

MINUTES

of a public meeting held on Tuesday 16 April 2019 at 7:46pm at the City Hall, Hobart, in response to a petition submitted to the City of Hobart by Residents Opposed to the Cable Car.

1. City of Hobart Welcome and Context Setting

The Lord Mayor Councillor Anna Reynolds opened the meeting, welcomed all in attendance and acknowledged the attendance of the Deputy Lord Mayor Councillor Helen Burnet, Aldermen Jeff Briscoe and Tanya Denison, Councillors Bill Harvey, Mike Dutta, Zelinda Sherlock, City of Hobart Acting General Manager – Ms Heather Salisbury and the City of Hobart's Executive Leadership Team.

The Lord Mayor also noted the attendance of the Secretary of the Department of State Growth – Mr Kim Evans, the Department of State Growth Acting Senior Director Business Finance and Strategic Programs – Mr Andrew Smythe, the Department of State Growth Director Policy and Coordination – Ms Anne Beach, the Chairperson of the Wellington Park Management Trust – Dr Christine Mucha and the Manager of the Wellington Park Management Trust – Mr Alex Von Krusenstierna.

The Lord Mayor introduced the Chairperson for the meeting Mr Alex Johnston.

2. Introduction from the Chairperson

The Chairperson, Mr Alex Johnston opened the meeting and welcomed those in attendance and provided a brief overview on how the meeting was to be conducted and of the public meeting rules.

3. Background on the Cable Car Issue

Mr Glenn Doyle, Director City Amenity addressed the meeting on behalf of the City of Hobart and provided the background around the cable car issue.

4. Noting of Summary of Submissions Received on the Subject Matter of the Meeting

A copy of the summary of submissions received is attached.

Moved: *Ted Cutlan*

Seconded: *Barbara Murphy*

That the meeting receive and note the summary of submissions.

Motion Carried



City of **HOBART**

5. **Speakers/Questions/Motions/Discussions**

The Chairperson invited members of the audience to address the meeting.

At the conclusion of the discussion, the Chairperson invited motions from the floor.

Motion 1

Moved: Louise Sales

Seconded: Ted Cutlan

This meeting calls on the State Government to:

1. Respect the wishes of the local Aboriginal community;
2. Respect the scenic and cultural value of the Organ Pipes;
3. Respect the Wellington Park Management Plan;
4. Ensure the protection of the threatened species living in the foothills of kynanyi/Mount Wellington;
5. Rule out over-riding the rights of landowners and compulsorily acquiring land of the project.

Motion Carried

Motion 2

Moved: Philip Stigant

Seconded: Joy Stones

This meeting condemns the proposal for a large commercial building at the pinnacle and a cableway that would cross directly over the Organ Pipes cliffs.



Motion 2 (cont)

This meeting request that the Hobart City Council:

1. Maintain its' prohibition of the use of Council land for such a project;
2. Not provide monetary or any other support for this project or an associated infrastructure; and
3. When sitting as a Planning Authority, recognise that neither a cable car nor a large building above the Organ Pipes are compatible with preservation or protection of the natural beauty of kunanyi/Mount Wellington.

Motion Carried

Motion 3

Moved: Bernard Lloyd

Seconded: Louise Sales

That the sponsors of this public meeting be entrusted to write to the Premier;

1. Detailing the concerns around governance expressed during this meeting;
2. Seeking assurances from the Premier that the State Government and its instrumentalities will act with these concerns and assurances foremost in their minds; and
3. Requesting the Premier to meet from time to time with sponsors of this public meeting.

Motion Carried



City of HOBART

Motion 4

Moved: ***Geoffrey Bradshaw***

Seconded: ***Sharon Connolly***

This meeting calls on the Tasmanian Labor Party and Labor federal candidates, to oppose any kind of cable car development, and also to oppose any kind of commercial development at or near the summit of kunanyi/Mount Wellington.

Motion Carried

8. Closure

The Chairperson thanked all those in attendance and closed the meeting at 9:23pm.

Public Meeting – Cable Car

Summary of submissions

524 submissions were received from members of the community.

475 were opposed to a cable car development on kunanyi / Mt Wellington.

37 were supportive of a development on kunanyi / Mt Wellington.

12 were unclear.

313 of the submissions spoke of the mountain holding a special place in the heart of many Hobartians and Tasmanians and that many care very deeply about the mountain.

These submissions called for the Hobart City Council to recognise the important and well-documented natural values of the bushland it owns and manages.

Specifically, they called for the Council to continue the same position as Carlton United Brewery (CUB) and to never allow rezoning of bushland or the removal of the existing prohibition on the use of Council land for a cable car or related infrastructure.

They also asked that the Council take a public position of not providing any financial assistance to the proposed development, including upgrades to public infrastructure.

They also asked that the Hobart City Council, in assessing any potential development application, insist on an independent visual, economic, traffic and environmental impact assessment of the entire development.

Of the remaining 162 submissions that were opposed to a development, there were many that viewed the mountain as a unique 'wild' place where people enjoyed the peace and tranquillity of nature and strong sacred connection to the land. Many were concerned that this 'sense of place' would be lost with a cable car travelling overhead of popular tracks and commented on the resulting social impact. They also felt the mountain's natural features were a significant tourist attraction and should be preserved, particularly the Organ Pipes.

Concerns were raised about the impact of increased traffic in South Hobart and who would fund improvements required to manage any increase. There were also concerns the existing road would be closed limiting access by locals.

Many were concerned about the visual impact and wanted view lines from various locations and the summit to be protected from further obstruction of infrastructure.

Impact on cultural heritage was raised and concerns emerged that first nation people had not been appropriately consulted. There were also concerns that local residents had not been consulted.

Many commented on the environmental impact and raised concerns about damage to the summit's alpine habitat, impact on flora and fauna and loss of habitat for threatened species.

Economic impact was also a concern. Some were concerned about the project's viability and that it was too reliant on cruise ship trade, could not operate in winds above 80km and would have low numbers on cloudy days. Some raised concerns about business failure and local or state funding being required to support the project. There was also concern about maintenance and removal of infrastructure should the business fail.

Others were concerned about economic impact on local businesses through loss of trade. Many were concerned that the project would have a detrimental impact on tourism, as it wasn't in keeping with the State image.

Comments were also made about the fare being too expensive for locals therefore restricting public access to public land.

Many submissions commented that public land should not be used for private commercial business and to approve a development would set a precedent.

Concerns were expressed about the State Government's involvement and the change of legislation to facilitate access.

Some submissions were concerned the proposal did not align with the City of Hobart's vision document 'Hobart: A community vision for our island capital', The Wellington Park Trust's mission and values statements or the *Wellington Park Act 1993*.

Some submissions were supportive of a development (restaurant and visitor centre) at The Springs and for other transport options to be investigated including those identified in the Wellington Park Trust Sustainable Transport Strategy.

Of the submissions that were supportive of the development and the submission of a development application, many were concerned that it was too early for a public meeting, and that it was not in accordance with the petition to hold a meeting at this time. They were also concerned about the cost to ratepayers and that the public meeting not become a ratepayer funded rally against the Cable Car.

Some commented that the project was a State project for all Tasmanians.

Some commented the project was more environmentally friendly as it reduced the number of cars and busses travelling to the summit. They also raised safety concerns about the condition of the existing road.

Many commented they were supportive because it would be good for tourism and would provide year-round access to the summit.