicles to give way to traffic entering the VSZ.</p> | <p>(10)</p> <p>(3)</p>           |
| <b>Issue 13: Visitor arrivals, parking (including boat trailers) and traffic flow</b> |   |  |                                  |
| 2   | <p>2.5.2 Strongly agree that current (visitor arrivals) area is unsuitable for parking and relocation to day use area is necessary.</p> <p>3.2 Disagree with concept of directing campers back to current office. Believes that office should be located at day use area so that all information for site users is in one spot.</p> <p>3.5.2 Agree that structure should harmonise with surroundings. Also would remove intrusion on caretakers' residence.</p> <p>3.9 Agree that current parking situation is poorly designed and inadequate but disagree that the (degraded &amp; unsightly) campsites 28 &amp; 29 should be maintained as, when in use they are visually intrusive and restrict traffic flow. Believe they should be available for boat trailer parking.</p> | <p>The visitor reception and day use area will be re-designed to improve traffic flow and visitor reception facilities.</p> <p>The re-design concept will also consider the placement of a visitor reception office which will handle bookings, information and sale of park passes.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>The parking situation is being addressed as part of there-design of the day use area. Sites 28 and 29 at Mill Creek will be considered for boat trailer parking as part of this re-design.</p>   | <p>(4)</p> <p>(3)</p> <p>(3)</p> |

## Summary of Public Comments on Fortescue Bay Draft Site Plan 2002

| Respondent<br>Number | Section of Site Plan and<br>Comment   | Response   | Assessment<br>Criteria<br>Reference |
|----------------------|---|--|-------------------------------------|
| 6                    | 2.11 Commented that day use carpark now has to cope with overnight walkers who previously parked at the start of the old Cape Pillar track. Doesn't believe the plan does enough to address the need for current carparking let alone future growth.  | Consideration will be given to providing additional parking to cater for overnight users of the Tasman Coastal and the Cape Pillar Tracks. The number of campsites in the VSZ will be limited to what is currently available. As capacity is only reached during the busiest period, it may be necessary to employ strategies to inform visitors before they arrive at Fortescue Bay that the campground has reached its capacity. | (4)                                 |
| 11                   | 2.11 & 3.9 States that increased numbers of visitors should be expected once area promoted under Great Short Walks project. Therefore adequate, safe parking (and camping) is essential. People using the Cape Pillar track currently park along the side of Fortescue Road. Making the start of the Cape Pillar track in the day use area will result in more congestion in the day use carpark. Carparks clearly need to be extended. | See above response.  | (11)                                |

## Summary of Public Comments on Fortescue Bay Draft Site Plan 2002

| Respondent<br>Number | Section of Site Plan and<br>Comment   | Response   | Assessment<br>Criteria<br>Reference |
|----------------------|---|--|-------------------------------------|
| 26                   | <p>2.11 &amp; 3.9 Move the house and associated infrastructure back up the road (approx 200m) just past the Cape Pillar track. Good site on southern side of the road. Need investigation for endangered species. This would make the office first point of contact-before camp sites walking tracks. Would need a small carpark. Would remove existing confusion. An orientation sign near the new house/ office would direct people to pay/ day use/ walking tracks/camp sites/ boat ramp etc.</p>  | <p>The re-location of reception facilities is being considered in the re-design of the existing road network and parking facilities at the Fortescue Bay. It seems likely that the information booth will need to be located in the first day use area. Staffing the booth with a Visitor Services Officer during the high peak use season will be considered.</p> | (3)                                 |
|                      | <p>3.9 By moving caretaker infrastructure away from the current site, the present location of the house could be used to relocate the road to Mill Creek and the day use area. The new road could continue through the existing generator shed site and angle gently to the south east to join the existing road to Mill Creek at a point just below the day use area toilets. This would also allow more room for reconstruction of the access road to the day use area and could be a loop back to the Banksia campsite. Better sight lines would be afforded making this safer and give clearer direction.</p> | <p>This is being considered as one of the options in the re-design of the day use carpark and the roads in the VSZ. The policy with respect to the campground is to condense visitor infrastructure into the existing area rather than create new areas of disturbance.</p>  | (7)                                 |
|                      | <p>The present road below the house could then be used for several buses to park. This would also allow buses to turn, in a safe manner, back onto the road near the present location of the house's back access road. Close access to the beach can be gained by kids from this point.</p>   | <p>See response above. Parking for two buses has been allowed for in the re-design of the car park and road design brief. This also includes a safe turn around point. Access to the beach can still be gained from the day use area.</p>  | (9)                                 |

## Summary of Public Comments on Fortescue Bay Draft Site Plan 2002

| Respondent<br>Number              | Section of Site Plan and<br>Comment  | Response  | Assessment<br>Criteria<br>Reference |
|-----------------------------------|--|---|-------------------------------------|
| <b>Issue 14: Built structures</b> |  |   |                                     |
| 18                                | 3.5 No specific mention is made here for any opportunity for public comment. Is this included in the cited Act and Code of Practice? If not, it should be included in the site plan. | Unless exempted under the relevant planning scheme all structures within reserved land will be subject to the <i>Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1999</i> and will require development applications. This is a process whereby the public has the opportunity to object to a proposed development on reserved land. The final site plan has been amended to clarify this process under Section 3.5.1.   | (5)                                 |
| 26                                | New (overflow) campground site may be needed to cater for projected increase in visitors. This would require another toilet, shelter and BBQ.  | There will be no expansion to the existing camping area. However the existing camping ground will be re-designed to make better use of the available space. In this process some sites will be reallocated. Where this occurs new camping sites will be developed if required. The final site plan gives consideration to the placement of additional facilities near Access track C (see Map 4 of site plan). It is also the intention to improve the design of the existing toilets to cater for more visitors. | (4)                                 |
| <b>Issue 15: Jetty</b>            |  |   |                                     |
| 23                                | See 'Parks Passes' comment below.  |   |                                     |
| 25                                | See 'Parks Passes' comment below.  |   |                                     |
| <b>Issue 16: Park passes</b>      |  |   |                                     |
| 2                                 | 2.10 Park pass exemption rule is confusing more easily understood policy and better communication needed.  | The current PWS policy is not to charge park fees to visitors who are using the boat ramp for launching their boats and with the exception of parking their cars, providing they do not intend to camp and use the other facilities at the campground. The different options with respect to the park entry fee will be better communicated to the public by means of the new information booth.  | (2)                                 |

## Summary of Public Comments on Fortescue Bay Draft Site Plan 2002

| Respondent Number                                  | Section of Site Plan and Comment  | Response   | Assessment Criteria Reference |
|--|---|--|-------------------------------|
| 23   | 2.10 The simple answer to the confusion as to who should pay park entry fees in such a small out of the way portion of Tasman National Park is to simply waive fees while on site or in close proximity.  | See above response.  | (2)                           |
| 25   | Given the established recreational use of the area, free access for boat launching is likely to be more effective than trying to charge fees, however this is also a factor which could be in-built in setting fees for overnight stays and camping.  | See response to comment #10.   | (2)                           |
| <b>Issue 17: Camping area design and expansion</b> |   |  |                               |
| 1  | 3.6.1 Agrees that existing capacity is reached on a few days a year and that camping facilities are found elsewhere. No need to provide extra spaces.   | Noted. The issue of carrying capacity of the site is currently being addressed through the re-design of the existing infrastructure within the VSZ, however the total number of campsites in the VSZ will be limited to what the area can sustain.   |                               |
| 10   | 3.6.1 Suggest that the camping area is close to capacity and suspect that environmental damage will increase sharply with increased visitor use - through trampling.  | See above response. During high peak periods those visitors that can't be accommodated within the existing campground will be re-directed to Lime Bay State Reserve or caravan parks at Port Arthur or White Beach. In the longer term the issue of how to cater for increased visitation to the Tasman area will need to be considered as part of an overall camping strategy for the entire Tasman Peninsula involving local council, tourism operators and PWS. | (4)                           |
| 11   | 3.6.1 The proposed extensions to carparks will encroach onto existing camping area. Camping should be extended north of the lagoon into the areas designated as development node. Believes that the aesthetics of providing screening vegetation should be foregone in preference for more campsites if required. | There are no proposed extensions to carparks rather it is the intention to better design and utilise areas made available for parking at present. It is not proposed to extend camping to the north of the lagoon into the identified development node as this would amplify visitation pressures on the northern end of Fortescue Bay beach and have detrimental impacts on flora and fauna.  | (7)                           |

## Summary of Public Comments on Fortescue Bay Draft Site Plan 2002

| Respondent Number | Section of Site Plan and Comment  | Response   | Assessment Criteria Reference |
|-------------------|---|--|-------------------------------|
| 22                | 3.8 Disagree with the provision of more gas barbecues, picnic tables and shelter in the day use area as this will result in unacceptable crowding of a beautiful spot with a special atmosphere of its own.   | The final site plan gives consideration to the placement of additional day use facilities, however the opinion of users will be sought as to whether they are needed. Maintaining the existing open space character will be the main consideration when siting any new day use facilities.   | (9)                           |
| 25                | The site as currently constituted is restricted in area, rendering the location and extent of camping and day visitor facilities are somewhat cramped.  | Noted. See above response.   |                               |
| 27                | The present camping facilities could benefit by upgrading.  | Noted. The existing campground will be re-designed to make better use of the available space, improve vegetation screening and drainage. In this process some sites will be reallocated. Where this occurs new sites will be developed if required. Toilet facilities will also be upgraded.   |                               |
| 26                | <p>3.6.1 A good potential site (subject to an EIS) for a new campsite is on the northern side of the road between the proposed house/office location and the lagoon. This is an attractive spot which could be well set back from the lagoon. Indicators that the site will have to cope with more school groups as well as discerning visitors over the next 10 years. It would be good to have something up our sleeves. Another toilet, shelter and BBQ would be needed at this site.</p> <p>The plan should allow for the closure of the campsite 23 at Mill Creek below the existing toilet to allow for an extended French drain.</p> | <p>There will be no expansion to the existing campground, but the existing camping areas will be re-designed to make better use of the available space. In this process some sites will be reduced in size to increase the total number of available campsites.</p> <p>It is proposed to upgrade the toilets at Mill Creek to a totally enclosed system which would be pumped out once a year. Technical advice will be sought as to whether the existing French drain at Mill Creek may be considered for greywater disposal. This may require the closure of campsite 23. This site plan has been amended to reflect this new information.</p> | <p>(4)</p> <p>(4)</p>         |

## Summary of Public Comments on Fortescue Bay Draft Site Plan 2002

| Respondent Number  | Section of Site Plan and Comment  | Response   | Assessment Criteria Reference |
|--|---|--|-------------------------------|
| 27   | Fortescue Bay has traditionally been a camping ground used by families, fishermen and a comparatively few bush walkers. The increased numbers of visitors the commercial accommodation could attract would place the penguin rookery along the northern shore in jeopardy.  | It is proposed that a monitoring program needs to be in place for at least a year (two years preferably to take account of seasonal fluctuations) prior to any development proceeding in order to have a reliable baseline from which to measure any impacts from increased foot traffic along the Tasman Coastal Track. Specific remediation actions have been identified under Section 3.2 to reduce levels of disturbance of the little penguin colony. | (4)                           |
| <b>Issue 18: Camping Area -vegetation management</b>     |   |  |                               |
| 1  | 3.6.1 Would not like to see blue gums lopped and believe it is possible to place tents clear on windy days. Strongly agrees with proposals for rehabilitation and revegetation in 3.11.   | PWS have an obligation to undertake measures to reduce risk to the public when on reserved land. At Fortescue Bay the dropping of limbs from trees in the campground has been identified as one of these risks.  | (7)                           |
| 2  | 3.6.1 Believes a 12 monthly inspection is adequate (6 monthly is excessive)   | Noted. When a risk assessment level has been determined for the site this will dictate the schedule of campground inspections. It may be that once every twelve months is acceptable.  |                               |
| 10   | See 'Sustainability' above  |  |                               |
| 23   | 3.6 Removal of dead limbs should be part of the maintenance program when it is practicable to carry it out ie. just prior to the main visitation period. The eucalypts provide a unique landscape character to the area as well as shade and shelter for campers. Future planting of Blue Gums could be lopped at six years to encourage lateral crown spread to provide shade and shelter for campers. | See above response.  |                               |
| <b>Issue 19: Camping Area - fire places and firewood</b> |   |  |                               |
| 1  | 3.6.1 Supports making kindling available to discourage foraging.  | The provision of kindling for purchase by campers was recommended in the draft site plan, there has been no change to this.  |                               |

## Summary of Public Comments on Fortescue Bay Draft Site Plan 2002

| Respondent Number | Section of Site Plan and Comment   | Response   | Assessment Criteria Reference |
|-------------------|--|--|-------------------------------|
| 2                 | 3.6.1 Supports the trialing of designated fireplaces as it would reduce scarring and risk of campfires escaping. Believes that the collection of kindling actually reduces the potential risk of fire escapes by reducing fuel load.   | The issue of fireplaces will be the subject of ongoing consultation with camping visitors to determine the design and location of designated fireplaces. Future visitor surveys will canvass this issue more fully. An integrated firewood and fireplace strategy needs to be developed for Fortescue Bay. An action to this effect has been included in Section 3.8.1 (Camping) of the final site plan. | (4)                           |
| 11                | See 'Visitor arrivals, parking (including boat trailers) and traffic flow' above.  |  |                               |
| 23                | <p>2.9 A campfire for many is part of a tradition of camping and should be allowed to continue. The wood available from the caretaker is definitely not cost effective for the copious quantities required by amateur crayfishers to cook their catch on a regular basis. PWS and Forestry should organise designated collection areas available nearby State Forest for campers to collect firewood during their stay. The caretaker could issue licences with conditions on behalf of Forestry for part of the licence fee.</p> <p>2.9 I am not in favour of formalised fireplaces as it is most likely conflict would result. People do not collect rocks from the foreshore to construct fireplaces, bush rocks are used and probably the same one over a long period of time.</p> | <p>See response to comment #2 above.</p> <p>This use of formalised fireplaces is required in an area as heavily used as Fortescue Bay in order to prevent the proliferation of fire scars. The issue of fireplaces will be the subject of ongoing consultation with camping visitors to determine the design and location of designated fireplaces.</p>  | <p>(4)</p> <p>(9)</p>         |
| 25                | The plan indicates that firewood collecting for campsites is causing some loss of vegetation. NPWAC agrees that compliance is required for firewood purchase, but this could be built-in with the camping fee. The need to use recognised fireplaces should be emphasised.   | See response to comment #2 above.  | (4)                           |

## Summary of Public Comments on Fortescue Bay Draft Site Plan 2002

| Respondent Number                    | Section of Site Plan and Comment  | Response   | Assessment Criteria Reference |
|--------------------------------------|---|--|-------------------------------|
| <b>Issue 20: Day use area design</b> |   |  |                               |
| 6                                    | See 'Visitor arrivals, parking, and traffic flow' above   |  |                               |
| 8                                    | 3.8 May consider structures such as picnic facilities and amenities blocks appropriate depending on the site specific details and environmental impact.   | There is an error in Section 3.8 of the site plan with regard to the proposed location for a picnic shelter. The tracks have been re-titled A, B, C & D. The proposed location is meant to be situated in the vicinity of Access track C (not Access track A). The location shown on Map 4 of the final site plan is now correct. The potential site will be assessed to determine its suitability for the construction of a shelter, the style of which would be in accordance with the guidelines outlined in Section 3.5 of this site plan. | (5)                           |
| 11                                   | 2.11 & 3.9 See 'Visitor arrivals, parking (including boat trailers) and traffic flow' above   |  |                               |
| 18                                   | 3.8 I would be sorry to see picnic facilities on the open area below the first day use area. This is a good area for viewing native hens and wrens.<br><br>3.8 Alongside the day use area carpark Tasmania Blue Gums have been planted a few years back. It might be a good idea to replace these with lower screening shrubs or sheoaks. Blue Gums are notorious branch droppers and unsuitable for carparks. If extra gas barbecues are unavoidable, could they be sited "up the back" in the area behind the road? | This proposed location was an error. See response to comment #8 above.<br><br>These species have been planted to provide swift parrot habitat. The TNPMP 2001 lists this as the preferred species to plant for rehabilitation purposes. It makes sense to have any new day use facilities within easy walking distance of the carpark and the beach. Visitors are unlikely to use facilities that have been sited "up the back".   | (5)<br><br>(5) (7)            |
| 19                                   | 3.2 & 3.3 The Greens are supportive of proposals to improve signage and use areas and interpretative conservation information.  | Noted.   |                               |
| 23                                   | 2.7 Leave camping areas as they are, some minor tree screening is required but not essential. Seasonal regrassing and remedial drainage to some sites is desirable.   | The existing camping ground will be re-designed to make better use of the available space. In this process some sites will be reallocated. Where this occurs new sites will be developed if required.  | (2)                           |

## Summary of Public Comments on Fortescue Bay Draft Site Plan 2002

| Respondent Number  | Section of Site Plan and Comment   | Response   | Assessment Criteria Reference |
|--|--|--|-------------------------------|
| 25   | The current site plan has a major deficiency in terms of day visitor parking and provision for buses. More areas are needed now or more overflow areas may be needed further back on the road outside the site proper. This matter requires investigation as it has many implications. | The issue of parking for day visitors is currently being addressed through the re-design of the existing infrastructure within the VSZ. Provision will be made for parking of up to fifty vehicles, including two bays for buses. Current visitor estimates suggest that this would be sufficient even during high peak periods.   | (4)                           |
| <b>Issue 21: Walking tracks (including sign posting)</b> |  |  |                               |
| 3  | 2.12 & 3.10 Believes requirement ie "the track is well-signed but it is hard to find" is contradictory.<br><br>2.11 Suggests a sign at the start of Cape Pillar track asking walkers to park in the day use area. (Add to Table 1)   | This sentence has been re-written to clarify that there is no orientation information to direct visitors to the start of individual walking tracks. This will be addressed when a new information booth is situated in the day use area.<br><br>Agreed. The site plan will be changed to recommend that the sign at the start of Cape Pillar track be modified to direct walkers to park their cars in the day use area. | (5)<br><br>(3)                |
| 6  | 3.10 Would like to see the track to the signal station improved and signposted.  | At present this track is a flagged route only which means that it is not a suitable walk to develop and promote. Any decision to change the classification of this route is dependent on the recommendations from a risk assessment study being undertaken by PWS. The cultural heritage aspects of the weir and the signal station would also require a full risk assessment.   | (7)                           |
| 11   | 3.10 Believes that all tracks should start from a central point. The track to the signal station is omitted and needs to be rerouted if the track to the weir is closed.   | It is proposed that all walking tracks commence from the day use area. This has been made clearer in the final site plan. In respect to the track to the Signal Station refer to the above response.   | (3)                           |

## Summary of Public Comments on Fortescue Bay Draft Site Plan 2002

| Respondent Number | Section of Site Plan and Comment  | Response  | Assessment Criteria Reference |
|-------------------|---|---|-------------------------------|
| 14                | 3.10 Would like to see the Canoe Bay track relocated away from the penguin colony as there is a big potential to damage burrows especially with projected increase in visitors (eg Great Short Walks, 2 ferries). If track cannot be relocated then some duck-boarding would help to protect the burrows. See 'Fauna' above.    | The final site plan will recommend that suitable infrastructure and planning is required to minimise impact on this species. The final site plan will also recommend that if the monitoring program indicates that penguin numbers are decreasing then remedial action will need to be taken. Other interim measures will include signage for visitors and best practice guidelines for commercial operators. The construction of raised walkways will also be considered in the plan if there is any walker induced damage to penguin burrows. | (3)                           |
| 23                | 2.5.2 & 2.6 Avoid unobtrusive regulatory oriented signage.  | Noted. The development of a signage plan for the VSZ has been recommended in the final site plan. This will assess the need for, and placement of, signs within the VSZ.  | (8)                           |
| 25                | The draft site plan recommends the closure and rehabilitation of Track A (shown on Map 4). As this is the only mapped direct track from the day-use area to the beach, it appears unlikely to work, as people will create additional routes. There needs to be one clearly delineated track from the day-use area to the beach. | The draft site plan proposes that there be only one beach access track (Map 6, Track C) from the day use area to the beach. The final site plan will include an action that a sign in the day use area be used to direct people to this access point.   | (5)                           |
| 26                | The Cape Pillar track could be rerouted above the present house site to the day use area mitigating potential conflict with road vehicles.  | To improve pedestrian safety Section 3.5 of the final site plan gives consideration to re-routing the Cape Pillar track to commence from the day use area. If this does not occur (due to cost) then the construction of a footpath along the side of the access road from the day use area to the start of the Cape Pillar track needs to be considered.   | (2)                           |

## Summary of Public Comments on Fortescue Bay Draft Site Plan 2002

| Respondent<br>Number                            | Section of Site Plan and<br>Comment   | Response   | Assessment<br>Criteria<br>Reference |
|---|---|--|-------------------------------------|
| <b>Issue 22: Information and Interpretation</b> |   |  |                                     |
| 6   | 3.4 Believes the signal station on Mt Fortescue should be interpreted as the foundations are in good condition.   | Section 3.6 of the final site plan gives consideration to incorporating the signal station located on Mount Fortescue into the interpretation provided at the day use area on the convict history of the area.   | (3)                                 |
| 10  | 3.4 Believe that providing good information should be a high priority not moderate as this is the only way (bar erecting barriers) for modifying behaviour.   | Noted. Upgrading interpretation for day visitors in the Fortescue Bay Visitor Services Zone was identified as a high priority in TNPMP 2001 and will be addressed by situating an information booth in the day use area.   | (4)                                 |
| 14  | 3.4 Should use a sign at the jetty regarding the laying of nets (ie not at dawn or dusk, adjacent to the penguin colony).<br><br>Unsure about placing signs adjacent to the penguin colony (ie. unaware and untouched versus informed and interfering). | PWS has written to the Director of Marine Resources to bring this event to their attention and to request that in the Review of the Scale Fish Plan due 2003-4 that the use of gill nets in the vicinity of the penguin colony in Fortescue Bay be prohibited.<br><br>It is proposed to have a monitoring program in place to provide a reliable baseline from which to measure any impacts from increased foot traffic along the Tasman Coastal Track. Interim measures will include best practice for guidelines for walkers and commercial operators. The construction of raised walkways will also be considered in the plan if there is any walker induced damage to penguin burrows. | (4)<br><br>(4)                      |

## Summary of Public Comments on Fortescue Bay Draft Site Plan 2002

| Respondent<br>Number | Section of Site Plan and<br>Comment   | Response   | Assessment<br>Criteria<br>Reference |
|----------------------|---|--|-------------------------------------|
| 18                   | <p>3.4 Information signs re: nesting shorebirds both Pied Oystercatchers and Hooded Plovers. At the north end of the beach there should be a sign including information on where and how to walk along the beach section of the Tasman Track and to inform people who have walked south from Waterfall Bay. Sign should show picture and size of Hooded Plovers and where they nest so as to avoid eggs and chicks.</p> <p>3.4 Bream in the lagoon, a reminder about legal size and fines could serve well.</p> <p>3.4 The toilet sign needs to be more obvious and placed in the Day Use Area.</p> | <p>The draft site plan proposes that an interpretative sign be placed at the main beach access points, with information on beach and ocean life. It is not considered necessary to have another sign for walkers coming from the Waterfall Bay direction as walkers will almost certainly walk on hard sand after having walked seven kilometres from the other direction as it generally makes for much easier walking.</p> <p>Bream are considered an estuarine species and therefore restrictions on size and bag limits apply under the Living Marine Resources Regulations.</p> <p>The toilets for the day use area will be upgraded and re-located closer to the day use area. Until such time as the toilets are relocated, the track from the day use area to the amenities block needs to be better signed and defined.</p> | <p>(2)</p> <p>(10)</p> <p>(4)</p>   |
| 19                   | <p>2.6 There is scope for interpretative and educational material to be provided about the indigenous inhabitants and their culture. This section does not make specific reference to Aboriginal culture when discussing the new interpretation boards currently being provided.</p> <p>3.2 &amp; 3.3 The Greens are very supportive of proposals to improve signage of camping and day use areas and interpretative conservation information.</p>  | <p>Noted. This has been recommended under Sections 3.3 &amp; 3.6 in the final site plan. The development of this material will be undertaken in consultation with the Tasmanian Aboriginal Land Council.</p> <p>Noted.</p>   | <p>(5)</p>                          |

## Summary of Public Comments on Fortescue Bay Draft Site Plan 2002

| Respondent Number        | Section of Site Plan and Comment  | Response   | Assessment Criteria Reference |
|--------------------------|---|--|-------------------------------|
| 22                       | <p>3.4 Notice must be taken of Fauna Policy dot point 2 in the TNPMP (restrict public access to breeding areas) and Fauna Action dot point 2 (monitor shorebird breeding success) in the Tasman NPMP, and appropriate policies and action developed for the site plan in line with them.</p> <p>3.4 Consider that interpretation by itself (as recommended) is totally inadequate for protecting shorebirds from human impacts. We recommend that the effect of board-style signage and interpretation panels be reinforced by pamphlet-style, portable, "in-the-hand material" such as the "Please be careful on beaches" leaflet produced by Birds Tasmania.</p> <p>Also provided extensive comment on the impact current levels of visitor have on breeding pairs of hooded plovers (5 points were made)</p> | <p>The site plan has been amended to reflect the requirements of the statutory management plan.</p> <p>There is no provision for supplying brochures to walkers using the Tasman Coastal Track (departing from the Waterfall Bay) and it also has the potential to create a litter problem along the track. However it may be suitable to supply these brochures at the Fortescue Bay day use area or in the material supplied to campers.</p> <p>Noted. Additional information on hooded plovers has been included in the final site plan under Section 2.1.4.2 and specific actions have been included under Sections 3.2 &amp; 3.6.</p> | <p>(3)</p> <p>(2)</p>         |
| 23                       | <p>2.9 Please come up with a reasonable education program for campfire use.</p>   | <p>Many long term campers see campfires as an important part of the experience of camping at Fortescue Bay. The site plan will recommend that strategies for educating a more efficient use of firewood (and for minimising the impacts of campfires) be included in information handed out to campers.</p>  | <p>(4)</p>                    |
| <b>Issue 23: Fishing</b> |   |  |                               |
| 10                       | <p>Point out that increased access and usage is affecting the marine environment. Heavy fishing has reduced the rock lobster population to almost entirely undersized animals.</p>  | <p>Noted. However this is outside scope of plan to influence the numbers of fishers using the area.</p>  | <p>(10)</p>                   |

## Summary of Public Comments on Fortescue Bay Draft Site Plan 2002

| Respondent<br>Number                                      | Section of Site Plan and<br>Comment   | Response  | Assessment<br>Criteria<br>Reference |
|---|---|---|-------------------------------------|
| 14  | <p>Wants gill nets and grab-all nets banned from Fortescue Bay. At least 5 kilometres away during breeding season and definitely not laid in waters surrounding access points to the colony.</p> <p>See 'Fauna' above for comment on the impact of gill netting on penguins.</p> <p>See 'Information and interpretation' above for comment on signs content at the jetty.</p> | <p>PWS has written to the Director of Marine Resources to bring this event to their attention and to request that in the Review of the Scale Fish Plan due 2003-4 that the use of gill nets in the vicinity of the penguin colony in Fortescue Bay be prohibited. Marine fauna specialists have indicated that penguins will congregate up to 500 metres offshore before coming ashore to access their burrows.</p> | (4)                                 |
| <b>Issue 24: Sewage, sullage and storm water disposal</b> |   |   |                                     |
| 10  | <p>Concerned about the disposal of sewerage, sullage and storm water from existing and proposed developments into a semi-closed marine system and/or the lagoon. Direct discharges are unacceptable. Plan is unclear about how this will be dealt with.</p>   | <p>Section 3.6.2 requires that any development proposal adopt environmental "best practices" in relation to sewage treatment, storm water management and the storage and disposal of solid and liquid waste. In addition these waste water management issues would need to be considered as part of the environmental impact assessment required for any development proposal.</p>                                  | (2)                                 |
| 16  | <p>Commercial activity require increased services - water, sewerage, waste removal and electricity.</p>   | <p>Any future commercial accommodation developments in the park are required to employ best practice with respect to their design and operation. Refer to Section 3.6.2 of the site plan. It is not anticipated that they will use any of the existing facilities provided in the VSZ.</p>  | (2)                                 |
| 25  | <p>There are other site problems in respect of water supply and the disposal of grey/black water. The latter is not discussed, but is becoming a significant problem at other sites as the number of caravans and motor homes increases. It is equally a problem in respect of campers and ought to be considered in more detail in the plan.</p>                             | <p>Noted. Agreed that this issue has not been adequately addressed by the site plan and needs to be. A requirement to this effect has been included under Section 3.9.2 in the final site plan.</p>   | (4)                                 |

## Summary of Public Comments on Fortescue Bay Draft Site Plan 2002

| Respondent Number   | Section of Site Plan and Comment   | Response  | Assessment Criteria Reference |
|---|--|---|-------------------------------|
| 26  | The plan should allow for the closure of the campsite 23 below the toilet to allow for an extended French drain.   | Noted. It is proposed to upgrade the existing toilet facilities within the VSZ to a fully contained system that can be pumped out to cater for the anticipated increase in visitor numbers. This would negate the need for extending the existing French drain at Mill Creek, however the drain may be considered for greywater disposal. The need for advice in different waste water options has been identified in Section 3.9.2 of the final site plan. | (3)                           |
| <b>Issue 25: Amenities including showers and water supply</b> |  |   |                               |
| 6   | 3.7 Concerned that Lunchtime Creek has dried up in recent summers and flagged that increasing usage may put a strain on the water supply from Agnes Creek. May need to consider recommissioning the weir.  | Technical advice on water supply and water reticulation required to supply the campground is required before any decision can be made.  | (4)                           |
| 11  | In 2003 Agnes Creek is not free-flowing and believes that the water supply is not reliable enough to cope with the proposed provision of showers and increased numbers of campers. Believes that provision for a large tank on the site should be made and this would allow for water to be trucked in when necessary. | One hot shower is provided at Banksia campground on a trial basis. The draft site plan proposes that the potential for showers to be installed at the Mill Creek amenities block is investigated. This investigation should consider the water supply for such facility. Given the scarcity of water in summer drinking water should be a priority over showers.  | (4)                           |
| 23  | 2.8 Hot showers are not an essential part of bush camping given the scarcity and limitations of the water resource during summer, however one hot shower is sufficient if other users so desire.   | See comment above.  | (4)                           |

## Summary of Public Comments on Fortescue Bay Draft Site Plan 2002

| Respondent<br>Number   | Section of Site Plan and<br>Comment  | Response   | Assessment<br>Criteria<br>Reference |
|--|--|--|-------------------------------------|
| <b>Issue 26: Commercial accommodation (Also see Bushfire management above)</b> |  |  |                                     |
| 1  | 3.6.2 Strongly opposes both lodge and cabin accommodation. A lodge would be out of character and decrease amenity and would create strong public reaction. Cabins are an unnecessary compromise. - potential to disturb soil, drainage and have sewerage problems. Any developments need to be located close to Tasman Highway. Also would undermine the social/recreational atmosphere of the site. | Any commercial accommodation proposal would need to be fully assessed to determine its impacts on the surrounding environment and the impact on other users.   | (2)                                 |
| 2  | 3.6.2 Agree that the creation of commercial accommodation would duplicate existing services. It would also impact adversely on the informal recreational setting.<br><br>3.6.2 Agrees that small scale foot accessed accommodation would be most suitable as long as wildfire risk is accounted for.   | The proposed accommodation would cater for visitors seeking a different experience from that presently provided. Any proposed development would be designed so that it does not intrude on the existing informal setting.<br><br>Depending on the size of the development it may require local government approval, which would not be given unless it complies with Tasmania Fire Service Regulations with respect to fire management plans for built structures. | (2)<br><br>(4)                      |
| 5  | 3.6.2 Comment made on inconsistency with regard plan not recommending any more budget - mid range accommodation but providing for further assessment. Believe that if PWS need to consider such accommodation in the future, then detailed assessments should take place.  | The potential for a vehicle based accommodation within the VSZ has been deleted from the final site plan as this could lead to further congestion problems at the site and place added demand on scarce resources ie. land, water etc.   | (2)                                 |
| 7  | 3.6.2 Suggest deleting reference to existing operations as it is misleading.<br><br>3.6.2 Would prefer PWS liaison before potential developers are accommodated in the proposed zones.   | Reference to existing operations has been deleted from the final site plan.<br><br>This is a commercial sector opportunity and it is for these commercial interests to pursue them with the relevant agencies any issues they may have with regards to the development.  | (5)<br><br>(10)                     |

## Summary of Public Comments on Fortescue Bay Draft Site Plan 2002

| Respondent<br>Number | Section of Site Plan and<br>Comment  | Response   | Assessment<br>Criteria<br>Reference |
|----------------------|--|--|-------------------------------------|
| 8                    | 3.6.2 Totally disagree with allowing commercial accommodation in national parks. Support their location outside of national parks.   | Built accommodation is permitted under the TNPMP 2001 (page 54). The management plan also states that standing camps (licensed camps) will also be considered for the VSZ (page 55) and Recreation Zone (page 57). Any proposals will be assessed according to the guidelines in the TNPMP 2001 under Section 5.5.7. | (7)                                 |
| 9                    | 3.6.2 Concerned with proposal to establish commercial accommodation within the national park as it would severely affect values. States that the distance between western boundary of park and sea is narrow and that the distance from penguin rookeries is too small. Disturbance is likely. Proposal for cabin accommodation is a move away from the traditional use on the area and will place stress on the natural environment. Stated that the creation of commercial accommodation would duplicate existing services and extra competition could affect the viability of local businesses. | These issues would need to be considered as part of an environmental impact assessment required for any proposed development at the identified locations.  | (2) (7)                             |
| 10                   | 3.6.2 Believe that site is close to capacity and do not believe that lodge development is a high priority. Note that the proposed location is close to the penguin colony.   | See above response.  | (4) (7)                             |
| 11                   | 3.6.2 Believes that the Visitor Services Zone (VSZ) is too small (and that parking and camping is already at full capacity) to accommodate any lodge or cabin accommodation. Suggests that this would be better placed elsewhere along the Fortescue Road and is not permitted in the VSZ or in the Tasman National Park.  | See response to comment #5.  | (2)                                 |

## Summary of Public Comments on Fortescue Bay Draft Site Plan 2002

| Respondent Number | Section of Site Plan and Comment  | Response  | Assessment Criteria Reference |
|-------------------|---|---|-------------------------------|
| 12                | 3.6.2 Extremely opposed to the allowance of commercial accommodation to be built inside the national park boundary. National parks' primary purpose is for nature conservation and is alarmed at the prospect of a commercial development being allowed at Canoe Bay. Believes there is enough scope for development outside of the park boundaries.      | Built accommodation is permitted under the TNPMP 2001 (page 54). Any proposals will be assessed according to the guidelines in the TNPMP 2001 under Section 5.5.7. Canoe Bay is a parcel of private land and therefore outside the national park.   | (7)                           |
| 13                | 3.6.2 Doesn't see the need for commercial accommodation but if it is going to go ahead then wants developments outside of the park boundary.  | See above response.   | (7)                           |
| 14                | 3.6.2 Doesn't want any construction of buildings at the northern end of Fortescue Bay as the potential for disturbance to penguin colony is high. See 'Fauna' above.  | The site related management issues and the broader impacts resulting from an increase in pedestrian traffic along the Tasman Coastal Track would need to be addressed as part of the environmental impact assessment for any proposed commercial development at the identified locations. | (4)                           |
| 15                | 3.6.2 I strongly object to the proposal to allow for commercial accommodation facilities within the Fortescue Bay area or any other area in Tasman National Park. Commercial developments engender a sense of privacy and exclusion and this is totally against the ethos of parks and the public access policy of such regions.                          | Built accommodation and licensed camps is permitted by the TNPMP 2001 (page 54, 55 & 57). Any proposals will be assessed according to the guidelines in the TNPMP 2001 under Section 5.5.7.   | (7)                           |
| 16                | 3.6.2 No commercial accommodation developments, either privately or government funded, should be considered anywhere in the Tasman National Park. Development within the park boundaries is inappropriate and will erode natural values. Commercial activity needs to be confined to outside the park where there is already infrastructure and services. | See above response.   | (7)                           |

## Summary of Public Comments on Fortescue Bay Draft Site Plan 2002

| Respondent<br>Number | Section of Site Plan and<br>Comment  | Response   | Assessment<br>Criteria<br>Reference |
|----------------------|--|--|-------------------------------------|
| 19                   | 3.8.2 We object to any proposed development of lodge accommodation on the grounds that such developments have the capacity to degrade the visitor experience of the majority for the benefit of a minority, by undermining the integrity of these natural areas.   | See response to comment #15.   | (7)                                 |
| 20                   | 3.5 & 3.6.2 I do not support commercial accommodation development or linked licensed camps being allowed anywhere in Tasman National Park, regardless of whether the area has been rezoned as a Visitor Services Zone. Parks are primarily for nature conservation. Development within the park boundaries is totally inappropriate and will erode the natural values of the park. | See response to comment #15.   | (7)                                 |
| 21                   | 3.5 & 3.6.2 Commercial accommodation developments or linked licensed camps are unnecessary. There are many potential sites outside the Tasman National Park boundaries. The rezoning of areas to 'Visitor service areas' ( <i>sic</i> ) to permit development is totally inappropriate and will erode the natural values of the park.  | There was no rezoning exercise undertaken in the draft site plan. The TNPMP 2001 has always identified a Visitor Services Zone for the area between Fortescue Bay to Canoe Bay.  | (7)                                 |
| 22                   | 3.6.2 We support the comment that "A large scale development would have a negative impact on the existing informal setting of Fortescue Bay and as such would be inappropriate".   | Noted. Any proposed development would be designed so that it does not intrude on the existing informal setting. The development nodes identified in the draft plan have been sited to create minimal intrusion on the surrounding area and on users of the Fortescue Bay campground. |                                     |
| 23                   | 3.6.2 The last thing we want is a waterfront development in Fortescue Bay which will destroy its wild place type character.  | See above response.  | (2)                                 |

## Summary of Public Comments on Fortescue Bay Draft Site Plan 2002

| Respondent Number | Section of Site Plan and Comment   | Response   | Assessment Criteria Reference    |
|-------------------|--|--|----------------------------------|
| 24                | <p>3.6.2 This section commences by stating "a large scale development etc.. ...would be inappropriate, by the top of page 20 it has worked its way round to talking about, quote - 'the assessment and approval of any major development'. All this talk of accommodation can only take place bearing in mind the increasing pressure on the beach and those nesting birds. Sustainability is the key factor.</p>  | <p>This was an error. The reference to a major development has been removed from the final site plan.</p>  | (5)                              |
| 25                | <p>NPWAC would applaud the decision to restrict the Fortescue Bay site to camping and day visitors rather than commercial development.</p> <p>What does 'development node' really imply. How would access be gained? Is cabin type accommodation proposed or not and where would it be located? These are extremely important issues, likely to generate considerable public debate, so clear strategic policy decisions are required.</p> <p>NPWAC is of the view that a major built accommodation is inappropriate for the Fortescue Bay site.</p> | <p>Fortescue Bay was one of six areas in Tasmania identified by a interagency working group as a possible site for future nature based tourism, this is the reason why commercial tourism opportunities have been catered for at this location.</p> <p>The site plan identifies two locations where walker based accommodation could be sited. These facilities are intended to be low key, catering for a small number of people and be accessible by foot. The proposal for vehicle based cabin type accommodation has been removed from the final site (see response #5).</p> <p>The final site plan states that large scale development would have a negative impact on the existing informal character of Fortescue Bay and is therefore not recommended.</p> | <p>(7)</p> <p>(2)</p> <p>(2)</p> |
| 27                | <p>Currently there seems to be a great number of empty beds for much of the year (on the Peninsula) - except for a few weeks at Christmas, accommodation is difficult to find - local operators seem to have a fairly thin time. In light of this any additional facilities should be seriously considered before being provided.</p>  | <p>Noted. Section 5.5.7 of the TNMP 2001 requires that the commercial viability of any commercial operation in the park would need to be demonstrated as part of the approval process.</p>   | (2)                              |

## Summary of Public Comments on Fortescue Bay Draft Site Plan 2002

| Respondent<br>Number            | Section of Site Plan and<br>Comment   | Response  | Assessment<br>Criteria<br>Reference |
|---------------------------------|---|---|-------------------------------------|
| <b>Issue 27: Licensed camps</b> |   |   |                                     |
| 8                               | 3.6.2 Totally disagree with linked licensed camps in national parks as they would degrade natural values.   | The TNPMP 2001 allows for temporary standing (licensed) camps in the Visitor Services Zone and Recreation Zone of the park (pages 55 & 57). The aim is to provide for low impact, low density and non-intrusive recreational use and enjoyment of the area. Any proposals for licensed camps will be assessed according to the guidelines set out in Section 5.5.7 of the TNPMP 2001. Depending on the proposal, additional assessment guidelines and criteria may be required. | (2) (7)                             |
| 9                               | 3.6.2 The establishment of standing camps would have detrimental environmental effects and only support commercial operations that involve self-contained backpacking.  | See above response.   | (7)                                 |
| 11                              | Doesn't agree with (walking) lodge development in the national park.  | See response to comment #8.   | (7)                                 |
| 12                              | Doesn't agree with commercial development in the national park.   | See response to comment #8.   | (7)                                 |
| 13                              | Doesn't agree with any commercial accommodation in the national park but if really needed then should be located outside park boundary.   | See response to comment #8.   | (7)                                 |
| 15                              | Please amend the draft site plan so that it does not allow for any commercial accommodation or linked licensed camps within the current Tasman National Park boundaries.  | See response to comment #8.   | (7)                                 |
| 16                              | 3.5 & 3.6.2 I do not support commercial accommodation or linked licensed camps. I strongly recommend that the plan be amended so that it does not allow for any commercial accommodation or linked licensed camps within the current Tasman National Park boundaries. | Built accommodation and licensed camps is permitted by the TNPMP 2001 (page 54, 55 & 57). Any proposals will be assessed according to the guidelines in the TNPMP 2001 under Section 5.5.7.   | (7)                                 |

## Summary of Public Comments on Fortescue Bay Draft Site Plan 2002

| Respondent Number | Section of Site Plan and Comment   | Response  | Assessment Criteria Reference |
|-------------------|--|---|-------------------------------|
| 17                | 3.5 & 3.6.2 I do not support commercial developments or even linked licensed camps. Parks exist chiefly for the conservation of nature. I strongly recommend that the Fortescue Bay Site plan be amended so that it doesn't allow any commercial accommodation development or linked licensed camps within the national park boundaries. | Noted. See response above.  | (7)                           |
| 19                | The Greens strongly recommend that the Draft Fortescue Bay Site plan be amended so that it does not allow for any commercial accommodation or linked licensed camps within the current Tasman National Park boundaries. It is vital that the natural values of the park be preserved for future generations.                             | The draft site plan is in accordance with the policies of the Tasman National Park Management Plan 2001. The management plan would need to be amended to preclude this type of development in the VSZ.  | (7)                           |
| 20                | I strongly recommend that the plan be amended so that it does not allow for any commercial accommodation or linked licensed camps within the current Tasman National Park boundaries.  | Noted. See response above.  | (7)                           |
| 21                | See 'Commercial accommodation' above.  |   | (7)                           |
| 22                | See 'Commercial accommodation' above and 'Commercial walking operations' below' (No specific mention made of licensed camps).  |   | (7)                           |
| 23                | 3.6.2 It is unclear what is meant by small scale camps along the walking trails to accommodate 10-20 guests. I would have thought the park is neither expansive enough or continuous to justify overnight eco tourism type accommodation.  | Small scale camps refer to licensed camps within the Recreation Zone. These would be limited in number and are required to be removed for a three month period every year. The camps would not be located directly on the existing walking tracks. It may be necessary to develop additional assessment guidelines and criteria for the establishment and operation of licensed camps to ensure that they do not have an adverse impact on natural and recreational values. An action to this effect has been included in Section 3.8.2 of the final site plan. | (2) (4)                       |

## Summary of Public Comments on Fortescue Bay Draft Site Plan 2002

| Respondent<br>Number                           | Section of Site Plan and<br>Comment  | Response  | Assessment<br>Criteria<br>Reference |
|--|--|---|-------------------------------------|
| <b>Issue 28: Commercial walking operations</b> |  |   |                                     |
| 8  | Disagree with allowing commercial walking operations in the park unless self-contained backpacking. Group sizes would need to be managed. See 'Licensed camps' above.  | The TNPMP 2001 specifies that the maximum size for licensed walking tour groups will be consistent with the principles of the <i>Tasmanian Walking Track Strategy and Marketing Plan 1997</i> . Group sizes and the guide to client ratio will depend on the standard of the particular walking track and the duration of the walk. | (2) (4)                             |
| 16   | I would support completely self-contained backpacking operations where such activity does not impact adversely on tracks and campsites.  | Noted. See response to comment #8   | (4)                                 |
| 17   | Consideration be given to commercial walking operations within the park only if they are stringently monitored as self contained and in limited numbers to guard their impact on tracks and campsites.   | Noted. See response to comment #8   | (4)                                 |
| 19   | The Greens support commercial walking operations within the park, but only as completely self contained low-impact backpacking operations. Group sizes need to be carefully managed in order not to degrade tracks and campsites.  | Noted. See response to comment #8   | (4)                                 |
| 20   | I support only completely self-contained backpacking operations in the park, however group sizes need to be carefully managed in order not to impact adversely on tracks and campsites.  | Noted. See response to comment #8   | (4)                                 |
| 21   | If group sizes are carefully managed in order not to impact adversely on tracks and campsites commercial walking operations that are completely self contained backpacking operations may be appropriate within the park. Operations that require huts or any other buildings are inappropriate. | Noted. See response to comment #8   | (4)                                 |

## Summary of Public Comments on Fortescue Bay Draft Site Plan 2002

| Respondent Number         | Section of Site Plan and Comment   | Response  | Assessment Criteria Reference |
|---------------------------|--|---|-------------------------------|
| 22                        | <p>2.4 Strongly oppose the concept of "other operations in the area such as overnight guided walks" need to ban overnight commercial guided walks on the beach as this would endanger nesting beach avifauna and disturb feeding activity.</p> <p>We ask that this prohibition, to cover the breeding period between September and March inclusive be written into the site plan.</p> <p>Banning of nocturnal Little Penguin guided walks "the use of lights and torches at night during the breeding season may deter the species from coming ashore after foraging.</p>  | Any proposals for guided overnight walks will be assessed in accordance with best practice guidelines. The operator would need to demonstrate that they can meet these guidelines before being issued with a licence to conduct these activities. Actions to this effect have been included under Sections 3.2 & 3.4 of the final site plan.  | (4)                           |
| 23                        | 3.6.2 It is unclear what is meant by small scale camps along the walking trails to accommodate 10-20 guests. I would have thought the park is neither expansive enough or continuous to justify overnight eco tourism type accommodation.  | Small scale camps refer to licensed camps within the Recreation Zone. These would be limited in number and be of temporary nature. The camps would not be located directly on any existing walking tracks.  | (4)                           |
| <b>Maps</b>               |  |   |                               |
| 3                         | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Map 4 &amp; 5 Start of Cape Pillar walking track missing</li> </ul>   | Noted. This has been corrected.   | (5)                           |
| 22                        | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Maps 3, 4 &amp; 6 require a different scale which would allow representation of the maps' data in relation to the total beach length so that a true picture of likely visitor impacts on shorebirds can be gauged.</li> <li>Maps 3, 4 &amp; 6 do not contain a necessary indication of cardinal points.</li> <li>From Map 5 it is not possible to understand where a potential vehicular-based cabin accommodation facility "south of the day use area" (sic) could be sited. Where is there sufficient room? This potential development needs to be indicated on Map 5.</li> </ul> | <p>Map 3 now provides an inset map which shows the total length of the beach in relation to the existing campground.</p> <p>Cardinal points have been included on these maps.</p> <p>The potential for a vehicle based accommodation within the VSZ has been deleted from the final site plan as this could lead to further congestion problems at the site and place added demand on scarce resources ie. land, water etc.</p> | (5)<br><br>(5)<br><br>(4) (5) |
| <b>Summary of Actions</b> |  |   |                               |
| 1                         | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Excellent - Supports <i>Summary of Actions</i> that states the existing characteristics of Fortescue Bay's informal recreational atmosphere be preserved.</li> </ul>  | Noted.  |                               |

## Summary of Public Comments on Fortescue Bay Draft Site Plan 2002

| Respondent Number | Section of Site Plan and Comment   | Response   | Assessment Criteria Reference |
|-------------------|--|--|-------------------------------|
| 3                 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Table 1: Additional actions required. See Signposting (2.11 and 2.12) and Fortescue Road (3.9) above.</li> </ul>  | <p>Agreed. This action in relation to term parking for walkers using the Cape Pillar track has been added to Table 1.</p> <p>In relation to signposting Fortescue Road see responses to Issue 12 (Standard of the Fortescue Bay Road).</p>   |                               |
| 7                 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Table 1: cross-referencing to sections is incorrect</li> <li>Wording of sign should separate the warning about log trucks from the warning of road conditions. See submission for wording.</li> </ul>   | <p>Noted. This has been corrected.</p> <p>See responses to Issue 12 (Standard of the Fortescue Bay Road).</p>  | (5)                           |
| 22                | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Table of key recommendations is useless for reference purposes because Section numbers do not match Action locations.</li> <li>There are no management actions of note for protecting birds from the effects of significantly increased numbers of visitors drawn to the area by improved facilities and offerings.</li> <li>There is no compliance with the avian requirements of the <i>Tasman National Park Management Plan 2001</i>.</li> </ul> | <p>This has been corrected so these two sections can be cross referenced.</p> <p>The policies and actions identified for avifauna and their protection in the TNPMP 2001 will apply to the site plan. This has been made much clearer in the final site plan.</p> <p>See above response.</p> | (5)<br><br>(5)<br><br>(5)     |
| <b>References</b> |  |  |                               |
| 10                | Add Richardson et al. (1999) to list of references.  | Noted. This reference has been included in the final site plan.  | (5)                           |

## Summary of Public Comments on Fortescue Bay Draft Site Plan 2002

### Appendix 1 List of respondents to the Draft Fortescue Bay Site Plan 2002.

- 1 Mr Chris Binks, Member of the Public
- 2 Mr Luke Gadd, Member of the Public
- 3 Dr David Leaman, Member of the Public
- 4 Mr Mark Chladil, Tasmania Fire Service
- 5 Mr Michael Lynch, Tasmanian Conservation Trust
- 6 Ms Marcia Solomon, Member of the Public
- 7 Ms Penny Wells, Forestry Tasmania
- 8 Mr Greg Wood, Tasmanian National Parks Association
- 9 Mr Peter Storey, Peninsula Environment Network
- 10 Associate Professor, Alistair Richardson, University of Tasmania, School of Zoology
- 11 Mr Denis Elwell, President, Hobart Walking Club
- 12 Senator Bob Brown, Greens Senator for Tasmania
- 13 Mr David Vliegen, Member of the Public
- 14 Ms Caryn Stevenson, Member of the Public
- 15 Mr Robert Campbell, Member of the Public
- 16 Mr Paul Nelson, Member of the Public
- 17 Mr Geoff Eisenkoeck, Member of the Public
- 18 Ms Ruth Brozek, Tasman Nature Guiding
- 19 Ms Peg Putt, Tasmanian Greens
- 20 Ms Jacqui Fletcher, Member of the Public
- 21 Ms Valerie Nicholls, Member of the Public
- 22 Elizabeth Jones & Priscilla Park, Conservation Committee, Birds Tasmania
- 23 Mr Robin Halton, Member of the Public
- 24 Mr T.N Terry, Member of the Public
- 25 Mr Bruce Davis, Chairperson, National Parks and Wildlife Advisory Committee
- 26 Mr Nick Bates, Senior Ranger, Parks and Wildlife Service, Taranna
- 27 Mr Bryan Sykes, Member of the Public