

**THE CULTURE & CULTURAL VALUES  
OF THE  
WELLINGTON RANGE**

**PART 1**

**Peter MacFie ©**

**2004 & 2017**

# WELLINGTON RANGE MANAGEMENT PLAN

## Chapter 1 - Background

### 1.2 Legislative Frame work

### 1.3 Management Arrangements

\*\*\*\*\*

## Chapter 2 – Statement of Significance

### 2.3 Cultural values

#### **Mt Wellington as a Cultural Place.**

*The whole atmosphere spelt health... Mount Wellington used to loom down as if to stay: 'Stay here. Surely this place can be hospitable to you.'*<sup>1</sup>

From the first years of settlement, Mt Wellington has attracted locals and visitors to explore its surface. People have been attracted to Mt Wellington for many reasons; celebration, retreat, recreation, escape, survival, aesthetics, scientific study, to write about its aura, and depict its moods.

Mt Wellington Range has evoked strong cultural and social responses from local, Tasmanian and visitor communities. These responses have varied from the reverential to the near barbarous. All have left an imprint on the people involved and they have made a physical impact on the mountain range, modifying its topography and probably its ecology, but have enhanced the quality of all users immeasurably.

Not all people viewed the experience with pleasure; the 'Susso' men felt building the Mountain Road during the Depression, or the prisoners who were housed in a Stockade on the mountain when track building in 1886, probably had mixed feelings. The hermits who occupied the mountain, and the groups of friends who built huts for weekend sojourns - all had differing views on the meaning of the Mountain.

The freedom and familiarity with which Hobart residents walked into the Park, and the unaffected ease with which like-minded groups built huts for their shared interests, reveals much of the closeness with which Tasmanians view 'their' Mountain. Such familiarity explains why Jack Thwaites, the Hobart Walking Club and others could build structures that were meant to stay; Jack and many others were 'claiming' their aesthetic inheritance.

Mt Wellington's reassuring presence pervades the atmosphere and dominates the skyline of Hobart and southern Tasmania. Similarly, the varied sections of the Mt Wellington Range -Collins Bonnet, the Sleeping Beauty- dominate the lives of communities on its slopes.

Mt Wellington Range has brought varied response from different communities on its boundary. While recreation has driven local and visitor use of the Mountain Park above Hobart, a utilitarian response has resulted in a different relationship from communities to the north and south of the Range. They saw the mountain with local perceptions; some sympathetic, some exploitive. The homes these communities live in were built from timber on the heavily forested hillsides, as Degraives exploited the forest stands at the Cascades in the 1820s.

---

<sup>1</sup> A. D. Luckman, in Roe, 1969

While the eastern face above Hobart tended to divide, the western end of the Mt Wellington Range allowed passage of the Huon and New Norfolk communities via Jefferey's Track, so much so that work, social life and marriage of the two districts were interconnected, and, to a limited extent, remain so.

Until studies examine the interaction and experience of communities and individuals, the full value and cultural significance of the Mountain Park, and Mt Wellington Range will not be understood.

## **Cultural Significance**

The most distinctive feature of the Mt Wellington Range is that, after 200 years of European settlement, and 40,000 years of aboriginal occupation, the area is a cultural landscape as well as a physiological landscape.

The Mt Wellington Range has always 'belonged' to the people of Hobart and southern Tasmania.

The cultural significance of the Park and Range, derives from an interaction between it and the communities who live with the Mountain, even when not physically on it.

The cultural significance may best be understood by separating the Mountain Park from the Mt Wellington Range

## **Mountain Park**

Mt Wellington evoked an early response from new settlers and was arguably the first native wilderness which attracted and confronted the new arrivals in Van Dieman's Land.

The alpine and semi-alpine environment was the first such experience new Australian settlers had to interact with. Its appearance, plants, animals and weather patterns were a constant reminder that this was a new land.

More than any other single natural feature, Mt Wellington aroused scientific general interest in native flora and fauna. Mt Wellington became the most intensively surveyed ecological environment in Tasmania with the earliest and most detailed collection of botanical and geological specimens of any micro ecology.

Forests of Wellington Range forests provided timber for construction of homes from the colonial period to the 1960s.

The needs of recreational users and visitors resulted in man-made features -such as the paths and roads- being erected by disadvantaged labourers, including prisoners.

Mt Wellington became home for low income workers and hermits, some of whom chose to live on the mountain. (eg Woods, Lacey, Griffiths) These people became the first guides, guardians, and honorary rangers on the mountain.

Mt Wellington became the first centre in Tasmania for 19thC 'eco-tourism'. These began with the Springs Ice-houses in the 1850s, and grew with the establishment of Springs Hotel in 1907.

In the late 19thC, Mt Wellington became a recreational area for tradesmen and other Hobart residents who erected huts for overnight retreats. The 19thC huts symbolised an acceptance and adaptation of local materials from the local environment.

Concern for the appearance of Mt Wellington evoked the first attempt to conserve native wilderness. Reserved from 1876, Mt Wellington became the first area in Tasmania set aside for scenic beauty.

The 1906 Mountain Park Act became the first Act of Parliament to specifically reserve an area of land for aesthetic reasons. Under the Act, the Park was the first to accept and supervise visitors as part of

its function, and the first to use a 'ranger' to cut tracks and act as a guide for visitors. This Act allowed, against public opposition, the construction of a hotel at The Springs, and the erection of an aerial tramway which were seen as a joint proposal.

Mountain Park became the first urban area in Tasmania where the conflicting demands of place, of aesthetics, of visitors and the utilitarian needs of a communities' demands for water and firewood, were contended with by a management structure. It was a model for the clash between conservation and utilitarian values. It also became the first residential area in Australia where an urban/alpine environment developed.

### **Mt Wellington Range**

The foothills of the Mt Wellington Range became home for migrant groups which settled into isolated communities- the Danish/German at Collinsvale, the Irish/English at Lachlan, and the emancipists in the Mountain River/Crabtree districts.

These communities developed a utilitarian relationship to the Mt Wellington Range, combined with a deep attachment to the sections of the Range which were a permanent backdrop.

Using the Jeffries Track on the western edge of the Range, rural communities of New Norfolk and Huon Valleys traded and maintained social contact.

## **2.4 Recreational Values**

### **Historical Background**

Mt Wellington was initially used by the urban elite of Southern Tasmania in the early years of the 19thC, but with increased affluence, Hobartians of all social backgrounds walked and camped on the mountain. Access was increased by the formation of the Huon Road, a growth in summer tourism, and was increased by the extension of the tramways to Cascades in 1893.

In the late 19thC the construction of huts by groups of friends and employees on the slopes added to regular recreational use.

Uncontrolled use of the reserve threatened its survival; in 1887 Perrin, Conservator of Forests warned of the threats to the mountain, when 'excursionists, chiefly troops of boys, armed with tomahawks and guns invaded the mountain at holiday time, 'lighting fires, chopping down saplings, or setting fire to the forest...'<sup>2</sup>

A cottage occupied by Woods was erected at The Springs in the 1870's, and the family became unofficial guides to visitors.

Increased use resulted in pressure on the reserve, and the introduction during the Edwardian era of a network of tracks to natural and scientific features. These were instigated for tourist promotion. Seats and botanical labels were introduced, adding to the recreational and educative nature of the reserve.

With the enactment of the 1906 Mountain Park Act, the recreational role of the mountain was formally acknowledged. Construction of The Springs Hotel as a private endeavour typified the optimism and extent of use expected.

Construction of the Pinnacle Road during the Depression provided east access for visitors, but removed some of the mystique and romance of the mountain.

---

<sup>2</sup> Perrin, 1887

The pressure of daily short term tourist excursions, with the need for larger scale facilities, has - and can still - threaten the longer term aesthetics and interests of the mountain for low impact recreational use.

## 2.6 Utility Values

### Historical Background

The natural resources of Mt Wellington - water and timber - were exploited by early Hobart settlers. When Jane Franklin's party first ascended Mt Wellington in 1837, they made use of a timber carter's track.

Saw-pits, and Degraives' sawmill operated on the Cascades foothills soon after Settlement.

Wood-carters used the Range until recent years to supply the domestic and industrial needs of urban Hobart.

Other sources suggest the Mountain was home to landless bush workers. An 1847 painting by De Wesselow shows a sod hut under the towering Organ Pipes, with bee hives stored nearby.

Hobart's water supply relied on the water quality of streams from the mountain. Five municipalities had water catchments and storage schemes taken from the Mt Wellington Range. Some of these still operate.

Rural communities along the north and southern foothills of the Mt Wellington Range have traditionally used its resources until recently; timber for milling, firewood and charcoal for hop industry, skins for fur trade, kangaroo meat for cheap diet, sheep-grazing.

## Chapter 3. Management Philosophy

### 3.1 Background

#### Management History

*...this grand recreation ground...should make its proper care and supervision.... the first care of its citizens.....Mt Wellington -its timbered slopes and gullies- ...should be jealously guarded ...*

*(Perrin, 1884)*

Despite periodic attempts to control human activity on Mt Wellington, the management history of the Mt Wellington Park, and particularly the Mt Wellington Range, can be described as laissez faire at best.

Although the mountain has been praised by visitor and locals alike, no successful attempt has been made at implementing an ongoing and pragmatic operation that meets the needs of the Mt Wellington Range and its users.

A key reason for lack of effective management of Mt Wellington is due to the division of the reserve among 5 municipalities, making agreement and control almost impossible.

The management of Mountain Park by the HCC allowed for direct input from low key users, familiar with the bureaucracy. However, the growth in tourism has not been met by a growth in resources to cope with the many visitors who visit the Park from outside the City boundary.

#### 19th C Management History

A study of the Park's management history gives an indication of the issues encountered, many of which are perennial. Beginning in 1876, a series of attempts at management of the mountain were initiated, culminating in the 1906 Mountain Park Act. The initial motive for initiating control over activity was to curb destruction of man-ferns by visitors removing branches for decoration. The need for a pristine water supply was a key factor also.

Despite these attempts, a lack of staff, assertive skilful management, and powers, made the failure inevitable.

#### Attempts at Management

##### 1. 1876 Young Proposal.

Russell Young, lawyer and Franklin MHA, received unanimous support. His aims were, '...to conserve for the benefit of the inhabitants of Tasmania that portion of Mt Wellington that at present remains un-alienated...'

He noted the destruction of the scenery, and continued,

*...the question of conserving public forests was one that engaged the attention of leading men in many countries; ...before the question of conserving Mt Wellington for pleasure grounds for the citizen, was that of the climatic effects which forest lands have in relation to the public health. The forest lands of Mt Wellington are also valuable in connection with water supply to the people of Hobart....<sup>3</sup>*

---

<sup>3</sup> Russell Young, MHA for Franklin

Young was well read on the subject, as he outlined current international ideas on the issue of forestation from New Zealand, Europe and North America.<sup>4</sup> A vote to ask the Governor to set aside land was agreed to; but the eventual outcome is unclear.

## 2. 1884 Henry Dobson & the Royal Society

Eight years later, the same damage to the mountain was noted by Justice Lambert Dobson, who asked a meeting of the Royal Society to support control on visitor behaviour to Mt Wellington. Dobson regarded Hobart's two main assets as the mountain and the river. He then;

... alluded to the wanton and mischievous destruction of the tree ferns on Mt Wellington. Many glens and other localities on the mountain had been utterly robbed of all their beauty and attraction by the stupid destruction of these trees, some of which no doubt represented a growth of 50 to 100 years. ....this desecration was permitted by many of whom better things might have been expected and in many cases for the mere decoration of ballroom, trees were cut down which we could never hope to see replaced in a lifetime. He thought something might be done to stop this senseless waste of beauty as far as Mt Wellington Reserve was concerned, by constituting it a people's park, and making it penal to remove ferns and other trees. If government took the initiative in the preservation of ferns it was probable that many private individuals....might be induced to follow the good example.<sup>5</sup>

After discussion, in which almost all present joined, it was resolved that a committee be appointed to bring the views of the meeting under the notice of the government.

(Committee of Justice Dobson, Mayor Belbin, Col Legge, CH Grant. , and hon sec Dr Agnew.)<sup>6</sup>

The Society was concerned with,

... destruction of ferns at the Bower had been brought under the notice of the last meeting by Justice Dobson.... a deputation had waited on Min for Lands.... he the Minister had entered heartily into the matter, and would do all in his power to carry out the objects of the deputation. Arrangements ....(were) made to define the boundaries of private property in the locality, and as soon as this was done, boards would be erected warning people not to cut ferns on the Crown land and bailiffs would be instructed to see that the notices were respected.<sup>7</sup>

Eventually a deputation met with the Minister for Lands to institute controls, including sign boards and bailiffs, but these do not appear to have had much effect.

(In 1906, Dobson became a prime mover and investor in the syndicate pushing for the reservation of the Mountain Park, and an investor in the joint venture Mt Wellington Hotel Co Ltd. and the Aerial Tramway. Co .)

## 3. 1887 . State Reserve at Mount Wellington Recommend by George Perrin

In a report to parliament, George Perrin (Conservator of Forests) again voiced alarm at the continued destruction on the mountain. He pointed to fire as a chief scourge, 'caused by excursionists, chiefly boys. ... Troops of boys, armed with tomahawks and guns, are everywhere to be met with in a

---

<sup>4</sup> Merc 13/10/1876

<sup>5</sup> Justice Lambert Dobson

<sup>6</sup> P&P Roy Soc Tas, June 1884, P lxxii

<sup>7</sup> *ibid*, Aug 84, P -Ferns on the Mountain.

holiday time, lighting fires, chopping down saplings or setting fire to the forest by the use of inflammable gun-wads.<sup>8</sup>

The great advantage possessed by this grand recreation ground, its nearness to the city, and other natural beauties, should make the proper care and supervision of a place do eminently suited to the wants of a large and ever increasing city the first care of its citizens.

I think I may safely say Mt Wellington - its timbered slopes and gullies - occupy a leading if not a chief position among such surroundings, and hence should be jealousy guarded from acts of vandalism now so common. The tracks are greatly neglected....<sup>9</sup>

Perrin then described the climatic effects a denuded Mt Wellington would have on Hobart and its water supply. He recommended a series of management measures, including a caretaker, improved tracks and severe penalties.

#### **4. 1906 Mountain Park Act**

Although received with much fanfare as a 'National Park', the new act gave only limited powers, and was seen by some as an attempt to legitimise the Mt Wellington Aerial Railway Act.

The Mountain Park Act did introduce a management structure for the first time. This was under the control of the Hobart City Council Reserves Committee, who managed a limited budget amongst dozens of conflicting demands. This was to be the eventual downfall of practical management, and by 1930 the Mountain Park Act was annulled and the Park management merged into the Hobart Corporation Act.

### **Earlier Management Studies**

In recent years, several studies of a conservation/management have been undertaken. No attempt has been made to assess the cultural impact of Mt Wellington on the surrounding population, or vice versa.

#### **1. K. L. Rahbek, 1900, Report on Hotel or Sanatorium at The Springs, Mt Wellington<sup>10</sup>**

A successful attempt to deter proposed development at The Springs in 1900, suggesting instead a site lower down, and the removal of existing structures, 'cottage and other sheds', at the Springs. A map enclosed indicates existing and proposed roads, and structures, including the position of the Stockade.<sup>11</sup>

#### **2. 1927. Management Study Proposal<sup>12</sup>**

This appears to be the earliest conceptual study of the Mountain Park. Although with a forester's bias, Irby suggested to the HCC Reserves Committee, a 12 point study of the Park to identify reasons for degradation. These included a survey and compartmentalising of the mountain; geological, climatic and silvicultural studies, and examination of fire protection.

He also proposed plans for upgrading visitor facilities, with tracks, fireplaces, seats and picnic areas. Irby's progressive proposal was rejected.<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> George Perrin, Conservator of Forests

<sup>9</sup> George Perrin, Conservator of Forests

<sup>10</sup> H of A Parl Papers, , No 68, 1900

<sup>11</sup> see report and map in appendix

<sup>12</sup> L G Irby, Conservator of Forests

<sup>13</sup> MCC 16/72/10, 25/11/1927. TSA



### **3. 1927 Master Builders Proposal.**

At the same time, a convention of the Master Builders Association in Hobart called for a re-forestation policy.<sup>14</sup>

## **3.3 Specific Land Use Objectives**

### **3.3.6 Cultural Land Use Values.**

As indicated, use of the Mt Wellington Range has a long tradition of physical occupancy. Access to huts is also organised privately while maintenance of is carried on in a voluntary manner.

At present hut users are reluctant to alert authorities to their existence, for fear of vandalism, and a fear of unsympathetic treatment by council or government officers. Users are particularly fearful of the transfer of management from the HCC to PW & H, who are regarded as unsympathetic to their traditional access.

#### **Objectives**

The needs of traditional land-users needs to be protected. These include the future of traditional tracks, the future of huts erected by various walking clubs and groups of friends. At present the status of these structures is uncertain. These need to be validated.

#### **Recommended Management Actions**

A management plan on the future of the huts and tracks, based on community consultation and research, should determine whether the tradition of hut erection and maintenance is continued.

---

<sup>14</sup> MCC 16/72/10 11/1/27

## Chapter 4 Conservation Values

### 4.5 Cultural Values.

#### 4.5.1 Context

Mt Wellington Range provides a variety of cultural sites and functions which relate to communities on all sides of the Range. These cultural functions are not dormant but part of the continuing involvement by the communities in their relationship with the Wellington Range.

The inter-relationships with the community are varied, (as previously indicated) from the predominantly recreational use on the Hobart side, coupled with utilitarianism and the more isolated rural communities to the north and south of the Range.

This utilitarianism was once part of the early history of the Mountain Park near Hobart, when timber and water was exploited. This function was lessened in recent years in favour of predominantly recreational activities, while the older utilitarian functions still operate in other municipalities on the Range.

The communities based around the Range are essentially Mountain Communities, whose life and culture has been dictated to by the weather patterns, topography and resources of the foothills on which they live. Special skills were necessary to live with and exploit the Range.

In this sense, these people have never let go of the mountain, and still claim it as an inheritance.

Many historic sites are, in the main, still part of the recent past. In the case of the huts on the mountain's Hobart face, they are still part of the living interaction with the mountain, with some being maintained on a voluntary basis by friends and fellow 'members', for the communal good. The Stone Cabin, for example, was rebuilt after the 1967 bushfires; response to vandalism and general repairs are carried out unselfishly, and without formal approval.

Similarly, the Hobart Walking Club re-cut the trail to Collins Bonnet in 1977.

The inter-action of community with the mountain, the phases in which tracks and huts were built, reveal much about the social history of Hobart and southern Tasmania. While the huts were built by occupation groups such as hair-dressers, camera club members, and employees of Cascade Brewery and Cordial Factory, earlier huts were erected for more pragmatic means - that of survival.

By contrast, the erection of The Springs Hotel in 1907 reflects a more sophisticated phase of tourism. This growth was a continuation of the use by the urban elite of the mountain as an aesthetic and sensual experience, beginning with Jane Franklin, and continued with construction of the Mt Wellington Ice Houses on the initiative of Lt Governor Denison, a Royal Engineer. Here the affluent residents of Hobart met in the heat of summer.

A noticeable change in use in recent years has been the concentrated use by day walkers and 'peak conquerors,' rather than the earlier tradition of over-night bivouacking in huts or under canvas.

Other districts backing onto the Range are noticeable in not developing tracks and making recreational - use in a formal sense - of this asset., and probably reflects the lack of an urban elite in these areas. Instead, the resources were seen in a more pragmatic manner, as timber to be exploited. The exception was Collinsvale, which developed a small tourism industry prior to World War I.

#### 4.5.2 Cultural Management Objectives

The chief objective should be to manage and interpret the Mt Wellington Range as a cultural site, as much as a natural physical site. Specifically, management objectives should seek;

- to relate the cultural history of Hobart and Southern Tasmanian communities to extant structures on the Mt Wellington Range
- to identify historical significance of tracks and develop a maintenance strategy
- to identify and preserve ruins and sites of vanished huts and develop a conservation and interpretation strategy
- to identify huts of current usage, and devise acceptable usage regime for traditional users
- to identify cultural values felt by local communities and to manage the mountain and any historic sites with their support and on their behalf
- to manage and maintain the mountain range as a part of the living history of surrounding communities
- to research, identify and conserve the 19thC recreational sites
- to research, identify and conserve the work sites and camps of prison labourers
- to research, identify and conserve sites connected with construction of the Mountain Road.

### **Previous Management Studies**

All earlier studies have concentrated largely on the management of the mountain's physiology. Apart from the Hobart Waterworks, little thought has been given to the interactive and continued tradition of mountain users.

With increased use of the mountain, traditional cultural values are likely to be threatened.

Any study of historic sites within the Range need to take into account the living history of the Range, including the huts of the Mountain Park, and the utilitarian remains of sawmills etc. within the broader areas of the Mt Wellington Range.

### **4.5.3 Recommended Management Actions**

#### **Historical and Archaeological Research**

- Identify sawmill sites within the Mt Wellington Range.
- Identify remains of huts sites in Mt Wellington Range
- Identify sites connected with prison labour, particularly the Stockade.

#### **Thematic and Interpretive Studies.**

The following are areas of and research, applicable to management and interpretation of the cultural significance of the mountain.

*Management of the Mountain.* Mt Wellington Park was the first declared Park in Tasmania. As indicated, the history of the formal management of Mt Wellington is now nearing 90 years since the first Mountain Park Act. A study of the Park's management would indicate the strengths and weaknesses of the previous years, from which much can be learnt for future planning.

*Social History- Tracks, Huts and Rangers* A thematic analysis of the evolution of tracks and huts, their builders and members will reveal much about the history of Mt Wellington and the social life of Hobart and Tasmania.

*Reshaping the Mountain.* Since settlement, the mountain had been moulded to meet the needs and aspirations of settlers. Construction of tramways, tracks and roads with related facilities has altered the appearance and perceptions of the mountain. Some of these works were performed by a conscripted work-force.

*Visitors and Mountain Dwellers* ..The mountain has been visited by all social groups. At Ferntree, before World War I 'Strawberry Feasts' entertained the affluent. Hobart hairdressers and Cascade Company staff built huts on the mountain face. To others from necessity the mountain was home. A study of the varied social groups who used the mountain reveals much of Hobart's past.

*Springs Hotel Site.* A study of this site would provide historical/interpretive material, and document the site's building and environmental history.

*Women on the Mountain.* From Jane Franklin to Lucy Pitman, a World War I nurse, managed the Springs Hotel from 1927, women have been associated with the mountain. The role of women on the mountain ,including the Pitmans, and the wives of rangers needs investigation.

*The Pinnacle Road- an (urgent) oral history project.*

Construction of the road during the Depression gave employment to Tasmanian men. Interviews with surviving workers, and documentation of their efforts is urgently needed.

*The Prisoners Stockade.* In 1886, men from the Hobart Penitentiary worked on track clearance on the mountain. On the Mountain they were housed in a Stockade. Documentation of these men and their labour, identification and interpretation of the Stockade would add detail to the Mountain's history.

### **Further Research**

Identify the water management implications of existing water schemes, other than Hobart's, which rely on the Mt Wellington Range.

Identify the significance of Zone 4, and specifically Jefferey's Track

Identify the relationship between rural communities and the Wellington Range.

### **Educational Training**

Promote training of staff and teachers on the cultural natural assets and significance of the Wellington Range.

Promote training of staff, teachers and community groups of cultural and natural assets of the Mt Wellington Range, particularly in areas where there is little community involvement at present. eg, Glenorchy, Collinsvale, Mountain River, Crabtree. etc

## **Interpretation**

*Signage* . Tracks, historical walking routes and huts; major features, spring site; botanical walks.

*Interpretation Centre*. Location of a low impact centre, possibly based on the style of Clematis Hut needs consideration.

## Chapter 5. Visitor Activities and Development

### 5.1 Access

#### 5.1.1 Context

Residents of urban Hobart and the rural communities have regarded the Wellington range as their domain. Apart from the Mountain Park, the timber resources have until recently been a traditional resource for these communities. Restrictions on access and supervision need to be managed in a cooperative agreement with these communities.

Locked gates were a point of contention for residents accustomed to decades of unhindered access. All appreciated the need for gates to control the extreme 4WD crowd. Some resented the need to apply to PWH for keys and then return. This was more true of older people who travel less to Hobart.

#### 5.3 Tourism

Context. Opportunities for tourism exist, both on the Mountain Park, and in more isolated regions. These included re-kindling the tourism industry at Collinsvale.

#### 5.4 Facility Design etc

##### Context.

##### (Some issues raised)

##### Visitor facilities & Signage

The lack of visitor facilities and informative signs was noted. The lack of maintenance of facilities at Myrtle Forest, Collinsvale, was evident. Lack of policing has resulted in the removal of man-ferns also. The Collins Cap access to the fire trail is past a slaughterhouse. Residents of Crabtree were effected by access by vehicles to Jeffries Track. (see below)

##### Road Maintenance.

A general concern. Access for the reliable user increasingly denied as tracks deteriorate. Less control as 'sensible' users then travel less.

Car-parking facilities were almost non-existent in these areas.

##### Subdivisions

Additional strain on the Range - particularly from bushfires - is likely from continued subdivision of old farming areas. At Mountain River new home owners are building in isolated bush settings.

##### Fire-Proneness

Prevention of dead wood collection, and bush centred housing on the verge of the Range was thought by some older residents a recipe for extreme bushfires.

##### Firewood Collecting

Timber gathering for firewood was a traditional use of the Range. This occurred in all areas. Continued use will allow a reduction in bushfire fuel, and also allow legitimate use of a traditional use which will only occur illegally otherwise.

## 5.7 Economic Resources

### 5.7.1. Context

Water and timber resources of the Mt Wellington Range have been a traditional source of mainstay and livelihood.

#### Water Schemes

Several districts have operating water schemes taken from the streams running off the Range. These include older schemes, such as Glenorchy, and smaller schemes, such as the Lachlan-New Norfolk, and Mountain River.

#### Operation of Small Water Schemes

While the beginnings of Hobart's early water schemes from Mount Wellington are known, the water catchment provided by the Wellington Ranges for other district water schemes is not recognised or well documented. These are worthy of further study, both for historical reasons, and to understand the importance of the catchment on the districts below and their impact on the ecology of the Range.

Two older schemes are the early 19th century Lachlan-New Norfolk scheme which supplied the village in its formative years, and the Mountain River scheme which supplies residents. The latter scheme, begun c1940, is drawn from an intake on Blackfish Creek, a tributary of Mountain River. Both systems are still operating.

#### Timber Resource

Firewood timber -gathering and collection of milling logs have been a traditional activity for local residents in rural communities on the boundary.

## Chapter 6 Management Practices

\*\*\*

## Chapter 7 Management Zones

### 7.1 Cultural Context

To better understand and assist in management of the Wellington Range, recognition of current human contact or Community Contact Zones is suggested. These zones derive from the communities located on the foothills and who have traditionally interacted with the Ranges. (see Chapter 7)

Historically, these zones extended from the communities outside the Wellington Range, to include areas within. Use of timber leases, and continued reliance on water source, are examples of this interrelationship. Similarly at Collinsvale, Edwardian-era tourist attractions of Myrtle Forest and track to Collins Bonnet, and Fairy Glen also crossed into the Range. Such inter-relationship effected the economy of smaller communities.

Today the extension of community into park continues with the preservation of water quality, and the use of recreational trails and small scale (unofficial) wood carting.

While the Mountain Park is the most popular zone, other zones exist on the northern and southern flanks of the Ranges. Each of these zones reflect features common to the community at its base. Some of these are unique while others are shared.

Management of access, of ecology, of visitor experience, of fire and of water quality within the Range will is dependent on the degree of interaction with the communities in these zones.

Help from residents in these communities - as unofficial guardians of the Range - already exists. This assistance needs to be formalised and built on.

### Community Contact Zones

Zone 1. Mountain Park Zone.

Zone 2. Northern Face Zone.

Glenorchy

Collinsvale/Collins Cap.

Lachlan

Zone 3. Southern Face Zone

Mountain River

Crabtree

Zone 4. Western Zone.

Jefferey's Track



## 7.5 Zone 4

### 7.5.1 Context

This zone encompasses the least understood or studied area of the Wellington Ranges and is bisected by several streams and the Jefferey's Track.

### 7.5.2 Significance

At the western end of the Mt Wellington Range, the Judd River marks the entrance to the Southwest Wilderness. This area was exploited for timber but in social historical terms is little understood. The Jefferey's Track provided a link with the Huon and New Norfolk communities.

### 7.5.3 Management Objectives.

Traditionally an area for logging which was carried out around Mt Charles in the 1960's. Access to the Huon/New Norfolk districts was a traditional activity. Current access by 4WD via the Jefferey's Track makes management ineffective.

#### Jefferey's Track.

Accessibility of the track in 4WD is well known, especially in the Lachlan/New Norfolk area. The track has also been used by contemporary and current residents to commute from the Huon to work in the Derwent Valley, by motor bike or 4WD.

Nationally the Jeffries Track has been promoted as an off-the-beaten-track alternative route for visitors; 2 years ago a Crabtree resident saw a window display in a Sydney travel agency featuring the Jeffries Track with this emphasis.

#### Track Abuse

Uncontrolled use. Locals commented on the lack of supervision of vehicle access. They were appreciative of the efforts of PWH rangers, who had limited resources.

The Track is regularly used by 4WD parties from New Norfolk on 'booze cruises'. These involve two way night-time crossings along the route. Residents of upper Crabtree have to contend with such parties in road-sides in their area. Recently a party of 18 4WD parked in Crabtree by-roads for such an occasion. The rat-bag 4WD element churn up areas along the track with 'mud-runs.'

Lack of signage to indicate, i) the state of the track, and ii) facilities, is also putting strain on local residents, who regularly have to pull two wheel drive vehicles from the road.

Use of the key-borrowing system was thought satisfactory. But with no regular supervision there is no system of check-ups.

Nomenclature. None of either Lachlan or Huon residents know the road as 'Jeffries Track.' Lachlan residents call it 'the Huon Track', while Huon residents refer to it as 'the New Norfolk Track.'

### 7.5.3 Recommended Action Plan

Research recommended for more detail on this area.

## Chapter 8 Administrative and Organisational Structures

### 8.1 Administrative Powers

#### 8.1.1. Context

Traditional use of the Park, including hut building and maintenance etc. appears to have been done on a voluntary manner with tacit council approval. Formalised structures will need to instigate a method of management which, while protecting the natural assets of the Wellington Range, does not shut the community out of its cultural inheritance.

### 8.2 Tenures and Licences

#### 8.2.1 Context.

Huts and hut guardians have not been licensed, as indicated. Management of an organised type of semi-private tenure for hut users would allow a continuation of this connection, and, given the cost of staff, is still the best method of hut maintenance.

## Bibliography

### Books and Reports

Anon, Collinsville School Centenary, 1877-1977, Hobart, 1977.

Alexander, A. Glenorchy, 1804-1964, Glenorchy, 1986.

Conrad, P Down Home- Revisiting Tasmania, 1988, P. 214.

Davies, R "The Mount Wellington Huts,' Tas Tramp, No 20. 1972, Pp 56-62.

de, Quincey, E. The History of Mount Wellington, A Tasmanian Sketchbook, Hobart, 1987.

Evans, K. Hop Industry Study, ??, PW&H, 1994.

McPhails Directory, 1867-8, TL

Muddle, G. 'The Jeffery's Track', Tasmanian Tramp, No 24, 1982-3, Pp 66-9.

Post Office Directory 1902. TL

Pridmore, G. Memories of Collinsvale, Collinsvale, 1986.

Thwaites, J The Ice Houses of Mt Wellington, Tas Tramp, ??

## **Unpublished Papers, Manuscripts & Interviews**

Brandstater, Roy The Brandstster Family Through Passing Years, ??, 1979.

Davies, R. Pers Comm. MacFie, 1994.

McGuire, Vere, Pers Comm/MacFie, 1994

Nicholson, Tony Pers Comm. MacFie, 1994 (owner Ringwood, Lachlan Valley)

Oates, I. Charles Oates, 1823-1916, unpublished m/s, pers comm.

Oates, Don Pers Comm/MacFie, 1994

Oates, Jack Pers Comm/MacFie, 1994

Rich, R. Pers Comm/ MacFie, 1994. (Forestry Commission Officer)

Smith, Harry, Pers Comm/ MacFie, 1994

Waller, Bill, Pers Comm/MacFie, 1994