



Audit of Public Submissions on the Bold Park Management Plan 2022-2027

April 2022



ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Botanic Gardens and Parks Authority (BGPA) gratefully acknowledges the contributions of all community members, organisations and staff in the development of the Bold Park Management Plan 2022-2027.

Published April 2022 by the Botanic Gardens and Parks Authority, Perth, Western Australia.

This work is copyright. Apart from fair dealing for purposes of private study, research, criticism or review, as permitted by the Copyright Act 1968, no part may be reproduced by any process without written permission. Enquiries should be sent to the address below.

Copyright Botanic Gardens and Parks Authority, 2022

Kings Park and Botanic Garden
Fraser Avenue
Kings Park WA 6005
Email: enquiries@bgpa.wa.gov.au
Website: www.bgpa.wa.gov.au

This work may be cited as:

Botanic Gardens and Parks Authority. (2022). Audit of Public Submissions on the Draft Bold Park Management Plan 2022-2027. Botanic Gardens and Parks Authority, Perth, Western Australia.

Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	3
Public Consultation Process	4
Submission Assessment Methodology	4
Submission Results	5
Number and Origin of Submissions	5
Analytical Table.....	5

Table of Figures

Table 1: Breakdown of comments by criterion.....	6
Table 2: Breakdown of comments by section	7
Table 3: Breakdown of comments by topic.....	9

List of Appendices

- Appendix 1 – Draft Bold Park Management Plan 2022-2027 online survey
- Appendix 2 – List of submitters during the public submission period
- Appendix 3 – Tabulated audit of submissions

Executive Summary

The Draft Bold Park Management Plan 2022-2027 was released for a two-month public consultation period as required by Part 4 of the *Botanic Gardens and Parks Authority Act 1998* from 30 November 2021 to 31 January 2022. This document is an audit of submissions on the draft plan. It outlines the public consultation process itself, the methodology for assessing submissions and results of the consultation including a summary of submissions. A tabulated analysis of all submission received is also included.

The public consultation period on the draft Bold Park Management Plan 2022-2027 was promoted through various communication channels including direct correspondence with stakeholders, print, online and social media. Submissions could be provided by completing an online survey, as a written submission by post or hand delivery, or via email. Submissions were then reviewed in accordance with established criteria.

During the public submission period, 53 submissions were received, consisting of 289 comments. Submissions consisted of 28 individuals (52.8%), nine state government departments (17%), nine community organisations (17%), five private organisations / companies (9.4%), and two local government submission (3.8%) making up the balance.

Most of the comments were supportive of the plan, proposed alternate strategies to achieve the same management objectives, or raised topics which had already been considered in its preparation. Comments of that nature were generally assessed as not requiring an amendment to the plan. Overall, 99 comments (34.3%) were supportive or neutral, 14 (4.8%) proposed alternate strategies that the respondent considered would better achieve management objectives, and 53 (18.3%) raised topics already considered.

Amendments to the management plan were made in response to 34 comments (11.8%). Most of the comments were of a similar nature including 15 comments on perceived omissions or suggesting additional detail should be provided (44.1%), four promoting greater articulation of cultural heritage values (11.8%), and three acknowledging the bush forever status of the park (8.8%). Comments of this nature did result in minor corrections or amendments to the draft plan unless the approach in the plan was still considered the best option upon further consideration.

Among all the comments, 59 expressed divergent viewpoints (20.4%) across key management initiatives listed under the four management categories. Comments and suggestions were considered in detail but did not result in amendments to the draft plan as the matters had been considered in the drafting phase and the approach in the plan was still considered the best option. Decisions to amend the plan considered both submissions on the draft Plan and evidence gathered during the community survey conducted in July 2021.

Opposition to increase cycling and bike access within the park was the most frequently held divergent view with 36 comments (12.5%) submitted. These submissions were considered in the context of 14 comments (4.8%) which supported increased cycling and bike access within the park and responses to a community survey in July 2021 in which 317 community members surveyed (83.4%) either enjoyed riding bikes within the park or would like to see increased access.

Five comments (1.7%) questioned whether the plan was adequate to meet conservation outcomes (i.e. perceived need for greater treatment of weed or feral animal management) which was the second most frequently held divergent view. This viewpoint was addressed through the inclusion of a commitment to enhance the use and reporting of bushland condition metrics but did not result in amendments to specific initiatives. It is noted that initiative 3.3 on page 25 details BGPA's intent to develop a Bushland Conservation Plan for Bold Park. This instrument was considered more appropriate for addressing these comments. Similarly, 19 comments (6.5%) voiced concerns on the condition of the park while 18 comments (6.2%) supported current and future management activities.

This document has been endorsed by the BGPA Board of Management.

Public Consultation Process

The Draft Bold Park Management Plan 2022-2027 was released for a two-month public consultation period as required by Part 4 of the *Botanic Gardens and Parks Authority Act 1998* from 30 November 2021 to 31 January 2022. Draft Bold Park Management Plan 2022-2027 The management plan was made available electronically via the BGPA website and in hard copy from the Kings Park and Botanic Garden Administration. The public consultation period was promoted through a range of channels including:

- Public notices in; two issues of the *Government Gazette**, two issues of *The West Australian**, one issue of the *Western Suburbs Weekly*, and one issue of the *Post* newspaper
- A notice and hard copies of the draft plan at Kings Park and Botanic Garden Administration* and a copy of the plan at the Kings Park Visitor Information Centre
- Email notification to BGPA staff, BGPA volunteer groups and 97 external stakeholders
- Email notification and an invitation to meet and discuss the plan with BGPA staff was sent to 11 external stakeholders
- Online news article on the BGPA website
- Article in the BGPA e-newsletter
- Posts on the BGPA Facebook and Twitter accounts.

Submissions could be made by completing an online survey via Survey Monkey (see Appendix 1 for a copy of the survey), in writing to the Botanic Gardens and Parks Authority or via email to planning@bgpa.wa.gov.au. Hard copy submission forms were also distributed to BGPA volunteers to make it easier to make a submission.

* Requirements under the *Botanic Gardens and Parks Authority Act 1998*.

Submission Assessment Methodology

To ensure a valid submission, a name, postcode, and email address were required to be provided. Any submission that did not provide this information was considered invalid. Submissions were able to be marked as confidential, in which case the details of the submitter are not published. All valid submissions were broken down into comments which were assessed according to the criteria outlined below.

1. The Draft Plan **was amended** if the comment:
 - a. provided additional information of direct relevance to management
 - b. indicated a change in (or clarified) government legislation or management policy
 - c. proposed strategies that would better achieve management objectives
 - d. indicated omissions, inaccuracies, or a lack of clarity.
2. The Draft Plan **was not amended** if the comment:
 - a. clearly supported proposals in the plan or made general or neutral statements
 - b. referred to issues beyond the scope of the plan
 - c. referred to issues already noted within the plan or already considered during its preparation
 - d. was one among several widely divergent viewpoints received on the topic but the approach in the plan is still considered the best option
 - e. contributed options which were not feasible (generally due to conflict with legislation, Government or Authority policy)
 - f. was based on unclear or factually incorrect information.

3. A comment was assessed as being Not Applicable (NA) if it could not be categorised as per the criteria above or was out of context.

Submissions made via the online survey or hard copy submission form, required submitters to indicate their overall level of support for the direction and planned activities in the management plan by selecting one of the following responses:

- I fully support the direction and planned activities presented in the Draft Bold Park Management Plan 2022-2027.
- I partially support the direction and planned activities presented in the Draft Bold Park Management Plan 2022-2027.
- I don't support the direction and planned activities presented in the Draft Bold Park Management Plan 2022-2027.

These responses were considered as comments for the purpose of the audit of submissions. Responses that indicated partial support for the plan were not assigned a response criterion (indicated as NA in Table 1 below). Instead, the specific comments which explained the reason for partial support were assessed.

Each comment was reviewed against the submission assessment criteria, assigned a category accordingly with a brief explanatory note and indication as to whether the plan was amended in response to the comment. The comments were also categorised according to the section of the draft plan to which they referred.

Submission Results

Number and Origin of Submissions

A list of submitters during the public consultation period is provided in Appendix 2. All the 53 submissions received were from the Perth Metropolitan Area and all were confined to Western Australia.

Submissions were provided by 28 individuals (52.8%), nine state government departments (17%), nine community organisations (17%), five private organisations / companies (9.4%), and two local government submission (3.8%) making up the balance.

The most popular method of submission was via the online survey 28 (52.8%), followed by email 25 (47.2%). No submissions were received in writing or utilising the hard copy submission form.

Analytical Tables

As mentioned above, the submissions were analysed as 289 different comments. The tabulated analysis, in Appendix 3 provides a summary of all comments received including:

- the submission numbers
- the comment numbers
- a summary of the submitter's comment
- the section of the draft plan the comment relates to
- the criteria by which each comment was assessed
- the BGPA's response to the comment
- whether or not the comment resulted in an amendment to the Final Plan.

Table 1 provides a breakdown of the comments by response criterion. The 289 comments include:

- 99 comments (34.3%) clearly supported proposals in the plan or makes general or neutral statements.
- 59 comments (20.4%) reflected widely divergent viewpoints received on the topic but the approach in the plan is still considered the best option.
- 53 comments (18.3%) referred to issues already noted within the plan or already considered during its preparation.
- 29 comments (10%) referred to issues beyond the scope of the plan.
- 14 comments (4.8%) proposed strategies that would better achieve management objectives.
- 13 comments (4.5%) indicated omissions, inaccuracies, or a lack of clarity.
- 5 comments (1.7%) provided additional information of direct relevance to management
- 11 comments (3.8%) were not applicable to the topic.
- 2 comments (0.7%) indicated a change in (or clarifies) government legislation or management policy
- 3 comments (1.0%) were unclear or incorrect.
- 1 comment (0.3%) contributed options which are not feasible (generally due to conflict with legislation, funding, or Government or Authority policy).

Amendments to the plan were a result of 34 comments (11.8%). However, many comments repeated similar suggestions.

Table 1: Breakdown of comments by criterion

Assessment of comments (refer page 4 for explanation)	Amendment	Number	Percentage %
2A - Support or neutral	Not Required	99	34.3
2B - Beyond scope	Not Required	29	10.0
2C - Already noted or considered	Not Required	53	18.3
2D - Among divergent views	Not Required	59	20.4
2E - Not feasible	Not Required	1	0.3
2F - Unclear or incorrect	Not Required	3	1.0
1A - Additional info	Yes	5	1.7
1B - Change in govt leg or policy	Yes	2	0.7
1C - Better achieves objectives	Yes	14	4.8
1D - Omission, inaccuracy etc	Yes	13	4.5
NA - Not Applicable	-	11	3.8
TOTAL		289	100

Table 2 provides a breakdown of the comments by section of the draft plan. Most comments were broad, with 107 comments (37%) discussing the entirety of the document. Of those, most were supportive of the document overall with 44 comments (15.2%) expressing support or neutrality towards the plan and its initiatives.

The Visitor Experience section received the second highest number of comments with 57 comments (19.7%) in total. Of those, most were in opposition to key management initiatives with 28 comments (9.7%) present divergent views toward the plan.

The Science and Environment Conservation management category received 49 comments (17%) with 14 comments (4.8%) expressing support or neutral statements to key management initiatives. The Amenity and Infrastructure management category received 43 comments (14.9%) with 14 comments (4.8%) expressing support or neutral statements to key management initiatives. The Introduction and Background section of the document had nine comments making the total.

Table 2: Breakdown of comments by section

Comments on Themes	Number	Percentage %
Overall	107	37.0
1A - Additional info	1	0.3
1B - Change in govt leg or policy	1	0.3
1C - Better achieves objectives	6	2.1
1D - Omission, inaccuracy etc	6	2.1
2A - Support or neutral	44	15.2
2B - Beyond scope	11	3.8
2C - Already noted or considered	15	5.2
2D - Among divergent views	13	4.5
NA	10	3.5
Introduction and Background	9	3.1
1A - Additional info	1	0.3
1D - Omission, inaccuracy etc	2	0.7
2A - Support or neutral	2	0.7
2B - Beyond scope	1	0.3
2C - Already noted or considered	2	0.7
2D - Among divergent views	1	0.3
Community Engagement and Participation	24	8.3
1B - Change in govt leg or policy	1	0.3
1C - Better achieves objectives	3	1.0
1D - Omission, inaccuracy etc	1	0.3
2A - Support or neutral	11	3.8
2B - Beyond scope	1	0.3
2C - Already noted or considered	4	1.4
2D - Among divergent views	2	0.7
2F - Unclear or incorrect	1	0.3
Visitor Experiences	57	19.7
1C - Better achieves objectives	1	0.3
1D - Omission, inaccuracy etc	2	0.7
2A - Support or neutral	14	4.8

Comments on Themes	Number	Percentage %
2B - Beyond scope	1	0.3
2C - Already noted or considered	9	3.1
2D - Among divergent views	28	9.7
2F - Unclear or incorrect	1	0.3
NA	1	0.3
Science and Environmental Conservation	49	17.0
1A - Additional info	3	1.0
1C - Better achieves objectives	2	0.7
1D - Omission, inaccuracy etc	2	0.7
2A - Support or neutral	14	4.8
2B - Beyond scope	12	4.2
2C - Already noted or considered	12	4.2
2D - Among divergent views	2	0.7
2E - Not feasible	1	0.3
2F - Unclear or incorrect	1	0.3
Amenity and Infrastructure	43	14.9
1C - Better achieves objectives	2	0.7
2A - Support or neutral	14	4.8
2B - Beyond scope	3	1.0
2C - Already noted or considered	11	3.8
2D - Among divergent views	13	4.5
GRAND TOTAL	289	100

Table 3 identifies broad discuss topics provided during the public consultation period. These include:

- 36 comments (12.5%) in complete objection to improving cycling or bike access to the park or any key management initiative indicating the possibility.
- 27 comments (9.3%) in support of current or future community engagement and education opportunities outlined in the plan.
- 19 comments (6.6%) voicing concerns on the condition of the park including weed management, feral animal control, or bushfire risk.
- 18 comments (6.2%) voicing support on the condition or current/future management of the park including weed management, feral animal control, bushfire management, and wildlife reintroduction.
- 17 comments (5.9%) in support of improving and promoting cultural heritage connection, cultural wellbeing, and cultural experiences within the park.
- 14 comments (4.8%) in support of improving cycling or bike access to the park or any key management initiative indicating the possibility.
- 13 comments (4.5%) in support of the Ecology Centre Master Plan and surrounding area.
- 8 comments (2.8) regarding concerns on funding and staff resource availabilities to implement the current/future management.

Table 3: Breakdown of comments by topic

Topic of comments	Number	Percentage
Overall supportive or neutral	59	20.4
Suggested detail or additional information	53	18.3
Opposition to improving cycling or bike access	36	12.5
Support for community engagement and education	27	9.3
Concern on park condition or conservation management	19	6.6
Support on park condition or conservation management	18	6.2
Support to improve and promote cultural heritage	17	5.9
Support to improving cycling or bike access	14	4.8
Support for an Ecology Centre master planning process	13	4.5
Concern on current or future funding / staff resourcing	8	2.8
Other topics (involving <6 comments)	25	8.7
TOTAL	289	100

There was notable repetition in the comments submitted. The submissions included 112 comments (38.8%) either broadly supportive or neutral, suggested additional details, or provided information to be considered by the BGPA in current or future management of the park. However, 152 comments (52.6%) could be grouped into eight overarching discussions points.

Appendix 1 – Draft Bold Park Management Plan 2022-2027 online survey



Draft Bold Park Management Plan 2022 – 2026

Part A – Comments on the Plan

*1. Please indicate your overall level of support for the Draft Bold Park Management Plan 2022 – 2026.

- I fully support** the direction and planned activities presented in the Draft Bold Park Management Plan 2022 – 2026.
- I partially support** the direction and planned activities presented in the Draft Bold Park Management Plan 2022 – 2026.
- I don't support** the direction and planned activities presented in the Draft Bold Park Management Plan 2022 – 2026.

* 2. What level of feedback would you like to provide on the management plan?

- Comment on specific sections of the plan and general comments on the overall plan.
- General comments on the overall plan only.

3. Do you have any specific comments on the '**Introduction and Background Information**' part of the management plan?

Reminder: Refer your points according to page numbers or subject headings in the plan



Draft Bold Park Management Plan 2022 – 2026

Comments on the plan – Planned activities 2022 - 2026

Reminder: Refer your points according to page numbers, subject headings or numbered initiatives in the plan

4. Do you have any feedback on the planned activities outlined in the **Community Engagement and Partnerships** section of the plan?

5. Do you have any feedback on the planned activities outlined in the **Visitor Experiences** section of the plan?

6. Do you have any feedback on the planned activities outlined in the **Science and Environmental Conservation** section of the plan?

7. Do you have any feedback on the planned activities outlined in the **Plant Collections and Displays** section of the plan?

8. Do you have any feedback on the planned activities outlined in the **Amenity and Infrastructure** section of the plan?



Draft Bold Park Management Plan 2022 – 2026

Comments on the plan – General comments on the overall plan

9. Do you have any comments on the overall plan or any other feedback?



Draft Bold Park Management Plan 2022 – 2026

Part B – Your details

Please tell us a bit about you and your connection to Bold Park.

* 10. Which of these categories best describes you? (Select a maximum of 3 categories.)

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> I have a connection with Bold Park because of my job. | <input type="checkbox"/> I bring interstate/international visitors to Bold Park. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> I occasionally visit Bold Park. | <input type="checkbox"/> I attend events in Bold Park such as concerts, movies, festivals |
| <input type="checkbox"/> I regularly spend time with family/friends in Bold Park. | <input type="checkbox"/> I volunteer in Bold Park. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> I regularly exercise in Bold Park. | <input type="checkbox"/> I never visit Bold Park. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> I visit Bold Park to relax. | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify) | |



Draft Bold Park Management Plan 2022 – 2026

Your details

* 11. Which category best describes your professional connection with

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="radio"/> I own / operate a business in Bold Park. | <input type="radio"/> I provide a service to Bold Park. |
| <input type="radio"/> My organisation is a corporate partner or receives services from Bold Park. | <input type="radio"/> I represent WA's cultural and arts sector. |
| <input type="radio"/> I am a Bold Park volunteer. | <input type="radio"/> I represent WA's environmental / conservation sector. |
| <input type="radio"/> I work for a State Government agency. | <input type="radio"/> I work in the tourism sector. |
| <input type="radio"/> I work for Botanic Gardens and Parks Authority / Department of Biodiversity, Conservation and Attractions. | <input type="radio"/> I represent the community sector. |
| <input type="radio"/> I work in Local Government. | <input type="radio"/> I represent heritage interests in WA. |
| <input type="radio"/> I represent Aboriginal interests. | |
| <input type="radio"/> Other (please specify) | |



Draft Bold Park Management Plan 2022 – 2026

Your details

* 12. What is your age?

- | | |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <input type="radio"/> Under 18 | <input type="radio"/> 45-54 |
| <input type="radio"/> 18-24 | <input type="radio"/> 55-64 |
| <input type="radio"/> 25-34 | <input type="radio"/> 65-74 |
| <input type="radio"/> 35-44 | <input type="radio"/> 75+ |

* 13. What is your gender?

- Female
- Male
- Other / Rather not say

For the survey to be complete, information is required in the fields marked with an asterisk.

* 14. Please enter your contact details.

Name

Company

Address

Address 2

City/Town

State/Province

Post Code

Country

Email Address

Phone Number

* 15. Do you wish for your submission to be marked confidential?

- Yes
- No

* 16. If you would like to subscribe to our newsletter and be the first to know about Kings Park and Botanic Garden news, please provide your email address below (optional).

Appendix 2 – List of submitters during the public submission period

The BGPA received 7 confidential submissions not included below.

Community Organisations			
Initial	Surname	Organisation	Postcode
M	Owen	Friends of Underwood Avenue Bushland	6008
K	Pekin	Perth NRM	6102
M	Gray	Urban Bushland Council WA Inc.	6005
S	Conlan	Friends of Mosman Park Bushland	6012
S	Clegg	Friends of Bold Park Bushland	6015
S	Sharma	Western Australian Naturalists' Club	6000
B	Loney	Wildflower Society of Western Australia	6014
V	Read	BirdLife Western Australia	6014
M	Blais	Volunteering WA	6007

Local Governments			
Initial	Surname	Organisation	Postcode
R	Wyllie	City of Subiaco	6010
K	Hincks	Town of Cambridge	6014

Private Organisations			
Initial	Surname	Organisation	Postcode
D	Bennit	Western Australian Horse Council	6401
C	McDiven	Hoist	6010
W	Bradshaw	WestCycle	6005
D	Osborne	HikeWest Inc	6156

State Government			
Initial	Surname	Organisation	Postcode
M	Calabro	Water Corporation	6002
M	Andrews	Department of Water and Environmental Regulation	6027
J	Carren	VenuesWest	6010
R	Brown	Tourism Western Australia	6000
D	Jones	Western Australian Museum Boola Bardip	6000
J	Lundberg	Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage	6000
R	Afsar	Office of Multicultural Interests/ Department of Local Government Sports and Cultural Industries	6000
V	Shannon	City of Nedlands	6009
M	Cosson	Department of Education	6004

Individuals			
Initial	Surname	Organisation	Postcode
G	Lewis	-	6014
H	Griffiths	-	6016
P	Harrison	-	6008
G	Chandler	-	6007
G	Jackson	-	6020
M	Silverlock	-	6056
J	Keeble	-	6003
B	Brodie-Hall	-	6007
C	Kelly	-	6014
J	Owen	-	6019
R	Hill	-	6008
R & A	Rule	-	6019
K	Smith	-	6015
E	Rippey (Combined)	-	6009
P	Ghirardi (Combined)	-	6014
R	Carter	-	6014
A	Kelly	-	6014
P	Moodie	-	6018
E	Forrest	-	6019
M	Conlan	-	6012
T	Bult	-	6014
J	Seares	-	6014
D	Aitken	-	6014

Appendix 3 – Tabulated audit of submissions

Sub. No.	Com. No.	Summary Comments	Section of Draft Plan	Response Criterion No.	BGPA Response	Final Plan Amended
1	1	Improve the integration of Bold Park with Perry Lakes. If Perry Lakes Drive was not a through road (i.e. make it two cul-de-sac) it would provide greater opportunity to integrate the two areas.	Amenity and Infrastructure	2C - Already noted or considered	This suggestion will be considered but is beyond the level of detail included in the management plan.	Not required.
1	2	Extend restricted walking trails into the north western conservation area which is currently largely inaccessible.	Amenity and Infrastructure	2D - Among divergent views	Noted and considered. This suggestion will be considered but is beyond the level of detail included in the management plan.	Not required.
1	3	Develop a dog park on the former turf farm.	Visitor Experiences	2D - Among divergent views	Noted and considered.	Not required.
1	4	Improve Weed Management. The weeds in the last few years have become overgrown to the point where many of the smaller native plants are now struggling to survive.	Science and Environmental Conservation	2C - Already noted or considered	Noted and considered. It is considered as a comment on the ongoing management of the park and the preparation of a long-term Bushland Conservation Plan for Bold Park (initiative 3.3).	Not required.
2	1	I'm very pleased with its [the plan's] aims, clarity and inclusions.	Overall	2A - Support or neutral	Supports draft plan.	Not required.
2	2	Tick the Culture and Heritage box for the following initiative: 2.5 Explore visitor hospitality experiences in partnership with businesses and the community. There is opportunity here to include bush tucker talks as well as providing catering afterwards from indigenous catering companies.	Visitor Experiences	1D - Omission, inaccuracy etc	Noted. Plan amended to include suggested detail. Culture and Heritage box ticked for 2.5 initiative.	Plan amended
2	3	I think it would be really useful to have closer collaboration between the two Friends Groups [Bush Carers at Kings Park and Friends of Bold Park Bushland], as suggested in the draft Plan.	Community Engagement and Participation	2B - Beyond scope	This suggestion will be considered but is beyond the level of detail included in the management plan.	Not required.
3	1	I did find it [the plan] rather light on the details of what was actually going to be done. For example, "Undertake a master planning process for the Reabold Hill precinct" but no follow up detail.	Overall	2C - Already noted or considered	Noted and will be considered during the master planning process for the Reabold Hill precinct (initiative 4.4)	Not required.
3	2	The walking / running trails in Bold Park are one of the few sets of linking trails in the Perth City area that have not been covered in tarmac or concrete and this makes them ideal for trail running. Please do not ruin this precious resource. Kings Park now has very few "sand" trails left as many have been concreted (which increases the risk of injury, especially in older runners).	Visitor Experiences	2C - Already noted or considered	Noted and but is beyond the level of detail included in the management plan.	Not required.
4	1	Water Corporation has no objection to the proposed plan.	Overall	2A - Support or neutral	Neutral statement.	Not required.
4	2	Any development near Water Corporation assets will require approval prior to construction and consideration given to protecting the assets.	Overall	2B - Beyond scope	Noted. Relevant approvals will be obtained for all works associated with the management plan. This level of detail is beyond the scope of the management plan.	Not required.
5	1	Page 8 Paragraph beginning 'The conservation, research and educational value....' Include reference to connect to Underwood Avenue Bushland.	Science and Environmental Conservation	1D - Omission, inaccuracy etc	Noted. Plan amended to include suggested detail.	Plan amended
5	2	'Acknowledgement of Noongar connection to the land'. The Friends of Underwood Avenue Bushland strongly support this great focus.	Community Engagement and Participation	2A - Support or neutral	Supports draft plan.	Not required.
5	3	Initiative 4.3 - Master planning process for Western Australian Ecology Centre precinct - This initiative is strongly supported.	Amenity and Infrastructure	2A - Support or neutral	Supports key management initiative.	Not required.

5	4	It is unacceptable that the community cannot access the Ecology Centre – for example in applying to BGPA for hiring the Centre for meetings of environmental groups such as the Friends of Underwood Avenue Bushland. The reason given was on one occasion - 'this is political'. The Ecology Centre sits there unattended and virtually unused – what a waste.	Visitor Experiences	2D - Among divergent views	Increasing community use of the facility is an objective in the plan.	Not required.
6	1	I partially support the direction and planned activities presented in the Draft Bold Park Management Plan 2022-2027.	Overall	NA	Response provided to specific comments which explain reason for partial support.	Not required.
6	2	The plan is broad without much commitment to Cyclists, given the significant number of comments and interest in creating cycling experiences at the Park. It notes exploring opportunities and references the drive-in site. I'd hope improved infrastructure for families to cycle to-and- from bold park can be considered. Along with nature-based cycling experiences. A bikes footprint is far less impactful than walking paths. Active healthy activities should be encouraged.	Visitor Experiences	2C - Already noted or considered	Supports plan. The plan proposes the BGPA will explore cycling due to increase demand from the wider community. As per the plan, this will be on designated paths consistent with public safety, visitor enjoyment, recreation and conservation objectives.	Not required.
6	3	How does horse riding meet conservation and ecological goals when they are trampling everything?	Amenity and Infrastructure	2C - Already noted or considered	Conservation risks regarding bridle trails within bushlands is well considered by the BGPA and use of the trail is low.	Not required.
7	1	I fully support the direction and planned activities presented in the Draft Bold Park Management Plan 2022-2027.	Overall	2A - Support or neutral	Supports draft plan.	Not required.
7	2	Mountain bike tracks	Visitor Experiences	2F - Unclear or incorrect	Not applicable. The intent of the comment is unclear.	Not required.
8	1	I partially support the direction and planned activities presented in the Draft Bold Park Management Plan 2022-2027.	Overall	NA	Response provided to specific comments which explain reason for partial support.	Not required.
8	2	I'm strongly opposed to (investigating a potential) expansion of the existing cycling access arrangements- beyond Scenic Drive. This would significantly alter the experience of Bold Park as a quiet sanctuary by the sea.	Visitor Experiences	2D - Among divergent views	Noted and considered. The plan proposes the BGPA will explore cycling due to increase demand from the wider community. As per the plan, this will be on designated paths consistent with public safety, visitor enjoyment, recreation and conservation objectives.	Not required.
9	1	Are you aware of or interested in any of the history of McGilvray Oval? Reputed to have been an aerodrome during the war, Harley Scramble motorbike racetrack, pig farm on the South side abutting the Asylum boundary and then a rubbish tip before its present use?	Overall	2B - Beyond scope	Noted and but is beyond the level of detail included in the management plan.	Not required.
10	1	I partially support the direction and planned activities presented in the Draft Bold Park Management Plan 2022-2027.	Overall	NA	Response provided to specific comments which explain reason for partial support.	Not required.
10	2	Looks really good.	Overall	2A - Support or neutral	Supports draft plan.	Not required.
10	3	Great to see strong support for working collaboratively and meaningfully Noongar TOs, would like to see a lot more work in this area -more collaborative projects, training opportunities, employment of Noongar staff, art and education resources developed about food/culture/mythological and plus other plant and animal knowledge.	Overall	2A - Support or neutral	Supports draft plan.	Not required.
11	1	I fully support the direction and planned activities presented in the Draft Bold Park Management Plan 2022-2027.	Overall	2A - Support or neutral	Supports draft plan.	Not required.
11	2	It appears to be heading in a good direction. Multiple users are identified and accounted for, as well as maintenance of ecology and biodiversity.	Overall	2A - Support or neutral	Supports draft plan.	Not required.
12	1	I fully support the direction and planned activities presented in the Draft Bold Park Management Plan 2022-2027.	Overall	2A - Support or neutral	Supports draft plan.	Not required.
12	2	The BP Management Plan is well written, concise and to the point.	Overall	2A - Support or neutral	Supports draft plan.	Not required.
12	3	As more of Perth becomes infilled, the park will become more important as a place where people can recreate, enjoy nature of have other meaningful (hands-on/learning) experiences.	Overall	2A - Support or neutral	Neutral statement.	Not required.
13	1	I partially support the direction and planned activities presented in the Draft Bold Park Management Plan 2022-2027.	Overall	NA	Response provided to specific comments which explain reason for partial support.	Not required.

13	2	In a recent study completed by the Town of Cambridge regarding options for Mountain Biking trails in the area, the preferred option was identified as being somewhere in Bold Park. However in this master plan I could not see any specific reference to proposed construction of mountain bike trails. There is certainly enough space in the park to be able to safely accommodate both mountain biking and walking trails, with safe separation, without impacting the amenity of each other and without diminishing the other stated aims of the master plan. In fact, many of the aims would be enhanced by a well planned and executed mountain biking experience in the park. The exclusion of mountain biking from the master plan feels like a significant missed opportunity.	Visitor Experiences	2C - Already noted or considered	Supports plan. The plan proposes the BGPA will explore cycling due to increase demand from the wider community. As per the plan, this will be on designated paths consistent with public safety, visitor enjoyment, recreation and conservation objectives.	Not required.
14	1	I fully support the direction and planned activities presented in the Draft Bold Park Management Plan 2022-2027.	Overall	2A - Support or neutral	Supports draft plan.	Not required.
14	2	Plan is very high level and does not provide details & timeline of planned actions	Overall	2B - Beyond scope	Noted and considered. Amendments have been made to clarify some details.	Not required.
15	1	I partially support the direction and planned activities presented in the Draft Bold Park Management Plan 2022-2027.	Overall	NA	Response provided to specific comments which explain reason for partial support.	Not required.
16	1	I fully support the direction and planned activities presented in the Draft Bold Park Management Plan 2022-2027.	Overall	2A - Support or neutral	Supports draft plan.	Not required.
16	2	it would be a shame if the park became full of mountain bike users. Please be cautious in how much 'biking' can be permitted in the park	Visitor experiences	2D - Among divergent views	Noted and considered. The plan proposes the BGPA will explore cycling due to increase demand from the wider community. As per the plan, this will be on designated paths consistent with public safety, visitor enjoyment, recreation and conservation objectives.	Not required.
16	3	This is good. I like the fact that it is simple and basic with a low footprint. Keep the park for plants, wildlife and education. No shops or playgrounds.	Amenity and infrastructure	2A - Support or neutral	Supports draft plan.	Not required.
17	1	I thank you for all your amazing work in protecting and enhancing Bold Park which is a peaceful, valuable and beautiful green lung in the heart of suburbia.	Overall	2A - Support or neutral	Neutral statement.	Not required.
17	2	I am deeply concerned about a point in the Draft Management Plan 2021-2025 which relates to cycling in Bold Park. The point 2.7 'Retain current cycling access arrangements on Scenic Walk and Scenic Drive and investigate opportunities for bicycle access to other areas of the park on designated paths consistent with public safety, visitor enjoyment, recreation and conservation objectives' raises serious concerns. Please do not take the initial step to allow even the most restricted cycling in Bold Park as it will literally open the floodgates to large scale destruction of this important natural asset.	Visitor Experiences	2D - Among divergent views	Noted and considered. The plan proposes the BGPA will explore cycling due to increase demand from the wider community. As per the plan, this will be on designated paths consistent with public safety, visitor enjoyment, recreation and conservation objectives.	Not required.
18	1	The 'Vision' for Bold Park is: For Bold Park to be identified as a World Class urban wilderness area enjoyed, studied and managed together with the community. The proponents shall conserve and enhance the flora and fauna. Most of the recommendations in the Plan have the interests in maintaining the above.	Overall	2A - Support or neutral	Supports draft plan.	Not required.
18	2	Page 23, 2.7 is suggesting allowing bicycle access to 'other' areas in the park. This would be inconsistent with public safety, visitor enjoyment, passive recreation and conservation objectives. The Park's ecosystem is under threat and duress already. Any further degradation would cause more habitat loss. There is no room for cyclists 'in' the park and it's not necessary with all the endless roads and paths that cyclists have access to.	Visitor Experiences	2D - Among divergent views	Noted and considered. The plan proposes the BGPA will explore cycling due to increase demand from the wider community. As per the plan, this will be on designated paths consistent with public safety, visitor enjoyment, recreation and conservation objectives.	Not required.
19	1	The Department of Water and Environmental Regulation (the Department) supports the Draft Plan and provides a number of recommendations for you to consider when finalising the management plan for Bold Park.	Overall	2A - Support or neutral	Supports draft plan.	Not required.
19	2	The Draft Plan would benefit from a brief description of the key features of Bold Park including its area, location, and major features. This information could be included in the "At a glance" section.	Introduction and Background	2C - Already noted or considered	Noted and covered adequately in the plan.	Not required.
19	3	The Draft Plan would benefit from additional information on the tenure of Bold Park, including the basis or nature of any management orders or lease arrangements.	Introduction and Background	1A - Additional info	Noted. Plan amended to include suggested detail such as mentioning	Plan amended

					Bush Forever Status and A Reserve Status.	
19	4	The Draft Plan would benefit from amendments to the map at the end of the Draft Plan to clearly show the boundary of Bold Park and the extent of the Parks and Botanic Gardens Authority's management responsibility.	Introduction and Background	2C - Already noted or considered	The map clearly illustrates the boundary of Bold Park and the extent of the Parks and Botanic Gardens Authority's management responsibility.	Not required.
19	5	The Draft Plan would benefit from confirmation the Draft Plan consistent with key policies including the Wetlands Conservation Policy for Western Australia (Government of Western Australia, 1997) and A guide to managing and restoring wetlands in Western Australia (Department of Environment and Conservation, 2012), WA Government Climate Policy, 2020.	Introduction and Background	2B - Beyond scope	Supports the planned initiative but goes beyond the scope of the plan. It is considered as a comment toward the ongoing management of the park and the preparation of a long-term Bushland Conservation Plan for Bold Park (initiative 3.3).	Not required.
19	6	The Draft Plan would benefit from additional information regarding the hydrological relationship between Bold Park and wetlands in adjacent areas, in particular other Conservation Category wetlands such as Perry Lakes.	Science and Environmental Conservation	2C - Already noted or considered	Noted and considered. It is considered as a comment on the ongoing management of the park and the preparation of a long-term Bushland Conservation Plan for Bold Park (initiative 3.3).	Not required.
19	7	The Department is currently funding work by the Town of Cambridge to improve the quality of water within Perry Lakes and encourages collaboration between the land managers responsible for wetlands within the same hydrological systems to maximise environmental improvements.	Science and Environmental Conservation	2B - Beyond scope	Noted and considered but goes beyond the scope of the plan. It is considered as a comment toward the ongoing management of the park and the preparation of a long-term Bushland Conservation Plan for Bold Park (initiative 3.3).	Not required.
19	8	The Draft Plan would benefit from additional information regarding water quality monitoring in groundwater and wetlands, and consideration of how the data will be used to improve wetland management.	Science and Environmental Conservation	2B - Beyond scope	This suggestion is considered but is beyond the level of detail included in the management plan.	Not required.
19	9	The Draft Plan would benefit from additional information regarding Phytophthora dieback, such as if it is present, how will it be managed and how may this information be used for community engagement.	Science and Environmental Conservation	1A - Additional info	Noted. Plan amended to include suggested detail in Science and Environmental Conservation management category.	Plan amended
19	10	The Draft Plan would benefit from consideration whether there may be threatened and priority fauna and community engagement benefits from restoration activities designed to promote important habitats for Carnaby's and Forest Red-tailed Black Cockatoos (e.g., similar to the Cockburn Community Wildlife Corridor) and Painted Button Quail.	Science and Environmental Conservation	1A - Additional info	Noted. Plan amended to include suggested detail in Science and Environmental Conservation management category.	Plan amended
19	11	Bold Park is one of the largest remaining bushland areas on the Swan Coastal Plain, so information about its flora, fauna and vegetation communities is valuable and should be readily accessible to the community. We would encourage the following information to be included in an appendix or published separately: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a list of fauna species • a list of flora species grouped by family, with the soil type (e.g., Karrakatta and Cottesloe soils) and/or vegetation community indicated via a table similar to that in Growing locals (Powell and Emberson 1996) • a map and description of the different vegetation communities, e.g., limestone heath, Banksia and Tuart woodland, Jarrah and Marri woodland, as well as wetlands (indicate wetland type). The map should include walk trails for orientation and access • a map showing vegetation condition (e.g., using the Bush Forever method – excellent, very good, good, degraded, completely degraded) • a map showing ecological linkages with surrounding bushland • a map of fire history • a map of Phytophthora dieback. 	Science and Environmental Conservation	1A - Additional info	Noted. Plan amended to include a map showing vegetation condition. Other suggestions are out of scope of the plan and would be more appropriate in the Bold Park Conservation Plan.	Plan amended

19	12	Key management initiatives listed under the management action category of Science and Conservation are broadly supported. Responding to climate change challenges through research, restoration and management activity is very important.	Science and Environmental Conservation	2A - Support or neutral	Supports the planned initiative but goes beyond the scope of the plan. It is considered as a comment toward the ongoing management of the park and the preparation of a long-term Bushland Conservation Plan for Bold Park (initiative 3.3).	Not required.
19	13	Key management initiatives under the Science and Conservation category would also benefit from inclusion of actions relating to wetlands, groundwater and hydrological processes as described above, and actions relating to introduced or invasive species.	Science and Environmental Conservation	2C - Already noted or considered	Noted and considered. It is considered as a comment on the ongoing management of the park and the preparation of a long-term Bushland Conservation Plan for Bold Park (initiative 3.3).	Not required.
19	14	Clearing permits under the Environmental Protection Act 1986 (EP Act) may be required for some activities described in the Draft Plan.	Overall	2C - Already noted or considered	Noted. Relevant approvals will be obtained for all works associated with the management plan. This level of detail is beyond the scope of the management plan.	Not required.
20	1	I fully support the direction and planned activities presented in the Draft Bold Park Management Plan 2022-2027.	Overall	2A - Support or neutral	Supports draft plan.	Not required.
20	2	The plan is comprehensive and easy to digest.	Overall	2A - Support or neutral	Supports draft plan.	Not required.
20	3	It is suggested that the consideration of other State Government entities in 1.4 may be appropriate i.e. VenuesWest and Tourism WA.	Community Engagement and Participation	1C - Better achieves objectives	Noted. Plan amended to include suggested detail and identify State Government entities.	Plan amended
20	4	VenuesWest supports initiatives 4.4, 4.5 and 4.9 in particular.	Community Engagement and Participation	2A - Support or neutral	Supports key management initiative.	Not required.
21	1	I partially support the direction and planned activities presented in the Draft Bold Park Management Plan 2022-2027.	Overall	NA	Response provided to specific comments which explain reason for partial support.	Not required.
21	2	Very concerned about the ref on page 16 to "improved access for cyclists". I am a keen cyclist BUT do not feel Bold Park is a suitable place for cycling either on existing paths or on potential dedicated mountain bike tracks. The sandy limestone substrate of the park is far too easily eroded, the flora too fragile. Let alone the safety aspects of trying to keep pedestrians & cyclists apart and maintaining the park as a "sanctuary by the sea". A small number of irresponsible cyclists are still entering the park - this needs to be addressed - not consideration of increase access.	Visitor Experiences	2D - Among divergent views	Noted and considered. The plan proposes the BGPA will explore cycling due to increase demand from the wider community. As per the plan, this will be on designated paths consistent with public safety, visitor enjoyment, recreation and conservation objectives.	Not required.
21	3	Ref to Item 2.7 in the Table on page 23 - again no increase in cycle access should be considered in the Park if it is truly to be maintained as a "sanctuary by the sea". See comments in Q 4.	Visitor Experiences	2D - Among divergent views	Noted and considered. The plan proposes the BGPA will explore cycling due to increase demand from the wider community. As per the plan, this will be on designated paths consistent with public safety, visitor enjoyment, recreation and conservation objectives.	Not required.
21	4	A very well thought out plan overall BUT the consideration of increase cycle access is both damaging to the Park and all its current users and would be an end to the "sanctuary by the sea" vision.	Overall	2D - Among divergent views	Noted and considered. The plan proposes the BGPA will explore cycling due to increase demand from the wider community. As per the plan, this will be on designated paths consistent with public safety, visitor enjoyment, recreation and conservation objectives.	Not required.
22	1	I fully support the direction and planned activities presented in the Draft Bold Park Management Plan 2022-2027.	Overall	2A - Support or neutral	Supports draft plan.	Not required.

23	1	The Town of Cambridge (the Town) encourages Botanic Gardens and Parks Authority (BGPA) to develop synergies with local not for profit groups such as Birdlife WA, the WA Naturalists club, the Friends of Bold Park, Friends of Perry Lakes, Cambridge Coastcare and other conservation groups. These groups could be co-located at Bold Park in a new multipurpose building which offers shared spaces where groups can run events and programs. This would align with initiative 1.3 and 1.5.	Community Engagement and Participation	2A - Support or neutral	Supports key management initiative.	Not required.
23	2	Visitor Experiences - Initiative 2.1 (Connecting with neighbouring precincts); As Bold Park is enveloped by the Town of Cambridge it would be important to create connections through pedestrian linkages and directional signage to promote a cohesive connection to the local area as per initiative 2.1.	Visitor Experiences	2A - Support or neutral	Supports key management initiative.	Not required.
23	3	Visitor Experiences - Initiative 2.3 (Innovative experiences); The Town fully supports initiative 2.3 as it also aligns with the Towns Strategic Plan.	Visitor Experiences	2A - Support or neutral	Supports key management initiative.	Not required.
23	4	Visitor Experiences - Initiative 2.7 (Retain current cycling access and investigate cycling in other areas); The Town agrees that initiative 2.7 is important as cycling is a popular pastime in Cambridge. Providing opportunities to separate some cycling from pedestrian paths will improve the parks visitor experience. Providing a biking trail in a natural area within the metropolitan area would be a unique experience that would also attract tourists in line with 2.10.	Visitor Experiences	2A - Support or neutral	Supports key management initiative. The plan proposes the BGPA will explore cycling due to increase demand from the wider community. As per the plan, this will be on designated paths consistent with public safety, visitor enjoyment, recreation and conservation objectives.	Not required.
23	5	Science and Environmental Conservation - Initiative 3.4 (Participation in UN Decade of Ecosystem Restoration); Initiative 3.4 aims to demonstrate leadership in adaptive management, ecological restoration and community engagement. The Town encourages BGPA to invest more in weed control within Bold Park to reduce the threat of weed invasion to biodiversity. Weed invasion is a key threatening process which aggressively compete with native vegetation. Further, uncontrolled growth of grasses increases bushfire risk within the Park as identified initiative 3.5. Consistent and adequate weed control will reduce bushfire risk and when coupled with revegetation will improve the Park's biodiversity value.	Science and Environmental Conservation	2C - Already noted or considered	Noted and considered but goes beyond the scope of the plan. It is considered as a comment toward the ongoing management of the park and the preparation of a long-term Bushland Conservation Plan for Bold Park (initiative 3.3).	Not required.
23	6	The Town encourages BGPA to invest in feral animal control to protect vulnerable native fauna in areas within and surrounding Bold Park. Rabbit and fox control is most effective if conducted regionally in a coordinated way. Rabbits and a fox have recently been sighted within the Park indicating that these feral animals use the Park. The seven WESROC Councils neighbouring Bold Park engage in feral animal control however a lack of control within Bold Park is impacting efficacy.	Science and Environmental Conservation	2C - Already noted or considered	Noted and will be considered but goes beyond the scope of the plan. It is considered as a comment toward the ongoing management of the park and the preparation of a long-term Bushland Conservation Plan for Bold Park (initiative 3.3).	Not required.
23	7	Amenity and Infrastructure - Initiative 4.3 (Master planning process for Western Australian Ecology Centre precinct); Initiative 4.3 is a key action to draw in visitors and tourists to the site. A multi-use co-located facility will create a destination for environmental education in the local area.	Amenity and Infrastructure	2A - Support or neutral	Supports key management initiative.	Not required.

23	8	Amenity and Infrastructure - Initiative 4.5 (Explore use and future of Skyline Drive-in site); The Town supports key management initiative 4.5 to explore the long-term use of the Skyline Drive-in and proposes that community consultation explores a mountain bike facility being constructed at the site.	Amenity and Infrastructure	2A - Support or neutral	Supports management initiative. The plan proposes the BGPA will explore the most appropriate use of the Skyline Drive-in including restoration where possible. Cycling is considered in key management initiatives due to increase demand from the wider community. As per the plan, this will be on designated paths consistent with public safety, visitor enjoyment, recreation and conservation objectives.	Not required.
23	9	Amenity and Infrastructure - Initiative 4.9 (Infrastructure to provide safe transport linkages); Initiative 4.9 which aims to encourage reduced dependence on vehicles will require improved connectivity to the site for both pedestrians and cyclists and separation of use to reduce conflict. Providing a cycling facility in the locale will increase patrons desire to ride as opposed to driving to the site (many of the known park users are local residents).	Amenity and Infrastructure	2C - Already noted or considered	Supports key management initiative. The plan proposes the BGPA will explore the most appropriate use of the Skyline Drive-in including restoration where possible. Cycling is considered in key management initiatives due to increase demand from the wider community. As per the plan, this will be on designated paths consistent with public safety, visitor enjoyment, recreation and conservation objectives.	Not required.
24	1	This gorgeous large section of land is very special to my friends and I and I am sure the larger community. Preservation of such land should be very thoughtfully considered as damage to the land and vegetation and compacting of the soil will have immediate and substantial environmental impact.	Overall	2A - Support or neutral	Supports draft plan.	Not required.
24	2	Visitor Experiences - Initiative 2.7 (Retain current cycling access and investigate cycling in other areas); I am very worried about future implications to a point in the Draft Management Plan 2021-2025 which relates to cycling in Bold Park. The point 2.7 raises serious concerns. There is already visible damage from cyclists in Bold Park – though I believe cycling is prohibited. When walking through the bushland new bike tracks and damage are ongoing and very evident. I have no doubt that if cycling were to be permitted in Bold Park along designated cycle tracks that cyclists will not keep to tracks and will be continually making new tracks and destroy the fragile and important natural environment. Bold Park is an urban park and area of significant and important vegetation and breeding area for a diverse variety birds. This will all be put at risk. Mountain biking is an activity NOT suited to this beautiful and important section of bushland. Mountain biking is a sport and I believe the participants are interested in the thrill and have little regard for nature and the natural environment. Please Please Please do NOT allow any form of cycling in Bold Park.	Visitor Experiences	2D - Among divergent views	Noted and considered. The plan proposes the BGPA will explore cycling due to increase demand from the wider community. As per the plan, this will be on designated paths consistent with public safety, visitor enjoyment, recreation and conservation objectives.	Not required.
25	1	Bold Park: a sanctuary by the sea – let's keep it that way.	Overall	2C - Already noted or considered	Noted and considered.	Not required.
25	2	There is a lack of detail on how the proposed initiatives will be achieved, and the opportunity to comment on such detail. Their key actions are listed on p. 28 – but how are you going to do these things – e.g. 4.4: Undertake a master planning process for the Reabold Hill precinct – how???	Amenity and Infrastructure	2C - Already noted or considered	Noted and considered. Amendments have been made to clarify some details.	Not required.
25	3	p. 23 Key Management initiatives item 2.7: "...investigate opportunities for bicycle access to other areas of the park on designated paths consistent with public safety, visitor enjoyment, recreation and conservation objectives" - passive recreation only and no mountain bike use. Bikers are already allowed access on Scenic Walk and Scenic Drive - if you let the bikers onto less formal trails then they will start to find more challenging places to put in their own trails. Keep them out is the best plan for a conservation area like Bold Park.	Visitor Experiences	2D - Among divergent views	Noted and considered. The plan proposes the BGPA will explore cycling due to increase demand from the wider community. As per the plan, this will be on designated paths consistent with public safety, visitor enjoyment, recreation and conservation objectives.	Not required.

25	4	The lack of public toilet facilities in the whole of the Park – and the BGPA know this but still have not addressed it.	Amenity and Infrastructure	2C - Already noted or considered	Noted and considered. The suggested comment goes beyond the detail included in the plan.	Not required.
25	5	Environmental conservation: you write “reinstate native ecological communities” and need to work harder on this particularly in the areas not coloured green on the map on p. 29.	Science and Environmental Conservation	2F - Unclear or incorrect	Noted and considered.	Not required.
25	6	On p. 28 Item 4.9 – “Explore the long-term use and future of the Skyline Drive-in site” – how do you propose to do this? The area of this and other land around the Town of Cambridge administration centre is not coloured green yet it is all part of Bold Park and given the Town of Cambridge’s desire for mountain bike trails we need to be very vigilant to prevent this from happening on this Bold Park land.	Amenity and Infrastructure	2D - Among divergent views	Noted and considered. The plan proposes the BGPA will explore cycling due to increase demand from the wider community. As per the plan, this will be on designated paths consistent with public safety, visitor enjoyment, recreation and conservation objectives.	Not required.
25	7	As well, the bush around the walk trail from the Bold Park Aquatic Centre to Bold Park Drive & also up the hill to Kalinda Drive is very pleasant and needs to be better cared for as there are heaps of weeds which are a fire hazard in summer.	Overall	2C - Already noted or considered	Noted and will be considered in the ongoing management of the park but is beyond the level of detail included in the management plan.	Not required.
26	1	Subdivisions, paths, roads, etc, lead to ecological deterioration (note the spread of weeds beside paths and from the CCGS playing fields into the adjoining bushland)	Amenity and Infrastructure	2D - Among divergent views	Noted and future management on the amenity or infrastructure within the park will adhere to the principles of sustainability.	Not required.
26	2	2.7 No cycle paths	Visitor Experiences	2D - Among divergent views	Noted and considered. The plan proposes the BGPA will explore cycling due to increase demand from the wider community. As per the plan, this will be on designated paths consistent with public safety, visitor enjoyment, recreation and conservation objectives.	Not required.
26	3	4.8 No more bridle trails	Visitor experiences	2D - Among divergent views	Conservation risks regarding bridle trails within bushlands is well considered by the BGPA and use of the trail is low.	Not required.
26	4	4.1 No more footpaths	Amenity and infrastructure	2D - Among divergent views	Noted and considered.	Not required.
26	5	4.3 Visitor gateway statement to be restricted to the cleared Ecology Centre area. There should be a toilet block.	Amenity and Infrastructure	2D - Among divergent views	Noted and considered during the master planning process for Western Australian Ecology Centre precinct (initiative 4.3).	Not required.
26	6	4.10. Could there be a defining EDGE to the Park – perhaps a fence (e.g. along Perry Lakes Drive)? At present the NE corner (Ecology Centre etc) is apparently not part of the Park and is wasted as bushland.	Amenity and Infrastructure	2B - Beyond scope	Noted and will be considered in the ongoing management of the park but is beyond the level of detail included in the management plan.	Not required.
26	7	3.8 Please restrict any landscaping to street verges and do not merge it into the bushland.	Science and Environmental Conservation	2B - Beyond scope	Noted and considered.	Not required.
26	8	1.5 Volunteering: There is a small group of volunteer guides. They have no recruitment, training or knowledge development system.	Community Engagement and Participation	2C - Already noted or considered	This suggestion will be considered but is beyond the level of detail included in the management plan.	Not required.
26	9	4.2 Existing signboards: the map at each trail intersection needs to include a small inset showing the whole park to assist walkers in locating themselves.	Visitor Experiences	2C - Already noted or considered	Noted and considered.	Not required.
27	1	Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Bold Park Management Plan. It is an accessible document with clearly articulated goals and approaches. The management initiatives are well planned, with most being readily achievable. We look forward to the possibility of working with the Botanic Gardens and Parks Authority to implement key initiatives in this Plan and to achieve your overall purpose.	Overall	2A - Support or neutral	Supports draft plan.	Not required.

27	2	Strong partnerships provide chances for a diverse network of participating organisations and groups and mean that our collective impact is greater, something that will be critical if we are to effectively address climate change. A commitment to increased involvement of representatives of the Whadjuk Noongar and Noongar businesses to implement your Plan and increase appreciation of Aboriginal Cultural Heritage is an encouraging step forward. It will be pleasing to see this action expanded to capture future opportunities for involvement of a diverse range of Noongar businesses, beyond tourism and interpretation, to develop Whadjuk Noongar rangers, and work towards joint management. In the future this intent could be captured in the organisation's 'Statement of purpose.'	Overall	2B - Beyond scope	This suggestion will be considered and supported but is beyond the level of detail included in the management plan.	Not required.
27	3	There is benefit in including measures of success within your Plan and clearly describing a timeline for the major initiatives, such as the planning documents, and differentiating them with those that are regular activities or necessary to manage a park effectively.	Overall	1C - Better achieves objectives	Noted. Plan amended to include suggested detail with measurements of success on Looking Forward section (pg. 16) of document.	Plan amended
27	4	This is a positive overview of the values and benefits of Bold Park. Perth NRM's programs and projects align closely with the park's work, and we can see benefit in working more closely together especially with the coastal volunteers and residents to strengthen ecological linkages and improve the condition of the remaining vegetation.	Overall	2A - Support or neutral	Supports draft plan.	Not required.
27	5	Do you want to consider providing a glossary of terms and a more detailed list of the plans and documents that guide the operational management of Bold Park e.g., Biodiversity Conservation Legislation? Consider including a reference to the figure on page 10 in the introductory text box on page 11 e.g., '...while other documents listed (figure page 10), are available on request'.	Overall	2C - Already noted or considered	Noted and considered.	Not required.
27	6	Given the frequent references to Noongar culture in the draft Plan and DBCA's Reconciliation Action Plan will there be an opportunity to expand BGPA's Statement of Purpose to include a reference to the First Nations or is it intended for this to be captured as part of the general reference to 'empowering communities'?	Overall	2C - Already noted or considered	Noted. The DBCA's Reconciliation Action Plan is between 2018 - 2020.	Not required.
27	7	Are all themes equal in importance? Given the BGPA's Statement of Purpose opens with 'To practise and inspire environmental conservation ...' it is interesting that the Science and Conservation is the fourth row of the themes.	Overall	2B - Beyond scope	Noted and considered. The themes do not reflect a prioritisation process.	Not required.
27	8	encompasses maintaining scientific and professional standards and rigor? Should this be more clearly articulated given the Statement of Purpose and the Goals (especially goals 3, 4, 5)?	Science and Environmental Conservation	1C - Better achieves objectives	Noted. Plan amended to include suggested detail in Science and Environment Conservation management category.	Plan amended
27	9	Consider rewriting the sentence "Threats are compounded by ..." the examples of reduced winter rainfall, higher temperatures and more frequent severe weather events are often considered to be closely related to climate change rather than being other environmental pressures.	Science and Environmental Conservation	2C - Already noted or considered	Noted and considered.	Not required.
27	10	It may be worthwhile considering the order of these paragraphs and their links to build the story for the reader. For example, A shared sense of place could be first, followed by Back to nature for physical and mental health, and then The experience economy, and lastly Using the virtual to enhance the physical experience of Bold Park.	Overall	1C - Better achieves objectives	Noted. Plan amended to include suggested detail but not too the extent as suggested.	Plan amended
27	11	pg. 20, Dot 4 is out of context in the document. It does not relate to other aspects of the Plan and whilst it can fit under the Healthy Spaces goal it is not part of that Approach. If there is a funding relationship or another reason for including it in this section, it would be beneficial to explain its inclusion. If it must remain within the section, consider having it as the last dot point.	Community Engagement and Participation	2F - Unclear or incorrect	Noted and considered.	Not required.
27	12	Initiative 1.5 could be considered a Truly local experience if packaged well and offered as a first time to volunteer in nature experience for youth, families, or new residents to Perth. If the activities fit into a larger conservation plan the participants can feel that they are making a meaningful contribution, they learn about the native flora and fauna and hear about Friends of Groups to join or other ways of being involved in the future. If supported with a Welcome to Country, participants can also gain appreciation of Aboriginal culture and begin to understand the importance of caring for Country.	Community Engagement and Participation	2C - Already noted or considered	Supports initiative and the comment will be considered during the implementation of key management initiatives.	Not required.

27	13	1.8 This initiative lists cultural wellbeing but is not represented in the Culture and Heritage (C&H) theme. Given the inclusion of the Approach to 'actively promote, respect and understand Whadjuk Noongar culture and knowledge of these lands' it may be beneficial to recognise its alignment with the C & H theme.	Community Engagement and Participation	1C - Better achieves objectives	Noted. Plan amended to include cultural wellbeing in initiative 1.8.	Plan amended
27	14	Pg 22, Dot 3 Suggest that the current Dot point 3 is moved to number 2 on the list, this point aligns closely with the overall Statement of Purpose and paragraph 2 of the Planning context text.	Community Engagement and Participation	1D - Omission, inaccuracy etc	Noted. Plan amended to include suggested detail.	Plan amended
27	15	2.1 There may be benefits from including the Science and conservation theme with this initiative. The listed precincts have some of the Perth Region's most engaged Friends of Groups and there is an opportunity to form partnerships with them to connect visitors to the precincts through on-ground action, education, and outreach experiences for visitors – both local and international.	Visitor Experiences	2A - Support or neutral	Supports key management initiative.	Not required.
27	16	2.5 This initiative provides an opportunity to address approaches 1 & 3 in the Culture and Heritage theme. It would be beneficial to recognise its association with the theme and to use it as a vehicle to support greater appreciation of Aboriginal culture and support contemporary Aboriginal businesses.	Visitor Experiences	2A - Support or neutral	Supports key management initiative.	Not required.
27	17	2.7 It is presumed that this initiative will include consideration of management of Phytophthora Dieback and other plant pathogens	Visitor Experiences	2C - Already noted or considered	Noted and considered. It is considered as a comment toward the ongoing management of the park and the preparation of a long-term Bushland Conservation Plan for Bold Park (initiative 3.3).	Not required.
27	18	2.10 Consider elevating this point to higher in the table given its potential links to 2.4 and the breadth of themes that it covers	Visitor Experiences	2C - Already noted or considered	Noted and considered.	Not required.
27	19	3.1 Consider splitting this initiative into two separate points – they are vastly different and community appreciation and understanding of them may be quite varied. Whilst the sustainability aspect of this initiative clearly links to Dot point 4, its placement as part of the first initiative does not align with the context and messaging of the overall document	Science and Environmental Conservation	2C - Already noted or considered	Noted and considered.	Not required.
27	20	3.4 Is it possible to use a stronger or more affirmative word than involve for this this initiative? Given its importance "as one of the largest remaining bushland remnants in the urban area" and the expertise of the staff it is imperative that it is part of the significant international restoration initiatives.	Science and Environmental Conservation	2C - Already noted or considered	Noted and considered.	Not required.
27	21	3.8 Would it be possible to reinstate biodiversity linkages with surrounding suburbs? The ReWild Perth program may provide an important opportunity to engage with local government and residents beyond the perimeters of Bold Park to improve linkages.	Science and Environmental Conservation	2B - Beyond scope	Supports the planned initiative. The BGPA strives to work closely with stakeholders within the areas linking Kings Park and Bold Park to discuss ecological linkages in the landscape.	Not required.
27	22	3.9 Consider revisiting the Healthy Parks Healthy People program that was initiated by Parks Victoria and was previously adopted by the Department of Environment and Conservation. Adoption of a Healthy Parks Healthy People type program has enormous potential to engage the community, business and government is supporting parks and community wellbeing. The program developed in Australia has been adopted internationally https://www.nps.gov/goga/hphp_welcome.htm .	Science and Environmental Conservation	2B - Beyond scope	This suggestion will be considered and supported but is beyond the level of detail included in the management plan.	Not required.
27	23	Consider the inclusion Culture and Heritage in 4.1, especially given the importance of the Zamia Trail and the links to the Whadjuk Walking Trails. Consider linking 4.1 and 4.9 given the similarities and potential overlap in their long-term outcomes.	Amenity and Infrastructure	1C - Better achieves objectives	Noted. Plan amended to include suggested detail in the initiatives and make mention of the Zamia Trail and the links to the Whadjuk Walking Trails.	Plan amended
27	24	4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.7, 3.5. How do these proposed plans fit together? Is there a priority order, a hierarchy, and a budget for all of them?	Overall	2C - Already noted or considered	Noted and considered.	Not required.
27	25	4.5. How does this initiative align with Dot point 2 and the mention of Perth's transport network in relation to Stephenson Highway road reserve? Will these competing objectives be considered in unison?	Amenity and Infrastructure	2B - Beyond scope	Noted and will be considered the planning process on how to improve place and movement connectivity with BGPA lands.	Not required.

27	26	Consider linking 4.2 and 4.10, is 4.10 a subset of 4.2?	Amenity and Infrastructure	2C - Already noted or considered	Noted and considered.	Not required.
28	1	2.7 Concern bikers will increase erosion, diminish safety, and lead to greater human footprint in the park.	Visitor Experiences	2D - Among divergent views	Noted and considered. The plan proposes the BGPA will explore cycling due to increase demand from the wider community. As per the plan, this will be on designated paths consistent with public safety, visitor enjoyment, recreation and conservation objectives.	Not required.
29	1	The Park currently hosts approximately 330,000 mostly local visitors annually. From a tourism perspective, maintaining and supporting, events, guided tours and cultural interpretation are priorities, along with further development of digital interpretation, signage and trails.	Overall	1D - Omission, inaccuracy etc	Noted. Plan amended to include activities suggested on page 8 of the document.	Plan amended
29	2	Tourism WA considers that highlighting the regional context and the relationship with Kings Park (which is also managed by the BGPA,) could be included in the Plan. Further, Tourism WA is of the opinion that the Management Plan could benefit from emphasising the complimentary attractiveness of both locations as a means to enhance visitor interest.	Overall	2B - Beyond scope	Noted and considered.	Not required.
30	1	Greater emphasis on engaging with youth	Visitor Experiences	2C - Already noted or considered	This suggestion will be considered and supported but is beyond the level of detail and is detailed on page 20.	Not required.
30	2	2.3 Supportive. 2.8 - Look into online engagement tools.	Visitor Experiences	2A - Support or neutral	Supports key management initiative.	Not required.
30	3	3.10 Make a priority.	Science and Environmental Conservation	2A - Support or neutral	Supports key management initiative.	Not required.
30	4	3.10 Install a predator proof fence around the park.	Science and Environmental Conservation	2E - Not feasible	Noted but is not economically feasible at this stage. Predator proof fencing may be considered as a management tool during the reintroduction of wildlife back into the park (initiative 3.10).	Not required.
31	1	A significant omission in the draft is that the status of Bold Park as Bush Forever Area 312 is not even mentioned. On page 11, the Bush Forever policy and plan should be included as the main policy and plan applied in the management of Bold Park.	Overall	1D - Omission, inaccuracy etc	Noted and considered. Bush Forever status has been noted and amendments made.	Plan amended
31	2	In order to deliver and meet the important conservation functions (b) and (c) under the BGPA Act, there is a need for greatly increased Government funding for this essential conservation management.	Overall	2B - Beyond scope	Noted and considered but goes beyond the detail included in the plan.	Not required.
31	3	There should be a whole section with details of weeds and control measures to be taken. Similarly with feral animals and other threats such as fire risk. Under Management effectiveness on page 13, the first dot point should start by inserting the words 'greatly increasing and' maintaining a diverse, knowledgeable, professional and engaged workforce...'	Science and Environmental Conservation	1C - Better achieves objectives	Noted. Plan amended to include suggested detail such as the inclusion of measures of success.	Plan amended
31	4	On pages 16-17. Again Bold Park's Bush Forever status should be included.	Overall	1D - Omission, inaccuracy etc	Noted. Plan amended to include suggested detail such as mentioning Bush Forever Status and A Reserve Status.	Plan amended
31	5	Various forms of active recreation are inconsistent with nature conservation and passive recreation uses. For example, bike riders can put walkers as well as wildlife at risk.	Community Engagement and Participation	2D - Among divergent views	Noted and considered. The plan proposes the BGPA will explore cycling due to increase demand from the wider community. As per the plan, this will be on designated paths consistent with public safety, visitor enjoyment, recreation and conservation objectives.	Not required.

31	6	Initiative 1.5 sounds good, but it needs to include much increased BGPA staff engagement work. Similarly we agree that Initiative 1.7 is good, but it must not be used to replace BGPA conservation actions and responsibilities which must be increased. Also initiative 1.9 will require additional BGPA staff to deliver this.	Community Engagement and Participation	2A - Support or neutral	Supports key management initiative.	Not required.
31	7	Again the word 'passive' should be included before the word recreation. More staff to facilitate passive recreation - on page 23, in 2.3 and 2.5 The words 'and provide' should be added: Explore and provide opportunities for innovative experiences that attract visitors.	Visitor Experiences	2D - Among divergent views	Noted and considered.	Not required.
31	8	We strongly disagree with initiative 2.7. There should not be any new or extended cycling access to designated paths in Bold Park. This form of active recreation is incompatible with and in conflict with passive recreation in this bushland conservation area. Cycling is a threat to human safety for walkers, and also is a threat to safety of wildlife which may be on paths. In initiative 2.10 insert the word 'passive' before the word 'recreation'. Thus it reads passive recreation.	Visitor Experiences	2D - Among divergent views	Noted and considered. The plan proposes the BGPA will explore cycling due to increase demand from the wider community. As per the plan, this will be on designated paths consistent with public safety, visitor enjoyment, recreation and conservation objectives.	Not required.
31	9	Science and environmental conservation should be the first theme. It should include much more biodiversity information and comprehensive management actions for the large 361.7 ha area of Bold Park. It is recommended that this section be reworded with much more specific detail and management actions.	Science and Environmental Conservation	2C - Already noted or considered	Noted and considered. The themes do not reflect a prioritisation process.	Not required.
31	10	Under 3.3 on page 25 the 'initiative' to 'Prepare a long-term Bushland Conservation Plan....' should be removed. Instead, this Bold Park Management Plan should indeed be the detailed Bushland Conservation Plan!	Science and Environmental Conservation	2B - Beyond scope	Noted and considered. The preparation of a long-term Bushland Conservation Plan goes beyond the intent of the Management Plan.	Not required.
31	11	On page 24, the first dot point should be that Bold Park and Adjacent Bushland, City Beach is Bush Forever Site 312.	Science and Environmental Conservation	2B - Beyond scope	Noted and considered.	Not required.
31	12	Weed management: All the threatening processes (as in the third dot point) need to be described in detail. For example a comprehensive list of the weeds present, and mapping of the most invasive and threatening weeds.	Science and Environmental Conservation	2C - Already noted or considered	Noted and will be considered in the ongoing management of the park but is beyond the level of detail included in the management plan.	Not required.
31	13	Thus the management initiative 3.7 on page 25 should be rewritten with detailed management actions.	Science and Environmental Conservation	2C - Already noted or considered	Noted and considered.	Not required.
31	14	Under 3.10 on page 25, the wording should be changed to a management action to re-introduce Quenda, Kangaroos and/or Black-gloved Wallabies to at least some parts of Bold Park bushland.	Science and Environmental Conservation	2B - Beyond scope	Supports the planned initiative but goes beyond the scope of the plan. It is considered as a comment toward the ongoing management of the park and the preparation of reintroducing wildlife (initiative 3.10).	Not required.
31	15	Community feedback of the need for additional infrastructure is strongly supported. The emphasis is on passive recreation needs. A café with book shop, and toilet facilities is certainly needed and would facilitate much more community engagement in Bold Park.	Amenity and Infrastructure	2A - Support or neutral	Supports key management initiative.	Not required.
31	16	The fact that the Ecology Centre is now closed with no DBCA staff based there to deliver on the need 'to maintain the natural values of our lands' is a major shortfall that must be addressed. For such an important public conservation asset, as is Bold Park, to be unmanaged on-site by teams of BGPA staff is totally unacceptable.	Overall	2D - Among divergent views	Noted and considered during the master planning process for Western Australian Ecology Centre precinct (initiative 4.3).	Not required.
31	17	Under 4.2: We agree with this, but it also needs teams of BGPA staff guides on site to deliver visitor services in person. Rangers and guides need to be available at key locations in this large area of Bold Park.	Amenity and Infrastructure	2C - Already noted or considered	Noted and considered.	Not required.
31	18	Under 4.3: New facilities that will be provided in the Ecology Centre precinct should be specified. This must include an indoor/outdoor café – bookshop and public toilet facilities which are currently remarkably lacking. A modern bookshop facility could be developed in conjunction with the Wildflower Society of WA and Birdlife WA.	Amenity and Infrastructure	2A - Support or neutral	Supports key management initiative. Noted and considered during the master planning process for Western Australian Ecology Centre precinct (initiative 4.3).	Not required.

31	19	Under 4.4: The Reabold Hill precinct is a good facility. There is a need to stop access by bikers as they are a risk to pedestrians and wildlife.	Amenity and infrastructure	2A - Support or neutral	Supports key management initiative and their considerations will be valuable during the master planning process. The plan proposes the BGPA will explore cycling due to increase demand from the wider community. As per the plan, this will be on designated paths consistent with public safety, visitor enjoyment, recreation and conservation objectives.	Not required.
31	20	We strongly disagree with a new or extended bike trail and biking facilities being located at the Drive-in site. Allowing bikers into this site would increase their incursions to the adjacent bushland. We have strongly objected at a workshop to such a proposal and stated:	Amenity and Infrastructure	2D - Among divergent views	Noted and considered. The plan proposes the BGPA will explore cycling due to increase demand from the wider community. As per the plan, this will be on designated paths consistent with public safety, visitor enjoyment, recreation and conservation objectives.	Not required.
31	21	It is recommended that existing Bike trails in the bushland areas of Bold Park be removed, and that no new or extended trails be constructed through the bushland. They are an inconsistent use with the primary purpose of nature conservation. Bike trails should be confined to cleared areas and be separated from pedestrian walk tracks.	Amenity and Infrastructure	2D - Among divergent views	Noted and considered. The plan proposes the BGPA will explore cycling due to increase demand from the wider community. As per the plan, this will be on designated paths consistent with public safety, visitor enjoyment, recreation and conservation objectives.	Not required.
31	22	Under 4.8: We disagree with the continued horse-riding opportunities. While the Bridle Trail has been reduced, it is now time for it to be ended. It is a form of active recreation and can bring in plant diseases and weeds via horse hoofs, urine and faecal droppings. Thus it is a threat to biodiversity health and condition.	Amenity and Infrastructure	2D - Among divergent views	While the conservation risks regarding bridle trails within bushlands is well considered by the BGPA, the use of the trail is negligible, and the extent of the trail will decrease as part of the plan.	Not required.
31	23	Under 4.10: This is supported with the addition of the phrase at its end: ...'and its nature conservation values.'	Amenity and Infrastructure	2A - Support or neutral	Supports key management initiative.	Not required.
32	1	Supportive of more invertebrate surveys and interested in collaborating on research, particularly to determine the conservation status of rare species.	Science and Environmental Conservation	2A - Support or neutral	Supports draft plan and their involvement in the development of the Bold Park Conservation Plan will be valuable.	Not required.
32	2	Supportive of groundwater monitoring and are interested in collaborating on research to understand and identify stygofauna living within the park	Science and Environmental Conservation	2A - Support or neutral	Supports draft plan and their involvement in the development of the Bold Park Conservation Plan will be valuable.	Not required.
33	1	I am pleased to advise that the priorities and strategic direction presented in the draft Management Plan, as a means of maintaining the important values of Bold Park for future generations, are supported by the Department and WAPC.	Overall	2A - Support or neutral	Supports draft plan.	Not required.
33	2	More detail on mitigation measures, in the Bushfire Management and Response Plan, that are intended for implementation over 2022-2027, would be beneficial given the high number of residences surrounding Bold Park in the bushfire buffer zone.	Overall	1C - Better achieves objectives	Noted. Plan amended to include suggested detail in the Science and Environmental Conservation management category.	Plan amended
33	3	It is recommended that the new Plan (2022 - 2027) also refers to Bold Park being Bush Forever area 312.	Overall	1C - Better achieves objectives	Noted. Plan amended to include suggested detail.	Plan amended
34	1	We endorse that Bold Park is managed for biodiversity and passive recreation, everyone's health and wellbeing and importantly for protecting Aboriginal Cultural values in suburbia.	Overall	2A - Support or neutral	Supports draft plan.	Not required.
34	2	We do not believe there should be any further incursions into the park which would degrade this already degraded park. Degraded sites should be restored for biodiversity and passive recreation not considered as a site for an activity not in keeping with preserving the values of Bold Park above.	Overall	2C - Already noted or considered	Noted and will be considered in the ongoing management of the park but is beyond the level of detail included in the management plan.	Not required.

34	3	Mountain Bike Trails should never have been considered in Bold Park bushland. Dogs and people scare most wildlife. Kids in Mosman Park, have cut down TEC trees to make bike paths through an important narrow linkage from the Sea to the Swan River bushland.	Overall	2D - Among divergent views	Noted and considered. The plan proposes the BGPA will explore cycling due to increase demand from the wider community. As per the plan, this will be on designated paths consistent with public safety, visitor enjoyment, recreation and conservation objectives.	Not required.
34	4	The statistics you present from the online survey have been stacked with those wanting bike tracks. Give them a mountain bike track in the grassed area of Perry Lakes. Get them to revegetate the area for a bush mountain bike experience. Do not allow activities that further degrade Bold Park Bushland.	Overall	2D - Among divergent views	The plan proposes the BGPA will explore cycling due to increase demand from the wider community. As per the plan, this will be on designated paths consistent with public safety, visitor enjoyment, recreation and conservation objectives.	Not required.
34	5	How did you let your survey be overwhelmed with this call for mountain bike tracks in Bold Park without informing the respondents of the degradation it would cause? Bushcare volunteers have worked for years trying to stop the degradation of Bold Park, their consult on Bold Park Bush Management should be the paramount community engagement.	Overall	2D - Among divergent views	Noted and considered. The plan proposes the BGPA will explore cycling due to increase demand from the wider community. As per the plan, this will be on designated paths consistent with public safety, visitor enjoyment, recreation and conservation objectives.	Not required.
34	6	Consider utilising the Ecology centre for community education of the wonders of our natural bushland, Aboriginal culture and threats. Consider opening it on the weekends. There is a treed bike path on the north side which could connect locals with active transport to it. A café open on the weekends might just be the impetus needed. This area has been beautifully planted with local plants, but it appears to be increasingly neglected by lack of weed control.	Overall	2A - Support or neutral	Supports key management initiative. Noted and considered during the master planning process for Western Australian Ecology Centre precinct (initiative 4.3).	Not required.
34	7	Unless further funding is given to stop the degradation then this last large remnant of coastal Tuart woodland will be lost to future generations leaving an overburnt lifeless woodland.	Overall	2D - Among divergent views	Noted and considered but goes beyond the scope of the plan. It is considered as a comment toward the ongoing management of the park and the preparation of a long-term Bushland Conservation Plan for Bold Park (initiative 3.3).	Not required.
35	1	We agree with many of the initiatives listed in the Management Plan and welcome many of the strategies especially around cultural heritage, indigenous knowledge, improved facilities for visitors and increased nature-based education and understanding.	Overall	2A - Support or neutral	Supports draft plan.	Not required.
35	2	Overall the plan is disappointing. In comparison with previous plans this next five-year plan appears lightweight and there seems a lack of ambition for the core mission of BGPA for Bold Park.	Overall	2D - Among divergent views	Noted and considered.	Not required.
35	3	Bold Park is approaching its official centenary. The Management Plan should have referred to this very significant approaching event.	Overall	1D - Omission, inaccuracy etc	Noted. Plan amended to include suggested detail.	Plan amended
35	4	Bold Park has a history of nearly 100 years of passive recreation and active recreational pursuits such as cycling have not been permitted. Active and passive recreation can be distinguished from each other by the infrastructure required and the environmental impacts of the activity. Cycling that requires the construction of trails for exclusive cycling use falls into the category of 'active' use, whereas cycling on existing trails with other uses would be considered 'passive'.	Overall	2D - Among divergent views	Noted and considered. The plan proposes the BGPA will explore cycling due to increase demand from the wider community. As per the plan, this will be on designated paths consistent with public safety, visitor enjoyment, recreation and conservation objectives.	Not required.
35	5	The Friends believe that this plan should include measurable biodiversity targets. Targets for bushland restoration should be addressed in each five-year plan with reference to the 100-year framework.	Overall	1C - Better achieves objectives	Noted. Plan amended to include suggested detail such as the inclusion of measures of success.	Plan amended
35	6	The Friends believe that Bold Park's international, national and local significance is not reflected adequately in the plan. Unique international attributes include the very large size for an area of urban bushland, coupled with the park's location within a major city that lies within an internationally recognised biodiversity hotspot.	Overall	2C - Already noted or considered	Noted and considered.	Not required.

35	7	In contrast, there is a sense that previously successful BGPA bushland restoration efforts have stalled. There appear to be no new substantial areas for bushland restoration in the plan beyond what has already been achieved. In recent years there has been a withdrawal of resources dedicated to the park's management, including the closure of the Ecology Centre and loss of dedicated Bold Park staff based in the park.	Overall	2C - Already noted or considered	Noted and considered during the master planning process for Western Australian Ecology Centre precinct (initiative 4.3).	Not required.
35	8	The Friends believe there is a need for strategies to address problems resulting from feral/human/pet encroachment, some of which may relate to lack of on-site staff. Meaningful strategies to counter climate change, such as increased plantings to increase the resilience of the bushland, are required.	Overall	2C - Already noted or considered	Noted and considered but goes beyond the scope of the plan. It is considered as a comment toward the ongoing management of the park and the preparation of a long-term Bushland Conservation Plan for Bold Park (initiative 3.3).	Not required.
35	9	It is unclear if the list on Page 16 comprises all ecological communities found in the park, or just those that are threatened. A map of the park's ecological communities, either here or elsewhere in the report, would communicate well. The park's size should be specified, as should its Class A status and purpose under the Land Act, and the subsequent requirement for changes to its status to be approved by both houses of State parliament.	Overall	1C - Better achieves objectives	Noted. Plan amended to include a map showing vegetation condition. Other suggestions are out of scope of the plan and would be more appropriate in the Bold Park Conservation Plan.	Plan amended
35	10	Data should be provided for the fauna monitoring (Page 14). There should be reference to seed collection, types of species collected, and where the plants are grown, i.e. further detail to flesh out the theme of restoration. The section on 'Successful Volunteer Partnerships' (Page 15) should refer to our guided walks program, and our participation in community information expos at Floreat Forum. The publication of our well-received 2017 anniversary book on the park deserves mention. This book was brought to local communities through handouts after guided walks, and with displays in local libraries and other venues.	Overall	2B - Beyond scope	This suggestion will be considered and supported but is beyond the level of detail included in the management plan.	Not required.
35	11	The Friends do not support additional cycling within Bold Park (Page 16; Page 23 at 2.7). There is no imperative to "respond to diverse recreational interests" nor do we agree that the BGPA needs to "strive to improve access for everyone, including pedestrians, cyclists, the elderly and people with a disability".	Visitor Experiences	2D - Among divergent views	Noted and considered. The plan proposes the BGPA will explore cycling due to increase demand from the wider community. As per the plan, this will be on designated paths consistent with public safety, visitor enjoyment, recreation and conservation objectives.	Not required.
35	12	Page 17 refers to the "provision of safe and welcoming outcomes through appropriate forms of recreation". We agree with the statement, but we do not believe that cycling is an appropriate form of recreation for the park.	Overall	2D - Among divergent views	Noted and considered. The plan proposes the BGPA will explore cycling due to increase demand from the wider community. As per the plan, this will be on designated paths consistent with public safety, visitor enjoyment, recreation and conservation objectives.	Not required.
35	13	The reference used in the introduction (page 7) is unclear: ... "to expand the provision of engaging and innovative nature-based and authentic cultural experiences", as is the phrase "a focus on amenity, facilities and services that celebrate the natural and cultural values of the park and deliver authentically Western Australian experience". This seems to have been cut and pasted from a plan for Kings Park and is not relevant to Bold Park.	Overall	2D - Among divergent views	Noted and considered.	Not required.
35	14	The last sentence on Page 7 describes what we see as the primary purpose of community activity in the park, and it should not be simply listed as an afterthought; an 'also'. This is to "involve and educate visitors in the conservation of our unique biodiversity and culture".	Overall	1D - Omission, inaccuracy etc	Noted. Plan amended to include suggested detail on page 7.	Plan amended
35	15	It is the Page 22 reference to providing 'spaces' which is out of keeping, and which seems to us to be oriented towards the construction of facilities such as for cycling. In fact, the whole park is for 'leisure and recreation' – particular 'space' does not need to be designated for this.	Visitor Experiences	2D - Among divergent views	Noted and considered. The plan proposes the BGPA will explore cycling due to increase demand from the wider community. As per the plan, this will be on designated paths consistent with public safety, visitor enjoyment, recreation and conservation objectives.	Not required.

35	16	Our intended focus (Page 22) is unclear what it is that needs to be 'balanced' (which implies that a degree of degradation is required, which we do not accept). There is no clarity on which State Government nature-based tourism strategies, if any, may be acceptable in the park, and what the implications are of trying to "help position Perth as a vibrant, connected and progressive city".	Visitor Experiences	2D - Among divergent views	Noted and considered.	Not required.
35	17	Examples of unclear or undefined terms include: 2.1, 2.2, 2.3 "innovative experience"; 2.5 "visitor hospitality experience"; and 2.7 "designated paths" which may refer to either existing or new paths. It is also unclear what an "immersive nature-based and authentic cultural experience" may be like (Page 22). "Explore opportunities..., create a sense of adventure...". This could include activities such high trees adventures and mountain biking that are incompatible with passive nature-based recreation and bushland conservation.	Visitor Experiences	2D - Among divergent views	Noted and considered. The plan proposes the BGPA management initiatives identified in the will be consistent with public safety, visitor enjoyment, recreation and conservation objectives.	Not required.
35	18	It is unclear where any text related to education and interpretation is located in the plan. This section should refer to the role of guided walks in the park, use of Facebook and other social media, brochures, maps, signage and apps.	Overall	1A - Additional info	Noted. Plan amended to include suggested detail under Visitor Experiences management category.	Plan amended
35	19	The Friends support increased infrastructure within Bold Park provided it does not impact on the core mission for the park. This includes maintaining limited access within the park to preserve the sense of wilderness that exists on the walk trails: a uniquely valuable, but intangible value. We support infrastructure improvements limited to precincts such as the WAEC, the turf farm and the old Skyline site.	Amenity and Infrastructure	2A - Support or neutral	Supports key management initiative. Noted and considered during the master planning process for Western Australian Ecology Centre precinct (initiative 4.3).	Not required.
35	20	Section 4 (Page 26, 27) contains a number of rather vague and unclear statements that could be used by the BGPA to support unwanted infrastructure, such as bike trails.	Amenity and Infrastructure	2D - Among divergent views	Noted and considered. The plan proposes the BGPA will explore cycling due to increase demand from the wider community. As per the plan, this will be on designated paths consistent with public safety, visitor enjoyment, recreation and conservation objectives.	Not required.
35	21	Although we agree with the principle of providing universal access in the park, it is not feasible for all trails to meet requirement due to the steep terrain and the appropriately informal character of the trails (i.e. limestone not concrete).	Amenity and Infrastructure	2C - Already noted or considered	Noted and considered. The plan proposes the BGPA management initiatives identified in the will be consistent with public safety, visitor enjoyment, recreation and conservation objectives.	Not required.
35	22	Given the instigation of the Perry Lakes Replenishment project by the Town of Cambridge (page 29), the Friends believe that bushland restoration within Camel Lake area should be included in the 2022-2027 plan.	Amenity and Infrastructure	2B - Beyond scope	Supports the planned initiative but goes beyond the scope of the plan. It is considered as a comment toward the ongoing management of the park and the preparation of a long-term Bushland Conservation Plan, for Bold Park (initiative 3.3).	Not required.
35	23	The plan aims to improve access for everyone (Page 16). As stated above, the Friends has no problem with access to the park for cyclists but not within the park other than as currently permitted on the Scenic Trail. Within the park, cycling is not compatible with passive recreation, dog-walking, improved access for the elderly and people with disability, or with the ethic of bushland conservation. Page 25, 3.7 lists a number of risks, but the list should have included dogs off leads, and bicycles on trails.	Science and Environmental Conservation	2A - Support or neutral	Noted and considered. The plan proposes the BGPA will explore cycling due to increase demand from the wider community. As per the plan, this will be on designated paths consistent with public safety, visitor enjoyment, recreation and conservation objectives.	Not required.
35	24	The Friends strongly supports initiative 3.10, the investigation of opportunities to reintroduce locally extinct fauna species. This is something that the Friends has been promoting for some years now, on the basis that it will assist in improving the park's biodiversity.	Science and Environmental Conservation	2A - Support or neutral	Supports proposed initiative.	Not required.
35	25	There are sensitive issues currently in relation to development proposals adjacent to the park's southern section. This is particularly relevant to the 2022-2027 Management Plan and should be addressed.	Overall	2B - Beyond scope	Noted and but is beyond the level of detail included in the management plan.	Not required.

35	26	Bold Park contains no botanic gardens (nor parklands) and including reference to these is confusing (Page 7 abstract, page 12). A Memorial Policy (page 11) is irrelevant to Bold Park and this section should be removed, as should the section on New Businesses and Events Policy (page 11).	Overall	1D - Omission, inaccuracy etc	Noted. Plan amended to include suggested detail regarding botanical parklands. The Memorial Policy (page 11) and New Businesses and Events Policy (page 11) are relevant to Bold Park as they are BGPA's policies and are applicable to overall conduct of the Authority.	Plan amended
35	27	For example, it is unclear what "experiences that connect visitors with neighbouring precincts" (2.1) refers to. We do not support 2.7, the investigation of opportunities for cycling in other areas of the park. Objectives should be provided in the plan for the Master Planning exercises in the vicinity of the Ecology Centre and Reabold Hill (4.3 and 4.4).	Overall	2D - Among divergent views	Noted and considered. The plan proposes the BGPA will explore cycling due to increase demand from the wider community. As per the plan, this will be on designated paths consistent with public safety, visitor enjoyment, recreation and conservation objectives.	Not required.
35	28	The Friends of Bold Park Bushland believes that the bushland condition of Bold Park is deteriorating. This deterioration has been particularly noticeable over the life of the last management plan. It has occurred during a period of great change to the management structure and practices of both BGPA and Bold Park... The 2022-2027 Bold Park management plan lacks ambition does not express any sense of urgency in responding to park pressures and even contains potentially hazardous elements that could exacerbate existing pressures.	Overall	2B - Beyond scope	Noted and will be considered in the ongoing management of the park but is beyond the level of detail included in the management plan.	Not required.
36	1	The Club has noted the excellent success achieved by BGPA over the years in managing the Bold Park. Native species richness and abundance has increased, technologically assisted fauna monitoring, restoration and fire ecology research initiatives have made impressive contributions to understanding and protecting the native fauna and flora of Bold Park.	Overall	2A - Support or neutral	Noted and considered.	Not required.
36	2	The Club believes that the proposed initiatives in the Draft Management Plan 2022-2027 are appropriate, and they will help to enhance community understanding about Bold Park's cultural heritage.	Overall	2A - Support or neutral	Support for initiative.	Not required.
36	3	The Club is happy to support the intended focus of the program and key management activities. The Club looks forward to actively engaging with BGPA in the conservation of the natural environment and diversity in Bold Park. The Club will be happy to engage and, if required, lead activities to nurture the interest and enthusiasm of children and young people and enhance their participation in environmental conservation.	Community Engagement and Participation	2A - Support or neutral	Support for plan.	Not required.
36	4	Bold Park environment, a natural urban bushland in Perth. The fourth dot point of the 'Intended Focus' section states: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> aligning functions and service priorities to State Government's COVID19 recovery objectives. The Club suggests that this statement is revised to include COVID-19 and similar incidents in the next five years. Please consider replacing the above dot point with the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> aligning functions and service priorities to State Government's prevailing emergency incident management responses and recovery objectives such as the COVID-19 recovery objectives. 	Visitor Experiences	2C - Already noted or considered	Noted and considered.	Not required.
36	5	The intended focus and key management initiatives are excellent. It is recommended that BGPA considers establishing a Bold Park Science team as a part of this Science and Environmental Conservation initiative.	Science and Environmental Conservation	2A - Support or neutral	Support for plan.	Not required.
36	6	The Club believes that the intended focus of planned activities and key management initiatives for additional infrastructure will help to increase the use and value of Bold Park's trails and improve visitor experience.	Amenity and Infrastructure	2A - Support or neutral	Support for plan.	Not required.

36	7	It is recommended that proper consideration be given to protect Bold Park bushland for biodiversity and ensure that recreational activities do not have a negative impact. For example, it is acceptable to have bike paths through the park as long as they are created by minimal adverse impact on the existing bushland	Amenity and Infrastructure	2C - Already noted or considered	Noted and considered. The plan proposes the BGPA will explore cycling due to increase demand from the wider community. As per the plan, this will be on designated paths consistent with public safety, visitor enjoyment, recreation and conservation objectives.	Not required.
36	8	With the increasing push for denser living, there is a real threat that the boundaries of the Bold Park may come under threat from fringe development. It is recommended that BGPA includes appropriate provisions in the Management Plan to ensure that the Bold Park boundaries are protected from increasing or inappropriate development threat.	Overall	2B - Beyond scope	Noted and but is beyond the level of detail included in the management plan.	Not required.
37	1	2.7 Retain current cycling access arrangements on Scenic Walk and Scenic Drive and investigate opportunities for bicycle access to other areas of the park on designated paths consistent with public safety, visitor enjoyment, recreation and conservation objectives. I am opposed to the construction of any bicycle access to other areas of Bold Park for the following reasons: - The potential impact this could have on the Bold Park wildlife, flora and fauna. - The potential impact this could have on noise, given the nature of bike riding and the need to communicate loudly with each other on paths along the track. - The potential for further tracks to be created beyond the existing path, as riders seek alternative routes and challenges - and the damage it may cause to Bold Park's wildlife and plantation. - Bold Park as a walking route is uniquely secluded, peaceful, spacious and safe for walkers. There is an abundance of other cycling paths in and around Perth.	Visitor Experiences	2D - Among divergent views	Noted and considered. The plan proposes the BGPA will explore cycling due to increase demand from the wider community. As per the plan, this will be on designated paths consistent with public safety, visitor enjoyment, recreation and conservation objectives.	Not required.
38	1	Overall, the document appears to lack an identifiable flow that links legal requirements and definitions through strategies, risks and objectives to plans, targets, actions, resourcing and funding with a final description of measurable outcomes to enable the plan to be audited and achievement against the plan reported.	Overall	2C - Already noted or considered	Noted and considered.	Not required.
38	2	No detail is provided on whether current and or future funds are sufficient for the planned activities. The amount of work required appears to be growing each year (e.g. mitigating threats such as weeds and dieback, increased visitation) yet there, concurrently, appears to be a decreased presence of BGPA staff at the Park and more reliance on volunteers as the 'real' budget declines as no provision appears to be made for increases in costs and wages.	Overall	2C - Already noted or considered	Noted and considered.	Not required.
38	3	No mention is made of Bold Park being both a Bush Forever site and an A Class reserve. Both these designations carry their own sets of associated policies (e.g. the 2000 Bush Forever policy, replaced in 2010 by State Planning Policy 2.8 Bushland Policy for the Perth Metropolitan Region, and the Land Administration Act 1997).	Overall	1B - Change in govt leg or policy	Noted. Plan amended to include suggested detail such as mentioning Bush Forever Status and A Reserve Status.	Plan amended
38	4	While the Themes and Goals outlined are commendable and many are required for the success of Bold Park, the first listed should be the Science and Conservation theme. This would yet again reiterate the centrality of conservation to the Plan.	Science and Environmental Conservation	2C - Already noted or considered	Noted and considered. The themes do not reflect a prioritisation process.	Not required.
38	5	Movement of the public within the park should be limited to foot traffic with the exception of parking areas around the periphery where vehicles could be parked for start/end of people transit within the park. The mix of wheeled traffic (with the exception of wheelchairs) and pedestrians leads to adverse interaction between people and wheeled vehicles, particularly where pedestrians are focussed on observing the natural beauty adjacent to walkways.	Visitor Experiences	2D - Among divergent views	Noted and considered. The plan proposes the BGPA will explore cycling due to increase demand from the wider community. As per the plan, this will be on designated paths consistent with public safety, visitor enjoyment, recreation and conservation objectives.	Not required.
38	6	"Prepare a long-term Bushland Conservation Plan for Bold Park to guide integration of scientific research with adaptive management of Bold Park Bushland for its ongoing conservation. This includes undertaking research to address knowledge gaps for bushland management, biodiversity conservation and ecological restoration, and building on our ecological records of local biodiversity". The draft management plan should include such conservation plans. What is meant by bushland management? One would assume that this would include, as an example, reducing weeds (a major issue in the park). Target weed species should be listed, and reduction and eradication actions listed.	Science and Environmental Conservation	2B - Beyond scope	Noted and will be considered but goes beyond the scope of the plan. It is considered as a comment toward the ongoing management of the park and the preparation of a long-term Bushland Conservation Plan for Bold Park (initiative 3.3).	Not required.

38	7	3.7 reads: "Manage risks in Bold Park, including risks associated with trees, fire, erosion, biosecurity and visitor access, for community safety, protection of park assets and to conserve native biodiversity in the bushland". We assume that, as an example, biosecurity relates to weeds, dieback and other diseases etc. Reducing biosecurity risks could be achieved by the removal of horse access to the Park. Again, such specifics of the management of these risks should be listed in the Plan so that comment by stakeholders can be made and the best approaches integrated.	Science and Environmental Conservation	2D - Among divergent views	Noted and will be considered but goes beyond the scope of the plan. It is considered as a comment toward the ongoing management of the park and the preparation of a long-term Bushland Conservation Plan for Bold Park (initiative 3.3).	Not required.
38	8	Cleared areas could also be used for Science and Conservation as they offer the opportunity to demonstrate bushland restoration techniques and train volunteers in bushland restoration as well as coastal dune restoration.	Science and Environmental Conservation	2B - Beyond scope	Supports the planned initiative but goes beyond the scope of the plan. It is considered as a comment toward the ongoing management of the park and the preparation of a long-term Bushland Conservation Plan for Bold Park (initiative 3.3).	Not required.
38	9	Promoting native horticulture in domestic gardens (p 16). Further development of the Perry House gardens using local species presents an opportunity for the WSWA to conduct such promotion. Key management initiatives 1.3 and 1.6 "Maintain, enhance and develop relationships with not-for-profit and community organisations to facilitate the continuing conservation, presentation and celebration of the natural and cultural values of Bold Park and biodiversity conservation values more generally" and "Undertake community engagement and strategic partnerships with State and local government, and not-for-profit and other organisations to promote native flora conservation outcomes and to increase native flora use in landscapes outside Bold Park".	Community Engagement and Participation	2A - Support or neutral	This suggestion will be considered but is beyond the level of detail included in the management plan.	Not required.
38	10	"Undertake a master planning process for the Western Australian Ecology Centre precinct to become a visitor gateway for Bold Park and a community engagement hub, including new facilities for community groups and improved public amenity". As part of the precinct, Perry House could be made more visible to visitors through permanent signage and an entry statement including landscaping of the surrounding formal gardens with native species. The Society reiterates that the purpose of Bold Park is conservation of its flora and fauna and this should remain the priority theme of this management plan. Other themes should be bounded in their scope by this theme. The Society would suggest that funding directed to conservation of flora and fauna should take precedence over funding of other activities, including recreation.	Community Engagement and Participation	2A - Support or neutral	Supports key management initiative. Noted and considered during the master planning process for Western Australian Ecology Centre precinct (initiative 4.3).	Not required.
39	1	I fully support the direction and planned activities presented in the Draft Bold Park Management Plan 2022-2027.	Overall	2A - Support or neutral	Support for plan.	Not required.
39	2	The Statement of Purpose is clear and relevant. The background information is relevant to the plan however it would be good to see the historic context more prominent, if not in this document, then in a supplement. Is great to have Bold Park as a 'special place for the people of WA', but then for local community recognition, ownership and engagement, an historic context would be good. There are so many connections, starting with Noongar occupation, through private ownership to current reserve status. Historic context provides connection.	Overall	2A - Support or neutral	Supports draft plan.	Not required.
39	3	The focus on community engagement and participation is a key theme that is fully supported by BirdLife WA. Partnership opportunities for this are important. This could be largely opportunistic but would be best if there were a strategic approach which this plan intends. A detailed CE&P strategy is required.	Community Engagement and Participation	2A - Support or neutral	Supports draft plan. This suggestion will be considered but is beyond the level of detail included in the management plan.	Not required.
39	4	Emphasis on the park being for all West Australians.	Visitor Experiences	2A - Support or neutral	Noted and considered.	Not required.

39	5	There needs to be more specific reference to control of feral pest animals, especially cats, foxes and rainbow lorikeets. BirdLife WA is keen to participate in fire response monitoring (bird surveys), including for the recent wildfire near Peregrine House.	Science and Environmental Conservation	2B - Beyond scope	Noted and will be considered but goes beyond the scope of the plan. It is considered as a comment toward the ongoing management of the park and the preparation of a long-term Bushland Conservation Plan for Bold Park (initiative 3.3).	Not required.
40	1	I fully support the direction and planned activities presented in the Draft Bold Park Management Plan 2022-2027.	Overall	2A - Support or neutral	Support for plan.	Not required.
40	2	p.23 Key management initiatives includes under 2.7: "... investigate opportunities for bicycle access to other areas of the park on designated paths consistent with public safety, visitor enjoyment, recreation and conservation objectives. The inclusion of "opportunities for bicycle access" appears to keep open the possibility of a future for Mountain Bike trails in the Park. Despite the intensive feedback/lobbying from MTB groups and individuals for mountain bike trails as evident from the Community Survey Summary Report, mountain biking anywhere with this Park would be a totally inappropriate use of any area of the Park; out of sync with the Park's conservation values and the immersive, sympathetic experience in nature that the Park specially provides to walking visitors. Although there has been strong support in recent years from within Government/DBCA, and from trails developers and enthusiastic recreational advocates for more mountain bike developments in WA (including in national parks regardless of the conservation values), mountain biking caters primarily to a mainly narrow, young, male-centric demographic whose focus is on physical challenge rather than passive enjoyment of nature. The SportAus (AusPlay) national survey results for year ended June 2021 indicate for 'adults' (over 15) the female: male participation ratio is also strongly skewed to males (18% female: 82% male). To remove any ambiguity in the plan's intentions regarding "opportunities for bicycle access" the Plan should specifically indicate mountain biking as being a non-passive activity incompatible with the Park values.	Visitor Experiences	2D - Among divergent views	Noted and considered. The plan proposes the BGPA will explore cycling due to increase demand from the wider community. As per the plan, this will be on designated paths consistent with public safety, visitor enjoyment, recreation and conservation objectives.	Not required.
41	1	I fully support the direction and planned activities presented in the Draft Bold Park Management Plan 2022-2027.	Overall	2A - Support or neutral	Support for plan.	Not required.
41	2	Pleased to see emphasis on cultural initiatives.	Visitor Experiences	2A - Support or neutral	Supports draft plan.	Not required.
41	3	2.1, 2.5, 2.6 I have concerns about what type of visitor experiences BGPA would promote in Bold Park. No mention of the environment or conservation. Is this the Authority's way of introducing experiences such as mountain biking?	Visitor Experiences	2D - Among divergent views	Noted and considered. The plan proposes the BGPA will explore cycling due to increase demand from the wider community. As per the plan, this will be on designated paths consistent with public safety, visitor enjoyment, recreation and conservation objectives.	Not required.
41	4	2.8 ,2.9 Excellent initiatives.	Visitor Experiences	2A - Support or neutral	Support for key management initiatives.	Not required.
41	5	Good initiatives.	Science and Environmental Conservation	2A - Support or neutral	Support for plan.	Not required.
41	6	Under Planning context - I would be concerned about providing public conveniences in Bold Park. This will involve ongoing costs through cleaning, maintenance and repair. Will staff be expected to open and shut conveniences; will they be open seven days a week? The community has become aware that there are no toilets and prepare accordingly. Careful consideration on signage needed. Is it necessary if 2.9 is executed?	Amenity and Infrastructure	2C - Already noted or considered	Noted and considered during the master planning process for Western Australian Ecology Centre precinct (initiative 4.3).	Not required.
41	7	The overall plan is good. Is there any chance you could have an initiative where the community could be educated to keep their dogs on leads and not leave their dog waste along the paths! 1.5 Meaningful volunteering?	Overall	2C - Already noted or considered	Noted and considered. Goes beyond scope of the detail included in the plan. Unsure on the intention of 1.5 comment.	Not required.
42	1	I fully support the direction and planned activities presented in the Draft Bold Park Management Plan 2022-2027.	Overall	2A - Support or neutral	Support for plan.	Not required.

42	2	<p>Endorse the issues and trends (p.16-17) particularly the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "Providing welcoming links to local neighbourhoods is a priority and BGPA will strive to improve access for everyone, including pedestrians, cyclists, the elderly and people with a disability". - Using virtual to enhance the physical experience of Bold Park <p>Suggested amendments</p> <p>Focus areas P20</p> <p>Include - educating users of the park regarding the ecological and restorative issues and activities</p> <p>Back to nature for physical and mental health</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - expand on evidence relating to natural spaces to include the use of the area for recreation physical exercise whether it be through walking, jogging or cycling. Can also adopt as a planned activity, the capturing of users thru a QR code to then provide education material. Also use of QR codes and other technology to provide education experiences on the journey around the park. 	Introduction and Background	2A - Support or neutral	Supportive statements but suggestions will be considered but is beyond the level of detail included in the management plan.	Not required.
42	3	Delete - smoke free objective, whilst recognising the link to fire protection would be better off stating that smoking is banned in the park. Encouraging and supporting is too soft and should not be included in its present form	Introduction and Background	1D - Omission, inaccuracy etc	Noted. Plan amended to include suggested detail as per smoking restrictions in outdoor public places.	Plan amended
42	4	<p>P 20 focus area, last dot point</p> <p>Expand statement to ... through formal and informal BGPA ... - informal kids' engagement can be a strategy for educating kids. There should be an additional strategy for those who use the park for exercise - presumably the bulk of the users. e.g. 1.11 Implement strategies targeting 'exercise users' of the park regarding ecological and restorative issues within Bold Park.</p>	Community Engagement and Participation	2C - Already noted or considered	Noted and considered. The plan proposes the BGPA will explore cycling due to increase demand from the wider community. As per the plan, this will be on designated paths consistent with public safety, visitor enjoyment, recreation and conservation objectives.	Not required.
42	5	<p>2.7 Whilst mentioned in the infrastructure section in order to include the Skyline drive in and open up the scope for general cycle facilities, should exclude the words "on designated paths"</p> <p>Could also add an initiative here or at 1.11 to "educate recreation and fitness users of Bold Park on the ecological and restorative issues within Bold Park. see suggested comment 1.11</p>	Visitor Experiences	2A - Support or neutral	Supports key management initiative. The plan proposes the BGPA will explore the most appropriate use of the Skyline Drive-in including restoration where possible. Cycling is considered in key management initiatives due to increase demand from the wider community. As per the plan, this will be on designated paths consistent with public safety, visitor enjoyment, recreation and conservation objectives.	Not required.
42	6	3.8 amend to add ... surrounding suburbs to increase public use and connectivity for tourists, walkers, joggers and bike riders.	Science and Environmental Conservation	2B - Beyond scope	Noted and will be considered the planning process on how to improve place and movement connectivity within and surrounding BGPA lands.	Not required.
42	7	<p>P26 Focus second dot point, include ... and the Long Term Cycle Network.</p> <p>4.5 endorse the generic fit-for-purpose recreation activation of the site (implies inclusion of bike riding).</p> <p>4.7 add ... and recreational opportunities - (whilst not specifically stated this could include a MTB and ecology park, hence managing the bike rider use in a degraded area of Bold park).</p> <p>4.8 add integrated use of bridle trail for bike riding and horse riding opportunities in accordance with dual use standards</p>	Amenity and infrastructure	2C - Already noted or considered	Noted and will be considered the planning process on how to improve place and movement connectivity with BGPA lands.	Not required.

42	8	Overall a good plan in a practical and political sense. There is good scope for the sensible integration of bike riding and ecological and restorative outcomes in the initiatives listed on P 28 - 2.7, 4.5 & 4.8. 2.7 could add ... in other areas, integrating ecological outcomes for users. 4.1 could add ... including connectivity to the active transport routes.	Overall	2A - Support or neutral	Support for initiatives. The plan proposes the BGPA will explore cycling due to increase demand from the wider community. As per the plan, this will be on designated paths consistent with public safety, visitor enjoyment, recreation and conservation objectives.	Not required.
43	1	I partially support the direction and planned activities presented in the Draft Bold Park Management Plan 2022-2027.	Overall	NA	Response provided to specific comments which explain reason for partial support.	Not required.
43	2	The draft plan highlights the benefits to volunteers in terms of well-being, addressing social isolation and mental health. It is not clear however the extent to which volunteers are relied on up to deliver outcomes from the Park. The strategy should highlight the challenges ahead to sustain a future volunteer workforce in a contemporary volunteer program. Some of the issues to be considered include: • Removing or reimbursing membership fees to join Friends of Bold Park (if that is a requirement to volunteer); • Diversity of volunteers to reflect community demographics; • Including specific strategies to promote inclusion of migrants, people with a disability and First Nations peoples; • Increasing episodic and spontaneous volunteering opportunities; and • Increasing role of virtual (online) volunteering.	Community Engagement and Participation	2C - Already noted or considered	This suggestion will be considered but is beyond the level of detail included in the management plan.	Not required.
44	1	I fully support the direction and planned activities presented in the Draft Bold Park Management Plan 2022-2027.	Overall	2A - Support or neutral	Support for plan.	Not required.
44	2	Happy with the strategic focus and general approach	Overall	2A - Support or neutral	Support for plan.	Not required.
44	3	I didn't see any mention of off-lead dogs. I find this to be a big problem in the park at the moment. It affects amenity for other visitors who don't want a big dog running up to them, and I'm sure it terrifies the small mammals. Dog droppings that are not collected by owners is another big problem currently.	Science and Environmental Conservation	1D - Omission, inaccuracy etc	Noted. Plan amended to include suggested detail in Visitor Experiences and Science and Environmental Conservation management categories.	Plan amended
44	4	Very happy to see cycling will continue to be supported and that new ways will be investigated to better support cycling in the park.	Amenity and infrastructure	2A - Support or neutral	Support for initiatives. The plan proposes the BGPA will explore cycling due to increase demand from the wider community. As per the plan, this will be on designated paths consistent with public safety, visitor enjoyment, recreation and conservation objectives.	Not required.
45	1	I fully support the direction and planned activities presented in the Draft Bold Park Management Plan 2022-2027.	Overall	2A - Support or neutral	Support for plan.	Not required.
46	1	I partially support the direction and planned activities presented in the Draft Bold Park Management Plan 2022-2027.	Overall	NA	Response provided to specific comments which explain reason for partial support.	Not required.
46	2	The Bushcare volunteers, Friends of Bold Park should be the community engagement. There say should be priority. They do not work tirelessly for further degradation of their work. They expect that funding will be provided to protect and enhance ecological values of the park which will benefit everyone.	Community Engagement and Participation	2D - Among divergent views	Noted and the Friends of Bold Park are a valued stakeholder and contributor to the management of the park. However, the intent of the state is beyond the level of detail included in the management plan.	Not required.
46	3	Passive recreation only so as to protect and enhance ecological, Aboriginal cultural and our health and wellbeing by visiting a park with a healthy ecosystem.	Visitor Experiences	2D - Among divergent views	Noted and considered. Passive recreation is one of many ways people explore and use the park and is considered the dominant use of the park at the moment.	Not required.

46	4	Utilise the Ecology centre to attract people to learn about our natural, Aboriginal heritage at Bold Park and the threats it faces. Perhaps a weekend cafe!	Visitor Experiences	2C - Already noted or considered	Supports key management initiative. Noted and considered during the master planning process for Western Australian Ecology Centre precinct (initiative 4.3).	Not required.
46	5	Re-generate the Skyline Drive-in with what was removed (<i>in regard to cycling and mountain biking</i>).	Amenity and infrastructure	2D - Among divergent views	Noted and considered. The plan proposes the BGPA will explore the most appropriate use of the Skyline Drive-in including restoration where possible. Cycling is considered in key management initiatives due to increase demand from the wider community. As per the plan, this will be on designated paths consistent with public safety, visitor enjoyment, recreation and conservation objectives.	Not required.
46	6	Consult with Friends of Bold Park Bushcare volunteers as a priority. Degrading Bold Park with non-passive recreation is contrary to their and the community expectation.	Overall	2D - Among divergent views	Noted and considered. Friends of Bold Park are a valued stakeholder and contributor to the management of the park and will be involved during consultation processes involving the implementation of key management initiatives.	Not required.
47	1	I partially support the direction and planned activities presented in the Draft Bold Park Management Plan 2022-2027.	Overall	NA	Response provided to specific comments which explain reason for partial support.	Not required.
47	2	I live in Iluka but frequently visit Bold Park to walk and jog in the hills rather than going to the much closer Yellagonga Park system because Bold Park is refreshingly free of cyclists. Cyclists are typically menaces to pedestrians on shared pathways. They use their electronic devices while riding much more often than they use their warning bells, in my long experience. They also seem collectively to feel a sense of entitlement but no concern for the safety of others. PLEASE do not give them more access to the park.	Visitor Experiences	2D - Among divergent views	Noted and considered. The plan proposes the BGPA will explore cycling due to increase demand from the wider community. As per the plan, this will be on designated paths consistent with public safety, visitor enjoyment, recreation and conservation objectives.	Not required.
47	3	A water fountain or two sounds nice, as would a rubbish bin at the halfway point of the Zamia Trail near the map at the bottom of the hill on the western edge of the park. Beyond that, I feel that the park should remain as wild and as a place as possible for people (and dogs) on foot, (along with the horse trails).	Amenity and Infrastructure	2A - Support or neutral	Noted and considered. Comments goes beyond the detail included in the plan.	Not required.
47	4	You all do a fantastic job tending to the park. The parking lot upgrades were necessary and welcome. I haven't seen any of your friendly rangers cruising the main path recently which is a slight concern.	Overall	2A - Support or neutral	Supportive comment. Noted and considered.	Not required.
48	1	I fully support the direction and planned activities presented in the Draft Bold Park Management Plan 2022-2027.	Overall	2A - Support or neutral	Support for plan.	Not required.
48	2	Item 4.4 - Undertake a master planning process for the Reabold Hill precinct with a view to improve access, safety and amenity. I would recommend broadening this to include improving the visitor experience at the summit of Reabold Hill be the introduction of an elevated viewing platform or tower at the summit. The walk-up Reabold Hill is a wonderful experience and even more so the walk up the elevated walkway towards the summit as the wonderful views are revealed at each of the stopping points. However, after such a build up the view from the summit is now very underwhelming. This is largely due to the growth of the surrounding trees over the past ten years or so. The view from the top of Reabold Hill could easily be the best in Perth (but is well short of that now). A DNA tower, or similar, like in Kings Park would be fantastic (assuming the trees surrounding the summit won't be trimmed down). The plan talks of Bold Park's impact on tourism - I think it could be a lot greater and a memorable summit view and experience at Reabold Hill would greatly increase the Park's attraction and engagement.	Visitor Experiences	2A - Support or neutral	Noted and will be considered during the master planning process for the Reabold Hill precinct (initiative 4.4)	Not required.

49	1	OMI recommends that BGPA considers adding inclusive measures mentioned in the framework as part of the broader goals not only for community engagement but also for visitor experiences (page 23) and amenities and infrastructure sections (page 27) as outlined in this submission.	Community Engagement and Participation	1C - Better achieves objectives	Noted. Plan amended to include suggested detail in measures of success.	Plan amended
49	2	Therefore, OMI recommends that the Plan includes the Western Australian Language Services Policy 2020 (WALSP) in the list to frameworks (page 20). Accordingly, it is important that BGPA considers ensuring provision of translated materials along with access to interpreting services to 'develop and implement partnership and programs that promote... multicultural inclusion' (#1.8) or 'undertake community engagement... 'under key management initiatives (page 21).	Community Engagement and Participation	1B - Change in govt leg or policy	Noted. Plan amended to include suggested detail in Community Engagement and Participation management categories.	Plan amended
49	3	OMI recommends that the key management initiatives in relation to visitor experiences reflect the strategies around promoting and celebrating diverse communities. For example, one of the key management initiatives for visitor experiences is: "Explore opportunities to host cultural events in Bold Park" (#2.2, page 23). As a part of this initiative, the BGPA can include activities relating to major celebrations of multicultural communities such as Chinese New Year, Vietnamese Tet, the Swan Festival of Lights and Diwali Mela. Information about these and other cultural occasions and events can be found on the OMI website (https://www.omi.wa.gov.au).	Visitor Experiences	1C - Better achieves objectives	Noted. Plan amended to include suggested detail in Visitor Experiences management category.	Plan amended
49	4	OMI website through publications such as WA's Changing Population and Cultural Landscape and Western Australians from Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Backgrounds: A Profile. To access more detailed information, the Search Diversity WA—an online search facility developed by OMI details the demographic, cultural and social economic backgrounds of Western Australians, including profiles of all WA electoral divisions and local government areas which can be used by BGPA to assess the needs of the local population and connect with local cultural groups.	Visitor Experiences	NA	This suggestion will be considered but is beyond the level of detail included in the management plan.	Not required.
49	5	OMI proposes that BGPA considers provision for interpreter services, to enable support to visitors from CaLD backgrounds that might need help and have low English language proficiency, for example if a child gets lost in the park and the parent needs to engage with Park authorities. In this connection, it is also important to have some system in place for registering missing people as a part of key management initiatives (#2.5 page 23).	Visitor Experiences	2B - Beyond scope	This suggestion will be considered but is beyond the level of detail included in the management plan.	Not required.
49	6	OMI recommends that BGPA considers culturally appropriate communications strategies such as use of plain English, languages other than English, relevant visual representations in the "entry statements and other signage" (#4.10) as well as other promotional resources and education materials that are culturally inclusive as part of key management initiatives outlined in the Amenity and Infrastructure section (page 27). OMI's publication - WA's Linguistic Diversity provides an overview of the languages most commonly spoken by Western Australians based on the 2016 Population and Housing Census, including those with low English proficiency. This will assist BGPA in its planning for translating and interpreting strategies, making information more accessible for everyone, including those from linguistically diverse backgrounds.	Amenity and Infrastructure	1C - Better achieves objectives	Noted. Plan amended to include suggested detail in Amenities and Infrastructure management categories.	Plan amended
49	7	OMI supports 'community wellbeing' as one of the strategic priority themes along with 'healthy spaces' as the goal (theme 2 under Strategic Themes and Goals page 12) outlined in the BGPA strategic priorities section.	Overall	2A - Support or neutral	Supports the draft plan or initiative.	Not required.
49	8	OMI recommends that the BGPA considers consultation with representatives of culturally and linguistically diverse (CaLD) communities as one of the corresponding targeted approaches to achieve this goal. Additionally, BGPA can also consider amending the last bullet point for this goal to make it more pertinent in the context of the State's increasing diversity, by changing it to 'Provide for evolving visitor demographics, "diverse cultures" and needs', as noted in the Approach column (page 12).	Overall	2C - Already noted or considered	Supports initiative and the comment will be considered during the implementation of key management initiatives.	Not required.

50	1	I fully support the direction and planned activities presented in the Draft Bold Park Management Plan 2022-2027.	Overall	2A - Support or neutral	Support for plan.	Not required.
50	2	The name 'Shenton Park Bushland' is incorrect the correct name is 'Shenton Bushland' page 8.	Introduction and Background	1D - Omission, inaccuracy etc	Noted and amended.	Plan amended
50	3	Support the planned activities under 'Community Engagement and Participation'.	Community Engagement and Participation	2A - Support or neutral	Support for plan.	Not required.
50	4	Support the planned activities under 'Visitor Experiences' and request promotion/inclusion of the Whadjuk Trails Network. The Whadjuk Trails (the Bush to Beach Trail and the Bidi Bo Djinoong) traverse Bold Park however they are not referenced. These trails would assist BGPA to enhance visitor experiences.	Visitor Experiences	2A - Support or neutral	Supports initiative and the comment will be considered during the implementation of key management initiatives.	Not required.
50	5	Support the planned activities under 'Science and Environmental Conservation'.	Science and Environmental Conservation	2A - Support or neutral	Support for plan.	Not required.
50	6	Support the planned activities under 'Amenity and Infrastructure' and request promotion/inclusion of the Whadjuk Trails Network. Promotion of the Whadjuk Trails by the BGPA would provide an opportunity to increase people's connection with green spaces and improve cultural and environmental educational for park visitors.	Amenity and Infrastructure	2A - Support or neutral	Supports initiative and the comment will be considered during the implementation of key management initiatives.	Not required.
50	7	Support the Management Plan and request promotion/inclusion of the Whadjuk Trails Network. The Whadjuk Trails (the Bush to Beach Trail and the Bidi Bo Djinoong) traverse Bold Park however their locations are not referenced on the trails map or in the Plan. Promoting these trails and including them in the Management Plan would assist BGPA to enhance visitor experiences as they share recognition of Noongar culture.	Overall	2A - Support or neutral	Supports initiative and the comment will be considered during the implementation of key management initiatives.	Not required.
51	1	I partially support the direction and planned activities presented in the Draft Bold Park Management Plan 2022-2027.	Overall	NA	Response provided to specific comments which explain reason for partial support.	Not required.
51	2	Page 7. Acknowledge that the natural value of the park is recognised but note that the desire to increase 'amenity, facilities and services' will impact the natural beauty and conservation value of the park. The park plan needs to be more aligned to its proximity developed area - Perry Lakes - which has ample toilets, drink fountains, area for hospitality, area for cycle paths/pump tracks etc. Bold Park must be preserved for its conservation and biodiversity value. Any investment needs to be in: - bushland research - bushland restoration & tree plantings - facilities for local and endangered species (i.e. water towers for Black Cockatoos, not drink fountains for humans)	Introduction and Background	2D - Among divergent views	Noted and considered. It is considered as a comment on the ongoing management of the park and the preparation of a long-term Bushland Conservation Plan for Bold Park (initiative 3.3).	Not required.
51	3	Strongly support key management initiatives: 1.3, 1.5, 1.6, 1.7 as they promote the conservation and preservation (not development) of this strategically significant local bushland.	Community Engagement and Participation	2A - Support or neutral	Support for key management initiatives.	Not required.
51	4	I support the focus areas listed in the introduction. However there are 'key management initiatives' that contravene the intent of the plan and the focus areas for visitor experiences.	Visitor Experiences	2A - Support or neutral	Noted and considered.	Not required.
51	5	2.5 - Strongly against - hospitality services are NOT needed within the park. If proximity services are required, they should be developed in the already cleared Perry Lakes parklands, not the Bold park bushland.	Visitor Experiences	2D - Among divergent views	The plan does not propose hospitality venues to be developed explicitly within bushland areas.	Not required.
51	6	Initiative 2.6 - Strongly against - public benefit is derived for the bushland through its conservation value and natural amenity. NOT through hospitality businesses, cafes etc.	Visitor Experiences	2D - Among divergent views	The plan does not propose hospitality venues to be developed explicitly within bushland areas.	Not required.
51	7	Initiative 2.7 - strongly against - no increase to bike facilities or paths through the bushlands. this will impact the local environment, flora and fauna with increased use and damage. this initiative goes against the conservation and biodiversity goals of the park.	Visitor Experiences	2D - Among divergent views	Noted and considered. The plan proposes the BGPA will explore cycling due to increase demand from the wider community. As per the plan, this will be on designated paths consistent with public safety, visitor enjoyment, recreation and conservation objectives.	Not required.

51	8	Strongly support the objective to conserve and enhance Bold Park bushland, in a natural sense. However there are no actions specifically to support the existing wildlife species within the bushland. I am concerned that with the long list of initiatives, money will be oriented into people-centric initiatives, landscaping, etc instead of supporting the remaining species which cling to life in this beautiful remnant bushland. This section needs to specifically include content on the preservation and conservation of Black Cockatoos (including Carnaby's, Forrest Redtails and Baudins) all which depend on bold park bushland, its water resources and native plants. For instance, cockatoo watering towers could be installed in proximity to the park, where the birds roost. This section does not include any specific actions on the restoration of dying banksias. Nor targeted planting programs for tuarts, which do not appear to have any saplings in the park, to replace the ancient beauties that will eventually disappear.	Science and Environmental Conservation	2D - Among divergent views	Noted and will be considered but goes beyond the scope of the plan. It is considered as a comment toward the ongoing management of the park and the preparation of a long-term Bushland Conservation Plan for Bold Park (initiative 3.3).	Not required.
51	9	Initiative 3.3 - strongly support the development of a bushland conservation plan. This needs to include science for restoration purposes (not just adaptive management) including trials and research into species reintroduction and support. This practice is common in Europe where species diversity and abundance in local bushlands are significantly improved over time (from previously degraded levels).	Science and Environmental Conservation	2A - Support or neutral	Supports the planned initiative but goes beyond the scope of the plan. It is considered as a comment toward the ongoing management of the park and the preparation of a long-term Bushland Conservation Plan for Bold Park (initiative 3.3).	Not required.
51	10	Initiative 3.5 - strongly support including some traditional cultural burning practices to improve the health of the bushland	Science and Environmental Conservation	2A - Support or neutral	Supports the planned initiative but goes beyond the scope of the plan. It is considered as a comment toward the ongoing management of the park and the preparation of a long-term Bushland Conservation Plan for Bold Park (initiative 3.3).	Not required.
51	11	Initiative 3.8 - any investment in landscape treatments MUST be towards increasing local flora species, not non-native species or treatments	Science and Environmental Conservation	2A - Support or neutral	Supports the planned initiative but goes beyond the scope of the plan. It is considered as a comment toward the ongoing management of the park and the preparation of a long-term Bushland Conservation Plan for Bold Park (initiative 3.3).	Not required.
51	12	Initiative 3.10 - STRONGLY support any initiative to reintroduce local species no longer found in the park.	Science and Environmental Conservation	2A - Support or neutral	Supports proposed initiative.	Not required.
51	13	Any infrastructure in bold park needs to be minimised. Support the agenda to achieve "excellence and innovation in design, environmentally sensitive and sustainable principles in planning and development, and conserving natural and cultural heritage values." Though I DO NOT support some of the proposed infrastructure as it is not possible to achieve both in some cases. Bold Park is a beautiful piece of bushland. For people to enjoy it, it just needs to be restored, preserved and conserved. It DOES NOT need to be developed to include cafes, cycle paths, toilets. There are many of these facilities across Perth - including in very close proximity to Bold Park (Perry Lakes, Cup & Co Cafe, Empire Shops, Floreat Forum). PLEASE DO NOT develop our beautiful bushland into another boring human space.	Amenity and Infrastructure	2D - Among divergent views	The plan does not propose hospitality venues to be developed explicitly within bushland areas. Similarly, infrastructure development will adhere to principles of sustainability.	Not required.
51	14	4.1 & 4.3 It is unclear what 'amenity' is referring to, but I DO NOT support the addition of toilets etc to Bold Park. There are ample within Perry Lakes that cyclists and others can access. Adding toilets will decrease safety, increase mess and drain financial resources out of BGPA that could be otherwise used for conservation efforts.	Amenity and Infrastructure	2D - Among divergent views	Noted and considered. The plan proposes the BGPA will explore cycling due to increase demand from the wider community. As per the plan, this will be on designated paths consistent with public safety, visitor enjoyment, recreation and conservation objectives. Any infrastructure development will adhere to principles of sustainability and	Not required.

					provide accessible facilities to cater for the diversity of needs within the community where reasonable.	
51	15	4.2 & 4.10 - DO NOT support any increase in signage in the park. The existing signs are lovely & ample. If any extra information needs to be provided, please only do so in the carparks. Adding signs through the bush ruins the natural, visual amenity.	Amenity and Infrastructure	2D - Among divergent views	Noted and considered.	Not required.
51	16	Bold Park is a beautiful piece of remnant tuart and banksia bushland. For people to enjoy it, it just needs to be restored, preserved and conserved. It DOES NOT need to be developed to include cafes, cycle paths, signs and toilets. There are many of these facilities across Perth - including in very close proximity to Bold Park (such as Perry Lakes, Cup & Co Cafe, Empire Shops, Floreat Forum). PLEASE DO NOT develop our beautiful bushland into another boring human space. All of the actions in this plan will cost money, time and effort. Please put money and focus into preserving the bush, planting tuarts, putting in water towers for endangered Black Cockatoos, and getting rid of the weeds. That is what the park needs most of all for it to thrive (not just barely survive) into the future.	Overall	2D - Among divergent views	The plan does not propose hospitality venues to be developed explicitly within bushland areas. Similarly, infrastructure development will adhere to principles of sustainability and provide accessible facilities to cater for the diversity of needs within the community where reasonable.	Not required.
52	1	I fully support the direction and planned activities presented in the Draft Bold Park Management Plan 2022-2027.	Overall	2A - Support or neutral	Support for the plan.	Not required.
52	2	No. I fully support this part of the plan	Introduction and Background	2A - Support or neutral	Support for the plan.	Not required.
52	3	No. I fully support this part of the plan	Community Engagement and Participation	2A - Support or neutral	Support for the plan.	Not required.
52	4	Yes. I support this part of the plan, but I provide the following feedback: Re: key management initiative 2.7 (page 23) - it is not clear what the 'Scenic Walk' and 'Scenic Drive' are and on the 'location specific' map this item is just shown as being at the intersection of Bold Park Drive and Oceanic Drive, which is not helpful.	Visitor Experiences	1D - Omission, inaccuracy etc	Noted and considered. The key management initiative has arrows indicating the walk and drive.	Plan amended
52	5	I am happy for opportunities for bicycle access to other areas being investigated on the basis outlined, but I would like a specific initiative to be included that steps will be taken to prevent (or at least minimise as much as possible) the damage which is being caused by irresponsible children and adults who bash through the bushland on their mountain bikes. I realise that this is a significant challenge for the park rangers, but I would like there to be a plan to provide adequate resources to deter and, if necessary to apprehend and prosecute perpetrators of this environmental damage.	Visitor Experiences	2A - Support or neutral	Support for initiatives. The plan proposes the BGPA will explore cycling due to increase demand from the wider community. As per the plan, this will be on designated paths consistent with public safety, visitor enjoyment, recreation and conservation objectives.	Not required.
52	6	Yes. I support this part of the plan, but I provide the following feedback: Re: key management initiative 3.7 (page 25), to protect the bushland from the damage caused by mountain bike riders, steps must be taken to prevent (or at least minimise as much as possible) the damage which is being caused by irresponsible children and adults who bash through the bushland on their mountain bikes. I realise that this is a significant challenge for the park rangers, but I would like there to be a plan to provide adequate resources to deter and, if necessary to apprehend and prosecute perpetrators of this environmental damage.	Science and Environmental Conservation	2A - Support or neutral	Supports plan. It is considered as a comment toward the ongoing management of the park and the preparation of a long-term Bushland Conservation Plan for Bold Park (initiative 3.3). The plan proposes the BGPA will explore cycling due to increase demand from the wider community. As per the plan, this will be	Not required.

					on designated paths consistent with public safety, visitor enjoyment, recreation and conservation objectives.	
52	7	Yes. I support this part of the plan, but I provide the following feedback: Re key management initiative 4.5 (page 27) - I would like to see a specific reference to the investigation of the possibility of a mountain bike trail being constructed in the degraded area of the drive-in site, to allow mountain bike riders to use that and not damage the valuable bushland areas in Bold Park. That would provide the opportunity to promote the conservation values of Bold Park in conjunction with the mountain bike trail.	Amenity and Infrastructure	2A - Support or neutral	Support for initiatives. The plan proposes the BGPA will explore cycling due to increase demand from the wider community. As per the plan, this will be on designated paths consistent with public safety, visitor enjoyment, recreation and conservation objectives.	Not required.
52	8	I think the BGPA is doing a good job of caring for and protecting Bold Park and the draft plan gives me much reassurance that this will continue and be enhanced. I just want the plan to deal with the significant threat which irresponsible mountain bikers are posing to the park.	Overall	2A - Support or neutral	Support for the plan. The plan proposes the BGPA will explore cycling due to increase demand from the wider community. As per the plan, this will be on designated paths consistent with public safety, visitor enjoyment, recreation and conservation objectives.	Not required.
53	1	The Department notes that restoration works will continue to be key focus of the Plan with planting and weed control conducted in key areas. Whilst there are no in principle objections to restoration works being undertaken in the area, the Department would welcome the opportunity to work with the Botanic Gardens and Parks Authority on any planned planting projects. The Department would seek to ensure the City Beach Residential College and the former City Beach High School sites are not subjected to an unreasonable bushfire hazard level once the planting programs are implemented and the vegetation has matured.	Overall	2A - Support or neutral	This suggestion will be considered but is beyond the level of detail included in the management plan.	Not required.