



Audit of Public Submissions on the Draft Kings Park and Botanic Garden Management Plan 2021-2025

May 2021



ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Botanic Gardens and Parks Authority (BGPA) gratefully acknowledges the contributions of all community members, organisations and staff in the development of the Kings Park and Botanic Garden Management Plan 2021-2026.

Published May 2021 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, 2021

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. (2021). Audit of Public Submissions on the Draft Kings Park and Botanic Garden Management Plan 2021-2025. 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 |

List of Appendices

- Appendix 1 – Draft Kings Park and Botanic Garden Management Plan 2021-2025 online survey
- Appendix 2 – List of submitters during the public submission period
- Appendix 3 – Tabulated audit of submissions

Executive Summary

The Draft Kings Park and Botanic Garden Management Plan 2021-2025 was released for a two-month public consultation period as required by Part 4 of *the Botanic Gardens and Parks Authority Act 1998* from 15 September 2020 to 16 November 2020. 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 Kings Park and Botanic Garden Management Plan 2021-2025 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, 42 submissions were received, consisting of 187 comments. The majority of submissions were from individuals 21 (50.0%), State government 9 (21.4%) and private organisations / companies 8 (19.0%), with community organisations 3 (7.1%) and one local Government submission (2.4%) making up the balance.

The majority of the comments were fully supportive of the plan or raised topics which had already been considered in its preparation and were therefore assessed as not requiring an amendment to the plan; 93 comments (49.7%) were supportive or neutral and 67 (35.8%) raised topics already considered. Seven comments resulted in minor amendments to the management plan.

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

Public Consultation Process

The Draft Kings Park and Botanic Garden Management Plan 2021-2025 was released for a two-month public consultation period from 15 September 2020 to 16 November 2020. 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 98 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.

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 Kings Park and Botanic Garden Management Plan 2021-2025.
- I partially support the direction and planned activities presented in the Draft Kings Park and Botanic Garden Management Plan 2021-2025.
- I don't support the direction and planned activities presented in the Draft Kings Park and Botanic Garden Management Plan 2021-2025.

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. Four submissions were marked as confidential so their details do not appear in the list. The majority of the 42 submissions received were from the Perth Metropolitan Area and all were confined to Western Australia. Most submissions received were from individuals 21 (50.0%) followed by State government departments / agencies 9 (21.4%), private organisations / companies 8 (19.0%), community organisations 3 (7.1%) and from local government 1 (2.4%).

The most popular method of submission was via the online survey 26 (61.9%), followed by email 16 (38.1%). No submissions were received in writing or utilising the hard copy submission form.

Analytical Table

As mentioned above, the submissions were analysed as 187 different comments. The tabulated analysis, in Appendix 3 provides a summary of all comments received including:

- the submission number
- the comment number
- 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. Of the 187 comments received, none stated an outright objection to any of the proposed initiatives in the plan and the majority were assessed by the BGPA as not requiring an amendment to the plan:

- 93 comments (49.7%) clearly supported proposals in the plan or made general or neutral statements
- 9 comments (4.8%) referred to issues beyond the scope of the plan
- 67 comments (35.8%) referred to issues already noted within the plan or already considered during its preparation
- 3 comments (1.6%) were one among several widely divergent viewpoints received on the topic but the approach in the plan is still considered the best option
- 2 comments (1.1%) contributed options which were not feasible
- 1 comment (0.5%) was based on unclear or factually incorrect information.

Seven comments resulted in amendments to the plan; 3 (1.6%) provided additional information that was incorporated in the plan (see Appendix 3 comment numbers 72, 163 and 166) and 4 (2.1%) highlighted an omission or inaccuracy which was rectified in the text (see Appendix 3 comment numbers 54, 108, 128 and 176).

Table 1: Breakdown of comments by criterion

| Summary | Criterion | Amendment | Number | Percentage % |
|--|-----------|--------------|--------|--------------|
| Supported or neutral | 2A | Not Required | 93 | 49.7 |
| Beyond scope | 2B | Not Required | 9 | 4.8 |
| Already noted or considered | 2C | Not Required | 67 | 35.8 |
| Among divergent views | 2D | Not Required | 3 | 1.6 |
| Not feasible | 2E | Not Required | 2 | 1.1 |
| Unclear or incorrect | 2F | Not Required | 1 | 0.5 |
| Additional information | 1A | Yes | 3 | 1.6 |
| Change or clarification in legislation or management | 1B | Yes | 0 | 0 |
| Better achieves objectives | 1C | Yes | 0 | 0 |
| Omission or inaccuracy | 1D | Yes | 4 | 2.1 |
| Not applicable | NA | - | 5 | 2.7 |

**Appendix 1 – Draft Kings Park and Botanic Garden
Management Plan 2021-2025 online survey**



Draft Kings Park and Botanic Garden Management Plan 2021-2025

Have your say

The Botanic Gardens and Parks Authority invites you to comment on the Draft Kings Park and Botanic Garden Management Plan 2021-2025. The draft management plan has been released for a two-month period to provide the public with an opportunity to comment on proposed key management initiatives for Kings Park and Botanic Garden for the next five years.

If you haven't already done so, please download a copy of the [management plan](#).

The closing date for submissions is Monday 16 November 2020.

To complete your submission, you must provide some personal details at the end of the survey (name, postcode and email address). The management plan will be reviewed in light of the submissions according to established criteria. An audit of submissions will be made available along with the final management plan, however responses to individual submissions will not be provided.

**Alan Barrett
Executive Director
Botanic Gardens and Parks Authority**

Draft Kings Park and Botanic Garden Management Plan 2021-2025

Make your comments count

To make your submission as effective as possible:

- be clear and concise
- refer your points to page numbers, subject headings or numbered initiatives in the plan
- say whether you agree or disagree with any of the content within each section - clearly state your reasons, particularly if you disagree
- give sources of information where possible
- suggest alternatives to any aspects of the plan with which you disagree.

The management plan will be reviewed in light of the submissions according to the criteria outlined below.

The management plan may be amended if a submission:

1. provides additional information of direct relevance to management
2. indicates a change in (or clarifies) government legislation or management policy
3. proposes strategies that would better achieve management objectives
4. indicates omissions, inaccuracies or a lack of clarity.

The management plan may not be amended if a submission:

1. clearly supports proposals in the plan or makes general or neutral statements
2. refers to issues beyond the scope of the plan
3. refers to issues already noted within the plan or already considered during its preparation
4. is one among several widely divergent viewpoints received on the topic but the approach in the plan is still considered the best option
5. contributes options which are not feasible (generally due to conflict with legislation, Government or Authority policy)
6. is based on unclear or factually incorrect information.



Draft Kings Park and Botanic Garden Management Plan 2021-2025

This survey

This survey is split into two parts:

Part A - Comments on the management plan

All information you supply in this part of the survey will be analysed against the criteria outlined. If needed, changes will be made to the plan to address matters raised. All feedback provided through the public submissions will be summarised in the audit of submissions.

Part B - Your details

To ensure a valid submission, your name, postcode and email address must be provided. If your submission is marked 'confidential' your contribution will remain anonymous, otherwise your initial, surname and postcode will be acknowledged in the audit of submissions but will not be linked to any responses. Your postcode will be used to generally indicate in the audit where the proportions of submissions came from (local, regional, state, national or international).

Your contact details will not be made public, and will only be used to contact you if further clarification of your submission is needed or to inform you later when the final management plan is released. Personal details will not be forwarded to any third party or used for any other purpose.

Draft Kings Park and Botanic Garden Management Plan 2021-2025

Part A - Comments on the plan

* 1. Please indicate your overall level of support for the Draft Kings Park and Botanic Garden Management Plan 2021-2025.

- I **fully support** the direction and planned activities presented in the Draft Kings Park and Botanic Garden Management Plan 2021-2025.
- I **partially support** the direction and planned activities presented in the Draft Kings Park and Botanic Garden Management Plan 2021-2025.
- I **don't support** the direction and planned activities presented in the Draft Kings Park and Botanic Garden Management Plan 2021-2025.

* 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.

Draft Kings Park and Botanic Garden Management Plan 2021-2025

Comments on the plan - Comment on specific sections

The management plan can be broadly divided into two parts: 'Introduction and Background' and 'Planned Activities 2021-2025'.

Introduction and Background

The Introduction and Background part of the plan provides an overview of Kings Park and Botanic Garden and how it is managed. This part of the plan is structured under the following headings:

- Kings Park and Botanic Garden – The Natural Heart of Perth
- Governance
- Planning Framework and Policies
- Strategic Priorities
- Looking Back – Achievements from the 2014-2019 Management Plan
- Looking Forward – Issues and Trends Shaping this Management Plan.

Planned Activities 2021-2025

The Planned Activities part of the plan provides details of initiatives for 2021-2025 under the following management categories.

1. Community Engagement and Participation
2. Visitor Experiences
3. Science and Environmental Conservation
4. Plant Collections and Displays
5. Amenity and Infrastructure.

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 Kings Park and Botanic Garden Management Plan 2021-2025

Comments on the plan - Planned activities 2021-2025

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 Kings Park and Botanic Garden Management Plan 2021-2025

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 Kings Park and Botanic Garden Management Plan 2021-2025

Part B - Your details

Please tell us a bit about you and your connection to Kings Park and Botanic Garden.

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

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



Draft Kings Park and Botanic Garden Management Plan 2021-2025

Your details

* 11. Which category best describes your professional connection with Kings Park?

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

Draft Kings Park and Botanic Garden Management Plan 2021-2025

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



Draft Kings Park and Botanic Garden Management Plan 2021-2025

Your details

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).



Draft Kings Park and Botanic Garden Management Plan 2021-2025

Thank you

Thank you for completing the survey. Your feedback is important, and we appreciate you taking the time to prepare a submission.

If you would like to obtain a copy of your submission, please contact the BGPA Planning Officer via planning@bgpa.wa.gov.au.

Appendix 2 – List of submitters during the public submission period

| Community Organisations | | | |
|-------------------------|-----------|--------------------------|----------|
| Initial | Surname | Organisation | Postcode |
| S | Clegg | Friends of Bold Park | 6014 |
| K | Thiele | Wildflower Society of WA | 6014 |
| P | Bodlovich | Perth NRM | 6152 |

| Private Company / Organisation | | | |
|--------------------------------|-----------------|---|----------|
| Initial | Surname | Organisation | Postcode |
| T | Cinavas-Prosser | Perth Region Tourism Organisation | 6000 |
| P | Wright | City Tours Pty Ltd | 6053 |
| P | Griffiths | Philip Griffiths Architects | 6008 |
| R | Ketjen | Stickybeaks Playground Café | 6005 |
| C | Hall | Spinway WA | 6084 |
| N | Passmore | Neville Passmore and Associates Pty Ltd | 6155 |
| E | Hall | Tourism Council Western Australia | 6100 |
| J | Donaldson | National Trust WA | 6005 |

| Local Government | | | |
|------------------|-----------|---------------|----------|
| Initial | Surname | Organisation | Postcode |
| K | Kjaerheim | City of Perth | 6000 |

| State Government | | | |
|------------------|--------------|--|----------|
| Initial | Surname | Organisation | Postcode |
| B | de Garis | Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage | 6000 |
| R | Sellers | Tourism Western Australia | 6000 |
| J | Cowdell | Heritage Council of Western Australia | 6000 |
| M | Rowe | Department of Water and Environmental Regulation | 6919 |
| | | Disability Services Commission | 6920 |
| E | Santostefano | Water Corporation | 6007 |
| B | Anderson | QEII Medical Centre Trust | 6009 |
| L | Rodgers | Department of Education | 6004 |
| P | Ford | Office of the Government Architect | 6000 |

| Individuals | | | |
|-------------|-----------|--------------|----------|
| Initial | Surname | Organisation | Postcode |
| C | Taylor | - | 6050 |
| P | Winter | - | 6018 |
| S | Clarke | - | 6153 |
| J | Soresi | - | 6018 |
| B | Hartley | - | 6111 |
| J | Gardner | - | 6009 |
| H | McCormick | - | 6018 |
| C | Lardner | - | 6151 |
| S | Malone | - | 6330 |
| P | Moodie | - | 6018 |
| I | Kerr | - | 6008 |
| C | Firth | - | 6157 |
| D | Dickinson | - | 6005 |
| V | Read | - | 6010 |
| B | Henderson | - | 6149 |
| A | Gartrell | - | 6055 |
| K | Roman | - | 6008 |

Appendix 3 – Tabulated audit of submissions

Draft Kings Park and Botanic Garden Management Plan 2014-2019
Audit of Public Submissions - Comments, Assessment Criteria and Action Taken

| Submission Number | Comment Number | Summary Comments | Section of Draft Plan | Response Criterion No. | BGPA Response | Final Plan Amended? |
|-------------------|----------------|---|--|----------------------------------|--|---------------------|
| 1 | 1 | I partially support the direction and planned activities presented in the Draft Kings Park and Botanic Garden Management Plan 2021-2025. | Overall | NA | Response provided to specific comments which explain reason for partial support. | Not required. |
| 1 | 2 | Increase parking facilities. | Amenity and Infrastructure | 2C - Already noted or considered | The plan provides for sustainable transport options (Initiative 2.7) and integrated transport planning (Initiative 5.6) that will consider parking along with ways to reduce reliance on private vehicles. | Not required. |
| 1 | 3 | Increase directional signage. | Amenity and Infrastructure | 2B - Beyond scope | Providing details regarding directional signage is considered beyond the scope of the management plan. This level of detail is addressed in BGPA operational plans. | Not required. |
| 1 | 4 | Plan for rubbish and recyclable items. | Science and Environmental Conservation | 2C - Already noted or considered | Initiative 3.1 (Respond to climate change and show leadership in environmental sustainability) extends to waste management in cooperation with Park based businesses. | Not required. |
| 2 | 5 | I fully support the direction and planned activities presented in the Draft Kings Park and Botanic Garden Management Plan 2021-2025. | Overall | 2A - Support or neutral | Supports draft plan. | Not required. |
| 2 | 6 | The plan is very comprehensive. How can the process for third party events or activations in the park be streamlined? | Visitor Experiences | 2A - Support or neutral | The comment reflects the intent of Initiative 2.6 (Review BGPA New Businesses and Events Policy). As such this comment is seen as supporting the plan. | Not required. |
| 3 | 7 | I fully support the direction and planned activities presented in the Draft Kings Park and Botanic Garden Management Plan 2021-2025. | Overall | 2A - Support or neutral | Supports draft plan. | Not required. |
| 3 | 8 | City of Perth welcomes the Kings Park Management Plan 2021-2025, and looks forward to an increased collaboration and celebration of our unique local flora. | Overall | 2A - Support or neutral | Supports draft plan. BGPA recognises the opportunity to work with the City of Perth and looks forward to doing so. | Not required. |
| 4 | 9 | I fully support the direction and planned activities presented in the Draft Kings Park and Botanic Garden Management Plan 2021-2025. | Overall | 2A - Support or neutral | Supports draft plan. | Not required. |

| Submission Number | Comment Number | Summary Comments | Section of Draft Plan | Response Criterion No. | BGPA Response | Final Plan Amended? |
|-------------------|----------------|---|--|----------------------------------|--|---------------------|
| 4 | 10 | Believe that a cable car would greatly impact on the quiet amenity of the park and enjoyment of visitors; would have an enormous impost of views from Mt Eliza; be a major distraction to the State War Memorial precinct, and could severely affect wildlife in the park. Believe it would be contrary to Botanic Gardens and Parks Regulations 1999. | Amenity and Infrastructure | 2C - Already noted or considered | The BGPA Board of Management is required under legislation to conserve and enhance the natural and cultural values of Kings Park and Botanic Garden, which provides a basis for assessment of any formal proposal for attractions that require significant new built infrastructure. The Board has not received any proposal for a cable car in Kings Park and Botanic Garden. | Not required. |
| 4 | 11 | Believe walkways through the park could be improved to allow better access for people with a disability. | Amenity and Infrastructure | 2C - Already noted or considered | Under Infrastructure and Amenity, it is stated that BGPA's focus is to 'improve visitor safety and accessibility to meet the evolving needs of Western Australians'. However, the provision of universal access to all areas of Kings Park and Botanic Garden is challenging due to the terrain and gradients. | Not required. |
| 4 | 12 | Consider motorised transport to increase accessibility. | Visitor Experiences | 2C - Already noted or considered | Transport options will be reviewed as part of implementation of Initiative 2.7 (Sustainable transport services). | Not required. |
| 5 | 13 | The Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage (DPLH) has reviewed the Plan and concludes there are no impacts to Aboriginal heritage as defined by the Aboriginal Heritage Act 1972. | Overall | 2A - Support or neutral | Neutral statement. | Not required. |
| 5 | 14 | The DPLH notes the Plan promotes Noongar culture and language and the intended focus of the management activates and initiatives within Community Engagement and Participation focuses on the Reconciliation Action Plan frameworks and objectives and strategies designed to improve social, economic, health a cultural outcomes for Aboriginal people. The DPLH therefore supports the direction and planned activities presented in the Plan. | Community Engagement and Participation | 2A - Support or neutral | Supports draft plan. | Not required. |

| Submission Number | Comment Number | Summary Comments | Section of Draft Plan | Response Criterion No. | BGPA Response | Final Plan Amended? |
|-------------------|----------------|--|---|----------------------------------|--|---------------------|
| 6 | 15 | Between 2010 to 2015, I watched the park become more beautiful and carefully tended. In the past five years I noted a multitude of weeds in the bushland and have watched the biodiversity and abundance in the gardens diminish. I suggest available funding be spent on the primary focus of Kings Park; the health and biodiversity of the plants which visitors and locals love. All the man made dressing up should be secondary. | Science and Environmental Conservation Plant Collections and Displays | 2C - Already noted or considered | There is no recorded species loss in the Park and there are strategies within the plan that focus on reducing bushland weeds and the health and biodiversity of plants. The BGPA does not consider that the biodiversity and abundance in the gardens has diminished. | Not required. |
| 7 | 16 | I fully support the direction and planned activities presented in the Draft Kings Park and Botanic Garden Management Plan 2021-2025. | Overall | 2A - Support or neutral | Supports draft plan. | Not required. |
| 7 | 17 | The most critical thing missing from Kings Park is the connectivity and ability to get there (especially for tourists). | Visitor Experiences | 2A - Support or neutral | Improving connectivity is covered under a range of initiatives including Initiative 2.1 (Connecting with neighbouring precincts), and Initiatives 5.1 (Kid's Bridge between QEII and Kings Park) and Initiative 5.8 (Linkages to reconnect Kings Park and the Swan River). As such this comment is interpreted as supporting the plan. | Not required. |
| 7 | 18 | The highest priority must be to get the cable car from Elizabeth Quay. | Visitor Experiences | 2C - Already noted or considered | There is no current proposal for a cable car to Kings Park and Botanic Garden. The BGPA Board of Management is required to conserve and enhance the natural and cultural values of the Park. Any cable car proposal would need to avoid disturbing natural areas or impacting cultural heritage values of the Park. | Not required. |
| 7 | 19 | Overall looks very comprehensive and a good long term plan. | Overall | 2A - Support or neutral | Supports draft plan. | Not required. |
| 7 | 20 | Please build the Kids Bridge from Perth's Children's Hospital. | Amenity and Infrastructure | 2A - Support or neutral | Supports draft plan. See Amenity and Infrastructure Initiative 1; complete the planned Kids' Bridge between QEII Medical Campus and Kings Park. | Not required. |
| 8 | 21 | I fully support the direction and planned activities presented in the Draft Kings Park and Botanic Garden Management Plan 2021-2025. | Overall | 2A - Support or neutral | Supports draft plan. | Not required. |

| Submission Number | Comment Number | Summary Comments | Section of Draft Plan | Response Criterion No. | BGPA Response | Final Plan Amended? |
|-------------------|----------------|---|--|----------------------------------|--|---------------------|
| 8 | 22 | Strongly consider the use of Noongar place names and Noongar words wherever possible. Co-naming of places would be a major step forward and addressed reconciliation as well as an area of interest for tourists. | Community Engagement and Participation | 2C - Already noted or considered | Use of Noongar place names is considered as part of Initiative 1.2 (Recognition of Noongar and other Aboriginal culture, heritage and connection). Whilst not explicitly stated, use of Noongar words forms part of enhancing recognition of Noongar and other Aboriginal culture. | Not required. |
| 9 | 23 | I fully support the direction and planned activities presented in the Draft Kings Park and Botanic Garden Management Plan 2021-2025. | Overall | 2A - Support or neutral | Supports draft plan. | Not required. |
| 9 | 24 | The plan is comprehensive addressing all foci of the park with appropriate proposed management strategies | Overall | 2A - Support or neutral | Supports draft plan. | Not required. |
| 9 | 25 | I was glad to see volunteers recognised because there is so much on-going work needed with limited funds best well spent on conservation, visitors & tourists. | Community Engagement and Participation | 2A - Support or neutral | Supports draft plan. | Not required. |
| 10 | 26 | I fully support the direction and planned activities presented in the Draft Kings Park and Botanic Garden Management Plan 2021-2025. | Overall | 2A - Support or neutral | Supports draft plan. | Not required. |
| 10 | 27 | Consider incorporating the RHS Chelsea Flower Show concept into the future Kings Park and Botanic Garden Management Plan 2021-2025. | Visitor Experiences Plant Collections & Displays | 2B - Beyond scope | The management plan includes scope to consider events and experiences in the park under Initiative 2.3 (Expand range of cultural events). This suggestion may be considered but is beyond the level of detail included in the management plan. | Not required. |
| 11 | 28 | I fully support the direction and planned activities presented in the Draft Kings Park and Botanic Garden Management Plan 2021-2025. | Overall | 2A - Support or neutral | Supports draft plan. | Not required. |
| 12 | 29 | Visitor Experiences - Initiative 7 (sustainable transport services); instead of searching for new services, promote existing such as the Perth Explorer bus. This service also addressed Amenity and Infrastructure - Initiative 8 (linkages to reconnect Kings Park and the Swan River). | Visitor Experiences | 2C - Already noted or considered | Noted. As part of Initiative 2.7 (Sustainable transport services), this will take into account existing services and how their use can be maximised. | Not required. |

| Submission Number | Comment Number | Summary Comments | Section of Draft Plan | Response Criterion No. | BGPA Response | Final Plan Amended? |
|-------------------|----------------|---|--|-------------------------|---|---------------------|
| 13 | 30 | Tourism WA notes the strategic objectives of the plan and considers these provide an appropriate framework to enable Kings Park to continue as one of the most visited tourism attractions in WA, while also improving the visitor experience over the next five years. | Overall | 2A - Support or neutral | Supports draft plan. | Not required. |
| 13 | 31 | Tourism WA supports the recognition of Kings Park role in enabling opportunities for Aboriginal cultural tourism experiences and commends initiatives undertaken in 2014-2019 including dual naming and support for aboriginal tour operators in the park. | Looking Back - Key Achievements from the 2014-2019 Management Plan | 2A - Support or neutral | Supports draft plan. | Not required. |
| 13 | 32 | It is suggested that the running of Boorna Waanginy, is added to the list of key achievements in 2014-2019 particularly is there is an intent for this or similar to be run in the future. | Looking Back - Key Achievements from the 2014-2019 Management Plan | 2B - Beyond scope | Noted. Boorna Waanginy was not included as an initiative in the previous management plan and hence is not in the achievements from the last plan. | Not required. |
| 13 | 33 | Tourism WA supports the statements on page 17 in the discussion on the Experience Economy to amplify the Aboriginal cultural narrative of the park. | Looking Forward - Issues and Trends Shaping this Management Plan | 2A - Support or neutral | Supports draft plan. | Not required. |
| 13 | 34 | Tourism WA supports the plans to develop further their educational programs in relation to Aboriginal culture for students and encourages the use of Aboriginal tourism businesses in the delivery of these programs to assist in the diversification of their business models enabling greater sustainability. | Community Engagement and Participation | 2A - Support or neutral | Supports draft plan. | Not required. |

| Submission Number | Comment Number | Summary Comments | Section of Draft Plan | Response Criterion No. | BGPA Response | Final Plan Amended? |
|-------------------|----------------|--|--|----------------------------------|--|---------------------|
| 13 | 35 | Tourism WA supports the recognition in the plan that capitalising on tourism is a priority for the Western Australian economy and the intent to provide for new experiences for visitors to the park. To ensure this can be achieved, the wording should be flexible enough to enable the development of additional activities and attractions beyond amplifying the Aboriginal cultural narrative of the park. It is suggested that the words 'and expand the range of tourism activities and attractions' should be added to the end of the first sentence of the second paragraph, to provide for this opportunity. | Looking Forward - Issues and Trends Shaping this Management Plan | 2C - Already noted or considered | BGPA considers the existing wording to be appropriate. In particular Initiative 2.3 (Innovative and world-class experiences). | Not required. |
| 13 | 36 | Tourism WA supports the planned activities outlined on pages 20-29. In particular, Tourism WA considers that initiatives associated with improving the connectivity and linkages to the Swan River; developing sustainable transport services including upgrades to bus, pedestrian and cycle networks; and enhancing the entrances to Kings Park with displays of Western Australian flora, to be significant in achieving the best tourism outcome. | Overall | 2A - Support or neutral | Supports draft plan. | Not required. |
| 14 | 37 | It would be a good idea to have better transport in and around the park. | Visitor Experiences | 2A - Support or neutral | This comment reflects the intent of Initiative 2.7 (Sustainable transport services). As such this comment is interpreted as supporting the plan. | Not required. |
| 14 | 38 | I fully support the direction and planned activities presented in the Draft Kings Park and Botanic Garden Management Plan 2021-2025. | Overall | 2A - Support or neutral | Supports draft plan. | Not required. |
| 14 | 39 | Currently there is no way to get from the top to the bottom of the park without walking all the way or paying for the open top bus, which is expensive. A CAT bus which travels along Adelaide Terrace picking up passengers from all the hotels, via Elizabeth Quay to Fraser Avenue, Forrest Drive, Zamia and May Drive and back would be a good way to get visitors into the park and around it. | Visitor Experiences | 2C - Already noted or considered | Noted. Transport options will be reviewed as part of implementation of Visitor Experiences - Initiative 7 (Sustainable transport services). Specifying exactly how this is to be achieved is beyond the scope of detail included in the management plan. | Not required. |

| Submission Number | Comment Number | Summary Comments | Section of Draft Plan | Response Criterion No. | BGPA Response | Final Plan Amended? |
|-------------------|----------------|--|--|----------------------------------|---|---------------------|
| 15 | 40 | I fully support the direction and planned activities presented in the Draft Kings Park and Botanic Garden Management Plan 2021-2025. | Overall | 2A - Support or neutral | Supports draft plan. | Not required. |
| 15 | 41 | I was surprised to see no specific mention of phytophthora protection, management and research. This is a catastrophic threat to some of our most iconic plants, and I believe there is a role for botanic gardens as a safe repository for species extinct in the wild, a partner in research and management and an advocate for increased awareness. Funding for research and management has been inconsistent, and the gravitas that botanic gardens could lend to addressing dieback management would be an important contribution to conserving rare and iconic plants. | Plant Collections and Displays Science and Environmental Conservation | 2C - Already noted or considered | Whilst not specifically mentioned, managing the threat of phytophthora is covered in the plan under Initiative 4.10 (Manage biosecurity surveillance of plant collections) along with Initiative 3.2 (Protect and restore Kings Park Bushland). | Not required. |
| 15 | 42 | Excellent document otherwise. | Overall | 2A - Support or neutral | Supports draft plan. | Not required. |
| 16 | 43 | I fully support the direction and planned activities presented in the Draft Kings Park and Botanic Garden Management Plan 2021-2025. | Overall | 2A - Support or neutral | Supports draft plan. | Not required. |
| 16 | 44 | Community Engagement and Participation - Initiative 5 (Meaningful volunteering); Meaningful volunteering will be an important part of implementing the plan. | Community Engagement and Participation | 2A - Support or neutral | Supports draft plan. | Not required. |
| 16 | 45 | Community Engagement and Participation - Initiative 9 (Professional advice to other land managers); KP has a responsibility to encourage best practice the 'KP way' as it is a leader in native horticulture and bushland restoration. It is important to find ways to deliver advice. | Community Engagement and Participation | 2A - Support or neutral | Supports draft plan. | Not required. |

| Submission Number | Comment Number | Summary Comments | Section of Draft Plan | Response Criterion No. | BGPA Response | Final Plan Amended? |
|-------------------|----------------|---|---|----------------------------------|--|---------------------|
| 16 | 46 | Visitor Experiences - Initiative 3 (Novel, innovative and world-class experiences); Concern that the cable car will be a suggestion for a visitor experience. It is important other experiences are explored. | Visitor Experiences | 2C - Already noted or considered | The BGPA Board of Management is required under legislation to conserve and enhance the natural and cultural values of Kings Park and Botanic Garden, which provides a basis for assessment of any formal proposal for attractions that require significant new built infrastructure. The Board has not received any proposal for a cable car in Kings Park and Botanic Garden. | Not required. |
| 16 | 47 | Visitor Experiences - Initiative 3 (Novel, innovative and world-class experiences); Is there any possibility of access along the scarp somewhere to allow visitors access to the Park with lookouts along the way; use parking facilities in Perth city but have a means whereby visitors could enjoy a nature trail into the Park. | Visitor Experiences Amenity and Infrastructure | 2C - Already noted or considered | This will be considered as part of Initiative 5.8 (Linkages to reconnect Kings Park and Botanic Garden and the Swan River). | Not required. |
| 16 | 48 | Visitor Experiences - Initiative 7 (Sustainable transport services); An electric bus which does a set circuit around the Park driven by volunteers. This would increase meaningful volunteering (Community Engagement and Participation - Initiative 5 (Meaningful volunteering). | Visitor Experiences | 2C - Already noted or considered | Transport options will be reviewed as part of implementation of Initiative 2.7 (Sustainable transport services). How this is achieved is beyond the scope of detail included in the management plan. | Not required. |
| 16 | 49 | KP already does outstanding work in science and environment. What is the best way of circulating that knowledge to the community? Through Podcasts, online seminars, workshops? | NA | 2C - Already noted or considered | This will be considered as part of a number of initiatives in the plan including Initiative 2.8 (Interactive web-presence and social media strategy), Initiative 2.9 (Multimedia technologies to enhance experiences and learning), Initiative 1.6 (Community engagement and strategic partnerships) and Initiative 1.7 (Education and outreach programs). | Not required. |

| Submission Number | Comment Number | Summary Comments | Section of Draft Plan | Response Criterion No. | BGPA Response | Final Plan Amended? |
|-------------------|----------------|---|--------------------------------|----------------------------|---|---------------------|
| 16 | 50 | Plant Collections and Displays - Initiative 7 (Demonstration gardens); I feel the Saw Avenue entrance lets the Park down. There is an unattractive abandoned house on the corner, grass and horrid palm trees further along the road. Driving along the road is difficult when cars are already parked. The playground is well used but stuck away out of sight. I notice that there are a few areas given over to plants but they look awful. This area needs a lot of improvement and potential. The Poole Road entrance to the Park is natural, leading visitors to the bushland area. | Plant Collections and Displays | 2D - Among divergent views | Among divergent views. The palms lining the avenue have historic and cultural significance and open space for large group activities is a primary focus for this area, with resources for landscaped gardens allocated to other precincts. Some opportunity for improvement in the precinct is provided within the management plan. | Not required. |
| 16 | 51 | Amenity and Infrastructure - Initiative 6 (Integrated transport planning); This is so important and upgrades need to be done sooner than later. Cyclists and cars need to be separated. The road surface isn't good and the edges are crumbling. Keep the two lane road but create a dedicated cycle track to one side. You cannot stop cyclists from racing as fast as they can through the Park so make it safer for them. Pedestrians on the other side. | Amenity and Infrastructure | 2A - Support or neutral | Supports draft plan. Additional comments noted. | Not required. |
| 16 | 52 | It is a thorough Management Plan, how well will it be executed! | Overall | 2A - Support or neutral | Neutral statement. | Not required. |
| 17 | 53 | The draft management plan is an excellent document | Overall | 2A - Support or neutral | Supports draft plan. | Not required. |

| Submission Number | Comment Number | Summary Comments | Section of Draft Plan | Response Criterion No. | BGPA Response | Final Plan Amended? |
|-------------------|----------------|---|---|----------------------------------|---|---------------------|
| 17 | 54 | Community Engagement and Participation; More attention needs to be given to the involvement of children in the Park from an early age. Their involvement is crucial to ongoing community engagement and support for the Park. There is no mention of children in the preamble and only passing mention in key management initiatives 7 in the context of exposing them to aboriginal culture, sustainability or native gardening. I suggest a separate initiative, focussing on children and ensuring that as many West Australian children as possible have the opportunity to spend quality time in the Park throughout their childhood on organised/guided activities. | Community Engagement and Participation | 1D - Omission, inaccuracy etc | Existing initiatives are considered adequate however the introductory text to Community and Engagement and Participation has been amended to reflect the focus on the involvement of children and young people in the park. | Plan amended. |
| 17 | 55 | Amenity and Infrastructure; In my view there should be considerably more park benches in the bushland areas of the Park, set back from the roads and tracks, where people can sit and rest for a while, enjoying the peace and tranquillity of the Park. | Amenity and Infrastructure | 2C - Already noted or considered | Noted. There is scope within the plan to increase benches in response to demand. | Not required. |
| 18 | 56 | It is positive to see Culture and Heritage included as one of the main Strategic Themes of the document and that the community surveys have highlighted a strong attachment and emotional investment in the park and its heritage. | Introduction and Background Information | 2A - Support or neutral | Neutral statement. | Not required. |
| 18 | 57 | The Heritage Council supports the application of the Kings Park Conservation Plan (2000) and Burra Charter principles in guiding sympathetic works in developed areas of the Park that may impact cultural heritage significance. | Introduction and Background Information | 2A - Support or neutral | Supports draft plan. | Not required. |
| 18 | 58 | Due to the place being a working and evolving heritage place, the Heritage Council recommends that the Conservation Plan, now 20 years old, is updated by suitably qualified and experienced professionals. | Introduction and Background Information | 2C - Already noted or considered | Noted. The Conservation Plan for the Developed Areas is scheduled for review and updating, however this level of detail is beyond the scope of the plan. | Not required. |

| Submission Number | Comment Number | Summary Comments | Section of Draft Plan | Response Criterion No. | BGPA Response | Final Plan Amended? |
|-------------------|----------------|---|---|----------------------------------|--|---------------------|
| 19 | 59 | I fully support the direction and planned activities presented in the Draft Kings Park and Botanic Garden Management Plan 2021-2025. | Overall | 2A - Support or neutral | Supports draft plan. | Not required. |
| 19 | 60 | Several other world class Botanic Gardens have commenced a climate change resilience /adaptation process regards managing their plant collections and garden displays into the future. Noting that climate change is mentioned throughout the Draft Plan, there may be merit in developing a landscape succession strategy, that specifically responds to climate change projections. | Plant Collections and Displays | 2C - Already noted or considered | This will be addressed through Plant Collections and Displays - Initiative 3 (Plant collections and interpretation to demonstrate adapting gardens to climate change). | Not required. |
| 20 | 61 | I fully support the direction and planned activities presented in the Draft Kings Park and Botanic Garden Management Plan 2021-2025. | Overall | 2A - Support or neutral | Supports draft plan. | Not required. |
| 20 | 62 | Support the plan and direction. | Overall | 2A - Support or neutral | Supports draft plan. | Not required. |
| 20 | 63 | Wish to highlight the roles of volunteers in meeting this vision. | Overall | 2A - Support or neutral | Neutral statement. | Not required. |
| 20 | 64 | Support upgrades and improvements that increase visitation from bicycle or alternative modes of transport other than cars. | Visitor Experiences Amenity and Infrastructure | 2A - Support or neutral | Supports draft plan. Consistent with Initiative 2.7 (Sustainable transport services) and Initiative 5.6 (Integrated transport planning). | Not required. |
| 21 | 65 | Though the authority manages the park with great skill, the missing piece in the cultural heritage element is inclusion in the State Register. This would be of assistance when there are external challenges to the park, like the possible imposition of a project that the park does not want and for which the authority needs an ally. | NA | 2C - Already noted or considered | Previously considered. The Board of Management resolved the current legislation and governance is adequate to protect, conserve, promote and provide for cultural heritage. May be further considered in the future. | Not required. |
| 21 | 66 | A review of the conservation plan would be timely. | NA | 2C - Already noted or considered | Noted. The Conservation Plan for the Developed Areas is scheduled for review and updating, however this level of detail is beyond the scope of the plan. | Not required. |
| 21 | 67 | I applaud the memorials policy as a way of managing an incessant stream or requests to memorialise everything. | Introduction and Background Information | 2A - Support or neutral | Supports draft plan. | Not required. |

| Submission Number | Comment Number | Summary Comments | Section of Draft Plan | Response Criterion No. | BGPA Response | Final Plan Amended? |
|-------------------|----------------|---|--|----------------------------------|---|---------------------|
| 21 | 68 | In population growth and infill, it would be good to see something about stress management as part of the response. | NA | 2C - Already noted or considered | Stress relief is adequately covered under health and wellbeing strategic priorities as well as the 'Back to nature for physical and mental health' section. | Not required. |
| 21 | 69 | Visitor Experiences - Initiative 10; I assume that Manage cultural heritage places and landscapes as locations with opportunities for cultural tourism, biodiversity conservation, recreation, education, and community involvement includes monuments and buildings. Perhaps it should say that. | Visitor Experiences | 2C - Already noted or considered | Noted. Existing wording is considered adequate. | Not required. |
| 21 | 70 | Plant Collections and Displays - Initiative 9 - I hope that Enhance the major entrances to Kings Park with displays of Western Australian flora that create a sense of arrival and place for visitors and build the park's identity as a centre for native flora will not mean the removal of significant exotic or native flora. | Plant Collections and Displays | 2C - Already noted or considered | Noted. Significant trees are highly valued and removals generally only occur for risk management or due to loss of structural integrity, poor health or irreparable aesthetic form. | Not required. |
| 22 | 71 | The Botanic Gardens and Parks Authority (BGPA) is to be commended on its approach to developing its five-year management plan. | Overall | 2A - Support or neutral | Supports draft plan. | Not required. |
| 22 | 72 | Amenity and Infrastructure - Initiative 4 (Improved irrigation infrastructure); Suggest mention and reflection on the Waterwise Perth Action Plan. | Amenity and Infrastructure | 1A - Additional info | Plan amended under Amenity and Infrastructure to note consideration of the Waterwise Perth Action Plan. | Plan amended. |
| 22 | 73 | Science and Environmental Conservation - Initiative 4 (UN Decade of Ecosystem Restoration); I would suggest that your scientific work is relevant more broadly than just within the context of Kings Park given the extent of conservation activities across the state of Western Australia. | Science and Environmental Conservation | 2C - Already noted or considered | Initiative 3.4 (UN Decade of Ecosystem Restoration) is not limited to Kings Park and Botanic Garden. | Not required. |

| Submission Number | Comment Number | Summary Comments | Section of Draft Plan | Response Criterion No. | BGPA Response | Final Plan Amended? |
|-------------------|----------------|---|--|----------------------------------|--|---------------------|
| 22 | 74 | Given your significant role in conservation, and the challenges facing our natural resources, other key Western Australian policy documents that I would encourage you to consider and reference, as you finalise your Management Plan, are the impending State Climate Change Policy and the development of our State Native Vegetation Policy which should be out for consultation prior to the finalisation of your Strategy. | Science and Environmental Conservation | 2C - Already noted or considered | While not specifically mentioned, these policy documents are captured in the final point on page 24 'State Government policy for a sustainable future, embracing environmentally sustainable design and practices and reducing waste'. | Not required. |
| 22 | 75 | Amenity and Infrastructure; Consider including BGPA relevant actions from the Waste Avoidance and Resource and Recovery Strategy including: - Continuing award-winning Zero Green Waste project - Implement public place recycling in Kings Park and Botanic Garden and Bold Park - Commence periodic audits of public bins to measure success of public place recycling and inform communication strategies. - Commence recording all waste disposal from BGPA management sites. | Amenity and Infrastructure | 2B - Beyond scope | These actions will be implemented but this level of detail is beyond the scope of the management plan. These actions are consistent with intended practice under Initiative 3.1 (Respond to climate change and show leadership in environmental sustainability). | Not required. |
| 23 | 76 | I partially support the direction and planned activities presented in the Draft Kings Park and Botanic Garden Management Plan 2021-2025. | Overall | NA | Response provided to specific comments which explain reason for partial support. | Not required. |

| Submission Number | Comment Number | Summary Comments | Section of Draft Plan | Response Criterion No. | BGPA Response | Final Plan Amended? |
|-------------------|----------------|---|-----------------------|----------------------------------|---|---------------------|
| 23 | 77 | Apart from mentioning the elderly and people with a disability in the introductory part of the plan, a few mentions of accessible healthy spaces and social inclusion as well as mention of survey results in which 94% of respondents indicated that providing good access for people with special needs is important; overall the plan seems to have no or very little consideration for the disability sector of society. There are no specific key management initiatives or goals that set out the needs of persons with a disability. Given the importance of Kings Park to all Western Australians and its connection with the hospitals the Board of the Disability Services Commission is willing to provide further commentary or review other related plans that may be focused on the requirements of those in the community with a disability. | Overall | 2C - Already noted or considered | Whilst not included as a management initiative, consideration of disability access and inclusion is a clear focus as referenced throughout the plan. All new developments include provision of universal access where practicable. Ongoing commitment to implementation and reporting on the BGPA Disability Access and Inclusion Plan. The willingness of the DSC Board to provide further input is appreciated. | Not required. |
| 23 | 78 | Car parking is considered inadequate, access to displays is challenging, changerooms/ showers not currently provided and other facilities including walkways and paths are inappropriately designed for people with a disability. All amenity and infrastructure includes cafes and playgrounds should be disability friendly. | Overall | 2C - Already noted or considered | Providing appropriate access and facilities for people with disability is a requirement in planning for all upgrades and new developments, and is included where achievable without significantly detracting from overall visitor experience or conservation values. Some legacy infrastructure will be upgraded on this basis as resources permit. | Not required. |
| 24 | 79 | I fully support the direction and planned activities presented in the Draft Kings Park and Botanic Garden Management Plan 2021-2025. | Overall | 2A - Support or neutral | Supports draft plan. | Not required. |
| 24 | 80 | Comprehensive and clearly stated | Overall | 2A - Support or neutral | Supports draft plan. | Not required. |
| 25 | 81 | I fully support the direction and planned activities presented in the Draft Kings Park and Botanic Garden Management Plan 2021-2025. | Overall | 2A - Support or neutral | Supports draft plan. | Not required. |
| 25 | 82 | Happy with Plan | Overall | 2A - Support or neutral | Supports draft plan. | Not required. |

| Submission Number | Comment Number | Summary Comments | Section of Draft Plan | Response Criterion No. | BGPA Response | Final Plan Amended? |
|-------------------|----------------|---|--|----------------------------------|--|---------------------|
| 26 | 83 | I fully support the direction and planned activities presented in the Draft Kings Park and Botanic Garden Management Plan 2021-2025. | Overall | 2A - Support or neutral | Supports draft plan. | Not required. |
| 26 | 84 | No objections | Overall | 2A - Support or neutral | Neutral statement. | Not required. |
| 27 | 85 | I fully support the direction and planned activities presented in the Draft Kings Park and Botanic Garden Management Plan 2021-2025. | Overall | 2A - Support or neutral | Supports draft plan. | Not required. |
| 27 | 86 | Community Engagement and Participation; Under the key management initiatives, has consideration been given to engaging with residents who live in/near Kings Park given that there are now plenty of residential properties fringing Kings Park in West Perth and Crawley? It suggests there is scope for greater outreach/liaison with park neighbours regarding park operations and activities. | Community Engagement and Participation | 2C - Already noted or considered | Engagement with the local community encompasses the immediate neighbourhood and its residents and is adequately covered under 'Community Engagement and Participation'. The BGPA will actively collaborate with the community and pursue productive partnerships with businesses, not-for-profit organisations and the community sector. | Not required. |
| 27 | 87 | Visitor Experiences- Initiative 2 (Expand range of cultural events); Has any consideration been given to partnering with institutions such as WAAPA or UWA Music School (or even high schools from adjacent suburbs) to allow small groups of music students to perform for park visitors? Areas such as the Botanical Terraces lend themselves to casual performance venues – for instance small groups of music students performing at the same place and the same time every week (Saturday/Sunday) during summer. | Visitor Experiences | 2B - Beyond scope | Opportunities to explore the range of cultural events will be considered under Initiative 2.2 (Expand range of cultural events). This suggestion will be considered but is beyond the level of detail included in the management plan. | Not required. |
| 27 | 88 | The key management initiatives make reference to “upgrade park security in high visitation areas to enhance public safety and to protect memorials, plant collections and other assets”. I support this initiative. | Amenity and Infrastructure | 2A - Support or neutral | Supports draft plan. | Not required. |

| Submission Number | Comment Number | Summary Comments | Section of Draft Plan | Response Criterion No. | BGPA Response | Final Plan Amended? |
|-------------------|----------------|--|----------------------------|----------------------------------|--|---------------------|
| 27 | 89 | The key management initiatives make reference to "Undertake an integrated transport planning exercise to inform longer term upgrades to pedestrian, cyclist and vehicle circulation and parking". I support this initiative. | Amenity and Infrastructure | 2A - Support or neutral | Supports draft plan. | Not required. |
| 27 | 90 | Amenity and Infrastructure - Initiative 6 (Integrated transport planning exercise); could I please request that the terms of reference for any planning exercise are expanded beyond traffic circulation and parking to also include traffic speeds and anti-social behaviour. I would also request that any planning exercise includes consultation with neighbours adjoining the park. | Amenity and Infrastructure | 2C - Already noted or considered | Noted. This suggestion will be considered when implementing Initiative 5.6. | Not required. |
| 27 | 91 | I also note that no real mention is made of waste management in the Draft Plan. The BGPA staff and volunteers do an absolutely amazing job of cleaning up litter but I wonder if more attention could be directed to deterring/preventing litter in the first place. | Amenity and Infrastructure | 2C - Already noted or considered | While waste management is not specifically mentioned as a management initiative, it is noted under Our intended focus for Science and Environmental Conservation and will be addressed under Initiative 3.1 (Respond to climate change and show leadership in environmental sustainability). | Not required. |
| 28 | 92 | I fully support the direction and planned activities presented in the Draft Kings Park and Botanic Garden Management Plan 2021-2025. | Overall | 2A - Support or neutral | Supports draft plan. | Not required. |
| 28 | 93 | The plan looks comprehensive and well thought out, I like that the park is broken into its key interest sections and the plan is structured to welcome new community interest and features moving forward. | Overall | 2A - Support or neutral | Supports draft plan. | Not required. |
| 29 | 94 | I fully support the direction and planned activities presented in the Draft Kings Park and Botanic Garden Management Plan 2021-2025. | Overall | 2A - Support or neutral | Supports draft plan. | Not required. |
| 29 | 95 | The plan shows care and commitment to the Western Australian community and aligns with Water Corporation's community objectives. There is opportunity to partner to educate the community on water, conservation and community engagement initiatives in the future where there are common goals. | Overall | 2A - Support or neutral | Supports draft plan. Additional comments noted. | Not required. |

| Submission Number | Comment Number | Summary Comments | Section of Draft Plan | Response Criterion No. | BGPA Response | Final Plan Amended? |
|-------------------|----------------|--|---|----------------------------------|---|---------------------|
| 30 | 96 | I fully support the direction and planned activities presented in the Draft Kings Park and Botanic Garden Management Plan 2021-2025. | Overall | 2A - Support or neutral | Supports draft plan. | Not required. |
| 30 | 97 | I would like to suggest a change of Strategic positioning so that Kings Park be involved in an outward looking approach into the broader WA community in a number of specific areas. 1) Bringing horticultural excellence to assist local councils. 2) Assisting Department of Planning, landscape architects, developers and construction companies to implement appropriate plant choices and aftercare. 3) Guidance for the mining and petroleum industry particularly with respect to mine site rehabilitation with local native plants. 4) Home gardeners in regenerative horticulture. We have to make far better use of the treasure chest of biodiversity that the residents of and visitors to Western Australia enjoy. | Community Engagement and Participation | 2C - Already noted or considered | Outreach will become a focus area under the management plan and will be addressed through a number of initiatives under Community Engagement and Participation including Initiative 1.6 (Community engagement and strategic partnerships), Initiative 1.7 (Education and outreach programs and Initiative 1.9 (Professional advice to other land managers). | Not required. |
| 30 | 98 | I would like to see a massive controlled atmosphere structure that can showcase all the major environments found in 'WA from the top of Bluff Knoll to the deserts of the inland to the Pilbara and the Kimberlies. Kings Park has the expertise and horticultural knowledge to pull such a project together and the appeal to world tourism cannot be overstated. Many overseas visitors lack the time to travel widely to see out wildflower treasures so centring these at Kings Park would give a brilliant canvas to show what's in flower across the state. | Visitor Experiences Plant Collections & Displays | 2E - Not feasible | BGPA considers such a structure would impose upon the open space and landscape values of the park, and is beyond existing resources to establish and operate. The Board remains open to consider funded proposals from external proponents that are consistent with the values of Kings Park. Current collections and displays cover a range of flora from throughout the State with free entry for all. Displays are arranged according to tourism regions as a springboard to further exploration of the regions. | Not required. |
| 30 | 99 | As part of increasing outreach, I believe we need to see research undertaken to evaluate appropriate plants for urban green walls and rooftop gardens as a means of coping with Urban Heat Island Effects and climate change. This knowledge is critically short for WA conditions. | Science and Environmental Conservation | 2B - Beyond scope | As mentioned above, Outreach will become a focus area under the management plan and will be addressed through a number of initiatives under Community Engagement and Participation. This suggestion will be considered but is beyond the level of detail included in the management plan. | Not required. |

| Submission Number | Comment Number | Summary Comments | Section of Draft Plan | Response Criterion No. | BGPA Response | Final Plan Amended? |
|-------------------|----------------|--|---|-------------------------|--|---------------------|
| 30 | 100 | Preventative burning is an area that needs the expertise of Kings Park to bring a science based approach to the horticultural effects of current fire regimes. | Science and Environmental Conservation | 2A - Support or neutral | Kings Park is already involved in fire ecology research as per Science and Initiative 3.5 (Lead long-term fire ecology research), as such this comment is seen as supporting the draft plan. | Not required. |
| 31 | 101 | The QEIIIMC Trust commends KPBG on its draft Management Plan and the aspirations outlined therein. | Overall | 2A - Support or neutral | Supports draft plan. | Not required. |
| 31 | 102 | Strategic Themes and Goals: Community Wellbeing. The QEIIIMC Trust recognises there is a significant opportunity to connect with KPBG to encourage open community spaces, potentially connecting both locations to support sense of place, active lifestyles, wellbeing and establish healing environments. | Introduction and Background Information | 2A - Support or neutral | Neutral statement. BGPA similarly recognises the opportunity. | Not required. |
| 31 | 103 | Back to nature for physical and mental health (pg 17). The QEIIIMC Trust office is very willing to work together with KPBG particularly with the new Kids Bridge opening to investigate creating connectivity and extension of landscape and public realm areas in order to improve connectivity, activation of outdoor spaces, community well-being and sense of place. | Introduction and Background Information | 2A - Support or neutral | Neutral statement. BGPA recognises the opportunity to work with the QEIIIMC Trust and looks forward to doing so. | Not required. |
| 31 | 104 | The QEIIIMC Trust believes it is important for it engage with KPBG to discuss collaborating with KPBG on improving cultural and heritage connections within the surrounding area, for example, by discussing potential enhancements to heritage, character, botanic richness and surrounding urban fabric and environment. | NA | 2A - Support or neutral | Neutral statement. BGPA similarly recognises the opportunity for collaboration. | Not required. |

| Submission Number | Comment Number | Summary Comments | Section of Draft Plan | Response Criterion No. | BGPA Response | Final Plan Amended? |
|-------------------|----------------|--|--|-------------------------------|--|---------------------|
| 31 | 105 | Community Engagement and Participation - Initiatives 6 (Community engagement and strategic partnerships); The QEIIIMC Trust's recently developed Master Plan 2019 depicts the landscape and public realm character of the QEIIIMC Reserve as a Campus Forest. The proposed QEIIIMC (long term) landscaping of the Campus may be likened to an effort to extend aspects of Kings Park landscaping. The Trust would be willing to work with KPBG to investigate how to increase and support the extension of native flora and fauna into the QEIIIMC Campus. | Community Engagement and Participation | 2A - Support or neutral | Supports the community engagement intent of the draft plan. | Not required. |
| 31 | 106 | Community Engagement and Participation - Initiative 8 (Partnerships and programs that promote wellbeing); The QEIIIMC Trust is enthusiastic to, where practicable; cooperate with KPBG investigations into programs that promote physical, mental, social, spiritual and cultural wellbeing. | Community Engagement and Participation | 2A - Support or neutral | Supports the community engagement intent of the draft plan. | Not required. |
| 31 | 107 | Community Engagement and Participation - Initiatives 9 (Professional advice to other land managers); The QEIIIMC Trust is enthusiastic to, where practicable; cooperate with KPBG investigations into improved sustainability practices for ongoing maintenance of the garden and grounds and establishing water catchments. | Community Engagement and Participation | 2A - Support or neutral | Supports the community engagement intent of the draft plan. | Not required. |
| 31 | 108 | Visitor Experiences - Initiative 1 (Experiences that connect visitors with neighbouring precincts); Please include the QEIIIMC Trust in this statement. The Trust is responsible for the development, management and control of the 28.4 hectares of land (which is an A class reserve) making up the QEIIIMC Reserve. The Trust noted in its Master Plan 2019 an interest to establish stronger connections with neighbouring Kings Park, Hollywood Private Hospital, University of Western Australia and surrounding local councils and looks forward to strengthening relations with KPBG | Visitor Experiences | 1D - Omission, inaccuracy etc | Initiative 2.1 (Experiences that connect visitors with neighbouring precincts) amended to include QEII Medical Centre Reserve. | Plan amended. |

| Submission Number | Comment Number | Summary Comments | Section of Draft Plan | Response Criterion No. | BGPA Response | Final Plan Amended? |
|-------------------|----------------|---|--|-------------------------|--|---------------------|
| 31 | 109 | Visitor Experiences - Initiatives 7 (Sustainable transport services); Access evolution is crucial for sustainable future growth of the QEIIIMC and the surrounding neighbourhood. A fundamental concern to the Trust is the need to establish short to medium term improvements to access (including public and active transport) to, from and around the QEIIIMC. Any future developments at QEIIIMC will be significantly impacted by the quality of access to the general area. In addition, the Trust notes the potential impact of the Kid's Bridge on KPBG and QEIIIMC and looks forward to future discussions on this topic. The Trust is supportive of meaningful ongoing engagement and collaboration with the KPBG and other neighbours to promote improved access to, from and around the Nedlands/Crawley Precinct. | Visitor Experiences | 2A - Support or neutral | Neutral statement. There is sufficient scope in the existing initiatives to improve access between Kings Park and neighbouring areas and accommodate further engagement in relation to the implications of the new Kids' Bridge. | Not required. |
| 31 | 110 | Science and Environmental Conservation - Initiatives 1 (Respond to climate change and show leadership in environmental sustainability) and Initiative 9 (Landscape treatments to Kings Park Bushland perimeters); The QEIIIMC Trust Master Plan 2019 aligns with the principles of Greenstar Communities rating scheme. This will involve future buildings constructed on the campus being required to meet Environmentally Sustainable Energy targets aligned with the Green Building Council Green Star rating tools. This initiative is also supported by the design principles for the Campus Forest vision. In undertaking its own efforts, the Trust acknowledges KPBG as leading the delivery of principled improvements in sustainability, connectivity and creating community. | Science and Environmental Conservation | 2A - Support or neutral | Neutral statement. | Not required. |

| Submission Number | Comment Number | Summary Comments | Section of Draft Plan | Response Criterion No. | BGPA Response | Final Plan Amended? |
|-------------------|----------------|---|--|-------------------------|--|---------------------|
| 31 | 111 | Science and Environmental Conservation (Key Management Initiatives No.7). The Trust is aware that the QEIIIMC is located in close proximity to Kings Park which is a bushfire prone area highlighted in the Bushfire Framework Review 2019 - The Map of Bushfire Prone Areas. The Trust expresses its desire to work closely with KPBG in regards to continuously improving appropriate bush fire risk awareness for the area including both Kings Park and QEIIIMC, and updating fire risk oversight of the QEIIIMC. | Science and Environmental Conservation | 2A - Support or neutral | Neutral statement. Collaboration on fire risk management will continue under this plan. | Not required. |
| 31 | 112 | Amenity and Infrastructure (Key Management Initiatives No 1 & 5). The QEIIIMC Trust would like to discuss items of mutual interest with KPBG to potentially promote the connectivity between Kings Park and QEIIIMC following the opening of the Kid's Bridge in order to create positive outcomes for both the community and visitors at both locations. | Amenity and Infrastructure | 2A - Support or neutral | Neutral statement. Noted, BGPA looks forward to the discussion of items of mutual interest. | Not required. |
| 31 | 113 | Amenity and Infrastructure - Initiatives 6 (Integrated transport planning) and Initiative 8 (Linkages to reconnect Kings Park and Botanic Garden and the Swan River); The QEIIIMC Trust supports improved active transport and public transport to, from and surrounding the QEIIIMC campus, including Kings Park. The Trust recognises KPBG interest in improved transport planning and improved connectivity between of both locations, the Crawley-Nedlands Precinct and the QEII/UWA SAC. | Amenity and Infrastructure | 2A - Support or neutral | Supports draft plan. | Not required. |
| 31 | 114 | Overall, the QEIIIMC Trust looks forward to improving our relationship with and ongoing collaboration with KPBG in all future opportunities and projects. | Overall | 2A - Support or neutral | Neutral statement. BGPA recognises the opportunity to work with the QEIIIMC Trust and looks forward to doing so. | Not required. |
| 32 | 115 | I am pleased to see that the draft management plan highlights ongoing expansion and development of cultural and environmental education. This aspect of the park has provided our students, and the wider community, with invaluable lifelong learning experiences and opportunities. | Overall | 2A - Support or neutral | Supports draft plan. | Not required. |

| Submission Number | Comment Number | Summary Comments | Section of Draft Plan | Response Criterion No. | BGPA Response | Final Plan Amended? |
|-------------------|----------------|--|--|-------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|
| 32 | 116 | I would also like to take this opportunity to acknowledge some other facilities and services Kings Park and Botanic Garden provides for our school communities including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a place to contemplate and mourn our ANZAC sacrifices; • events to celebrate our wonderful state; • the vast and varied recreational areas to exercise and more recently learn through Naturescape initiatives; and • utilisation of the findings of the various research programs to drive tree management and climate change strategies in schools. | Overall | 2A - Support or neutral | Neutral statement. | Not required. |
| 32 | 117 | I commend the Botanic Gardens and Parks Authority on their draft Management Plan. Kings Park is an iconic place in Western Australia and plays a significant role in education, particularly in the areas of culture and biodiversity. I look forward with enthusiasm to seeing our schools and students benefitting from the planned strategies and outcomes contained within the Draft Management Plan 2021-2025. | Overall | 2A - Support or neutral | Supports draft plan. | Not required. |
| 33 | 118 | The structure of the plan is relevant, comprehensive and accessible. The themes and priorities are easily identified, and as a West Australian, they are also identifiable with my own preferred place of living and vision for our future. The State of Purpose of the plan linking local identity within a global context is recognised and applauded. | Overall | 2A - Support or neutral | Supports draft plan. | Not required. |
| 33 | 119 | The imaging and referencing to Whadjuck Noongar knowledge and culture is well balanced and appreciated. The intent to continue with internal renaming to reflect Aboriginal heritage is supported. The balance of Aboriginal and colonial history is important. | Community Engagement and Participation | 2A - Support or neutral | Supports draft plan. | Not required. |

| Submission Number | Comment Number | Summary Comments | Section of Draft Plan | Response Criterion No. | BGPA Response | Final Plan Amended? |
|-------------------|----------------|--|---|----------------------------------|--|---------------------|
| 33 | 120 | What is out of balance is retaining the sole name 'Kings Park' without a replacement or at least conspicuous dual naming. The display of the preferred Aboriginal name at the entrance to the park is a faint tribute to prior land occupation, but the continued dominance of the colonial name of 'Kings Park' misses the opportunity for symbolic redress. Even as a non-Aboriginal person, the sole colonial name does not reflect my own values, or those I see as being of progressive West Australians, | Community Engagement and Participation | 2C - Already noted or considered | The plan presents an opportunity for this to be considered as part of Initiative 1.1 (Cultural compact with Whadjuk Noongar people) and Initiative 1.2 (Recognition of Noongar and other Aboriginal culture, heritage and connection). | Not required. |
| 33 | 121 | The plan is about Kings Park and the Botanic Garden within but on P12 ('Culture and heritage' theme), there is mention of sharing stories from Bold Park. These seems an anomaly in the plan. | Introduction and Background Information | 2C - Already noted or considered | The 'Strategic Priorities' are priorities for BGPA so apply to the management of both Kings Park and Botanic Garden and Bold Park, hence the references to Bold Park. | Not required. |
| 33 | 122 | The reference to linkage with neighbouring areas is important so the inclusion of Bold Park is relevant but there needs to be better specification or at least conceptual development of what this neighbourhood linkage might be (areas to be linked) and further thematic development (e.g. ecological connectivity, Aboriginal cultural linkage, colonial cultural linkage), | Visitor Experiences | 2C - Already noted or considered | Neighbourhood linkages are covered under Initiative 2.1 (Connecting with neighbouring precincts), and Initiatives 5.1 (Kid's Bridge between QEII and Kings Park) and Initiative 5.8 Linkages to reconnect Kings Park and Botanic Garden and the Swan River). The plan is intended to be high level and not all inclusive. The development of the themes will occur on a project basis and be opportunistic as it also depends on partnerships or political willingness | Not required. |
| 33 | 123 | There is an understandable focus on tourism generating not just economic benefit but also experiencing a showcase of West Australian culture and identity. Within this context, the draft plan does make mention of 'eco-tourism' opportunities but does not provide clarity about what is intended. Is there to be new commercial opportunities for eco-tourism within the park? If so, is this to be linked with the huge eco-tourism opportunity within WA? Could a visitor to the park who is inspired by representative landscapes in the Botanic Garden be easily able to arrange a guided visit to the areas of their interest? | Visitor Experiences | 2C - Already noted or considered | The plan allows for new tourism opportunities under Initiative 2.3 (Innovative and world-class experiences), whilst intentionally not being prescriptive as to what these experiences may be. The BGPA has close working relationships with relevant State and local government, and tourism industry bodies as well as providing for new market-led business opportunities to be assessed as required. | Not required. |

| Submission Number | Comment Number | Summary Comments | Section of Draft Plan | Response Criterion No. | BGPA Response | Final Plan Amended? |
|-------------------|----------------|--|--|----------------------------------|---|---------------------|
| 33 | 124 | The importance of engaging the interest of young children in the living environment can't be over-estimated. I have spent many hours with my grandson at the Rio Tinto Naturescape watching kids engage their parents in a natural landscape. They don't want to leave. That particular venue does get very crowded which detracts from the engaging bush experience which indicates that additional similar settings would be valuable. | NA | 2E - Not feasible | It is acknowledged that at some peak visitation times the site can become busy, however there are many other times when the site is very quiet. Additional similar opportunities to engage with nature already exist throughout Kings Park and while the construction of additional similar facilities is constrained by resourcing, nature play objectives do influence BGPA's landscape design thinking when other playground areas are upgraded. | Not required. |
| 33 | 125 | Although the general concepts are on biodiversity and conservation, the specific focus is on wildflowers. This is understandable with there being the world-class botanic garden. However, the park is also a great place to see birds. The draft plan has no specific mention of birds although all visitors can't avoid their conspicuous activity in the park. Could there not be a greater focus on the parks avifauna? | Overall | 2C - Already noted or considered | While birds are not specifically mentioned, the BGPA Science and Conservation Strategic Priority covers all native biodiversity, including education and outreach. This suggestion will be considered but is beyond the level of detail included in the plan. | Not required. |
| 33 | 126 | The focus on revegetation and landscape rehabilitation is recognised and to be supported, especially where it is enabling community-based conservation effort. This focus could be enhanced if it were to be linked to the current global concept of 're-wilding', which in effect means providing habitat to attract wildlife. The opportunity to encourage revegetation for birds, especially the iconic Carnaby's Black Cockatoo could be enhanced in the plan. | Science and Environmental Conservation | 2C - Already noted or considered | Ecological restoration to provide wildlife habitat including Carnaby's Cockatoo is intended under the plan but is beyond the level of detail included in the plan. | Not required. |
| 33 | 127 | The high-level focus on volunteers is to be applauded. Engagement of volunteers within the park is currently highly effective and provides a role model for other organisations. | Overall | 2A - Support or neutral | Supports draft plan. | Not required. |
| 33 | 128 | The draft plan does variously note first that there are 1,000 and later that there about more than 500 volunteers. This simple difference in a statistic detracts from the intended continuing high quality volunteer involvement, | Overall | 1D - Omission, inaccuracy etc | The figure of 1000, is in reference to the total number of volunteers, 500-plus of which are regular volunteers. The wording of the plan has been amended to clarify that the new volunteer hub 'Wanju Marr' is used by active volunteers with no reference to the number. | Plan amended. |

| Submission Number | Comment Number | Summary Comments | Section of Draft Plan | Response Criterion No. | BGPA Response | Final Plan Amended? |
|-------------------|----------------|--|--|----------------------------------|--|---------------------|
| 33 | 129 | There is some note of passive recreation in the park (e.g. cycling) but there are many West Australians who go to the park for active recreation (fitness). It would be denying the reality of their purpose to not recognise the park as an important place for local folk to keep fit. This purpose should be made conspicuous and people be encouraged to participate. Other parks have outdoor fitness facilities. These do not need to be dominant but it would add value to the many who do visit the park for fitness purposes, | Visitor Experiences | 2C - Already noted or considered | The BGPA considers cycling as active recreation and both active and passive recreation experiences are welcomed. Kings Park is a popular venue for fitness activities which are supported. Initiative 2.10 (Cultural heritage places as locations for tourism, conservation, recreation, education and community involvement) specifically references recreation. | Not required. |
| 33 | 130 | There is general note about sustainability which is appreciated. However, the opportunity exists to adopt a much higher profile in adopting and therefore promoting key sustainable living themes, especially water-use efficiency and renewable energy use. Which such high levels of visitation to the park, and with the intent to tackle threatening processes (which includes climate change), there could be world-class demonstration of sustainable management. | Science and Environmental Conservation | 2C - Already noted or considered | This is addressed under Initiative 3.1 (Respond to climate change and show leadership in environmental sustainability). | Not required. |
| 34 | 131 | I partially support the direction and planned activities presented in the Draft Kings Park and Botanic Garden Management Plan 2021-2025. | Overall | NA | Response provided to specific comments which explain reason for partial support. | Not required. |
| 34 | 132 | The statement regarding contributing positively to opportunities to help position Perth as a vibrant connected and progressive city could be taken by some commercial enterprises to mean developing totally unsuitable projects such as a cable car. This would be a very limited activity with long term negative consequences for the integrity of the park particularly if the project was commercially unsuccessful. This is also at odds with the statement "treading lightly on the land". | Visitor Experiences | 2C - Already noted or considered | The BGPA Board of Management is required under legislation to conserve and enhance the natural and cultural values of Kings Park and Botanic Garden, which provides a basis for assessment of any formal proposal for attractions that require significant new built infrastructure. The Board has not received any proposal for a cable car in Kings Park and Botanic Garden. | Not required. |

| Submission Number | Comment Number | Summary Comments | Section of Draft Plan | Response Criterion No. | BGPA Response | Final Plan Amended? |
|-------------------|----------------|--|--|----------------------------------|---|---------------------|
| 34 | 133 | With regard to transport options the public ask why is there not a small shuttle service which can take visitors to less explored parts of the gardens such as Roe Gardens and the Place of Reflection and highlight sections in the whole park including Memorials and playgrounds | Visitor Experiences | 2C - Already noted or considered | Transport options will be considered under Initiative 2.7 (Sustainable transport services). How this is achieved is beyond the scope of detail included in the plan. | Not required. |
| 34 | 134 | Science and Environmental Conservation - Initiative 8 (Manage Mt Eliza escarpment); The management of Mt. Eliza scarp is important. Comments are made about the increased degradation at certain points along Fraser Ave and below the War Memorial. Again a cable car would increase degradation in this area. | Science and Environmental Conservation | 2A - Support or neutral | Supports draft plan. | Not required. |
| 34 | 135 | Amenity and Infrastructure - Initiative 8 (Linkages to reconnect Kings Park and Botanic Garden and the Swan River); Currently access to the river is by the Kokoda Track and the Crawley steps. The divided Mounts Bay Road is an impediment to access. A pedestrian bridge from the scarp to the river would provide access to more visitors from the river path. | Amenity and Infrastructure | 2A - Support or neutral | Supports draft plan. | Not required. |
| 34 | 136 | Amenity and Infrastructure - Initiative 8 (Linkages to reconnect Kings Park and Botanic Garden and the Swan River); Not a cable car. | Amenity and Infrastructure | 2C - Already noted or considered | Noted. The BGPA Board of Management is required under legislation to conserve and enhance the natural and cultural values of Kings Park and Botanic Garden, which provides a basis for assessment of any formal proposal for attractions that require significant new built infrastructure. The Board has not received any proposal for a cable car in Kings Park and Botanic Garden. | Not required. |

| Submission Number | Comment Number | Summary Comments | Section of Draft Plan | Response Criterion No. | BGPA Response | Final Plan Amended? |
|-------------------|----------------|--|--|----------------------------------|---|---------------------|
| 34 | 137 | The events of 2020 have highlighted how important Kings Park is to residents of the whole metropolitan region. It has provided, as always, a place to meet recreate and escape to a significant place of natural beauty and ecological importance. It would not be enhanced by commercial ventures which permanently damage the integrity of the park, for short term gain. Any decisions made cannot be at the behest of Perth City Council as this very special place is for all WA inhabitants. | Overall | 2C - Already noted or considered | The plan recognises the significance of Kings Park to the community at large and any new activity or development proposed will be carefully considered in the context of conserving the park's significant natural and cultural values. | Not required. |
| 35 | 138 | I partially support the direction and planned activities presented in the Draft Kings Park and Botanic Garden Management Plan 2021-2025. | Overall | NA | Response provided to specific comments which explain reason for partial support. | Not required. |
| 35 | 139 | Overall, the plan does not provide assurance that any activities in the bushland (the most important part of Kings Park) will be consistent with biodiversity conservation, including no clearing of native vegetation. This should be very clearly stated. | Science and Environmental Conservation | 2C - Already noted or considered | Initiatives 3.2 (Protect and restore Kings Park Bushland), 3.3 (Integrate research with adaptive management for bushland conservation) and 3.8 (Manage Mt Eliza escarpment) aim to conserve, protect and restore the Kings Park Bushland. | Not required. |
| 35 | 140 | I only support key management initiatives if conducted in a way that will not in any way disturb the bushland and are consistent with biodiversity conservation. The way the plan is written, it is difficult to comment as the intentions for recreation, ecotourism, education, wellbeing and infrastructure are not stated in sufficient detail to determine their potential impact on the bushland. The plan needs to clearly state that no activities or developments will be permitted that in any way adversely impact on the bushland, including no vegetation clearing. | Overall | 2C - Already noted or considered | As stated under Our Intended Focus within Amenity and Infrastructure, management activities and initiatives will be undertaken whilst conserving natural and cultural heritage values. | Not required. |

| Submission Number | Comment Number | Summary Comments | Section of Draft Plan | Response Criterion No. | BGPA Response | Final Plan Amended? |
|-------------------|----------------|---|--|----------------------------------|---|---------------------|
| 35 | 141 | I strongly support "leadership in science and environmental conservation" but this needs to be supported by a well-funded bushland management and research program. On page 16, I strongly support the inclusion of the "Environmental challenges in Kings Park, on the Swan Coastal Plain and beyond". This makes it clear that bushland management in Kings Park (and other urban bushlands) is a priority and should be funded as such. | Science and Environmental Conservation | 2A - Support or neutral | Supports draft plan. | Not required. |
| 35 | 142 | I note that conserving and restoring the bushland honours Noongar culture. | Community Engagement and Participation | 2A - Support or neutral | Neutral statement. | Not required. |
| 35 | 143 | Visitor experiences in the bushland should be consistent with biodiversity conservation and be slow-paced, passive and focused on nature appreciation. | Visitor Experiences | 2D - Among divergent views | The BGPA considers that nature is also appreciated by active visitors such as cyclists or joggers and these activities are consistent with biodiversity conservation. | Not required. |
| 35 | 144 | I strongly support all the key management initiatives on page 25 but to achieve these initiatives, a commitment is required from BGPA to secure additional funds for the management of Kings Park and Bold Park bushlands, and ideally other TEC woodlands of the Swan Coastal Plain. Note that volunteers, while being a very important part of managing the bushland, cannot replace a sufficiently sized and resourced bushland management team of professionally trained staff. | Science and Environmental Conservation | 2C - Already noted or considered | The BGPA acknowledges the resource requirements to conserve the Kings Park bushland, and allocates available funding to address public safety and asset protection as a priority, including biodiversity conservation. BGPA has a team of trained professional staff who undertake weed management and other restoration activities, which are supported by volunteers who add value to enhance bushland management activities. | Not required. |
| 35 | 145 | I support all the Key Management Initiatives on page 27, and note that more funding is required to maintain Plant Collections and Displays to its high standard. | Plant Collections and Displays | 2A - Support or neutral | Supports the draft plan. | |

| Submission Number | Comment Number | Summary Comments | Section of Draft Plan | Response Criterion No. | BGPA Response | Final Plan Amended? |
|-------------------|----------------|--|----------------------------|----------------------------------|--|---------------------|
| 35 | 146 | Amenity and Infrastructure - Initiative 6 (Integrated transport planning); Multiuse paths are very problematic from a safety and visitor enjoyment perspective and the current network for pedestrians and cyclists in the bushland is well balanced. Mountain bikes should not be permitted given the destruction they can cause to bushland. | Amenity and Infrastructure | 2B - Beyond scope | Path uses will be considered as part of the transport planning process yet to be undertaken but this detail is beyond the scope of the Management Plan. | Not required. |
| 35 | 147 | I definitely do not support a cable car. | Amenity and Infrastructure | 2C - Already noted or considered | The BGPA Board of Management is required under legislation to conserve and enhance the natural and cultural values of Kings Park and Botanic Garden, which provides a basis for assessment of any formal proposal for attractions that require significant new built infrastructure. The Board has not received any proposal for a cable car in Kings Park and Botanic Garden. | Not required. |
| 35 | 148 | I do not support upgrades to the Kings Park Administration Building at this stage, because reinstating the budget for the bushland is the biggest funding issue that the BGPA currently faces. This applies to any expensive amenity and infrastructure projects - adequately fund the bushland before adding any built developments, because the bushland is the heart of Kings Park, and keeping it in good condition for future generations to enjoy is of the greatest importance. | Amenity and Infrastructure | 2C - Already noted or considered | The BGPA acknowledges the resource requirements to conserve the Kings Park bushland, and allocates available funding to address public safety and asset protection as a priority, including biodiversity conservation. | Not required. |
| 36 | 149 | Tourism Council WA believes that by implementing the following recommendation the BGPA will more effectively fulfil its duties under the BGPA Act and provide an elevated experience for visitors to the designated land; Focus on Improving Tourism Facilities and Services; more geared towards providing diverse, bookable experiences that are facilitated through market-led proposals without a competitive tender process. | Visitor Experiences | 2C - Already noted or considered | The plan allows for new tourism opportunities including under Initiative 2.3 (Innovative and world-class experiences). | Not required. |

| Submission Number | Comment Number | Summary Comments | Section of Draft Plan | Response Criterion No. | BGPA Response | Final Plan Amended? |
|-------------------|----------------|---|-----------------------|----------------------------------|---|---------------------|
| 36 | 150 | Tourism Council WA suggests the implementation of a Flexibility Clause into the Management Plan; Providing the ability to approve new plans and proposals without triggering amendments to the management plan and creating legislative setbacks in creating new tourism experiences. | Visitor Experiences | 2C - Already noted or considered | The plan is considered to be sufficiently flexible. | Not required. |
| 36 | 151 | Tourism Council WA believes that a clear objective should be to create new, bookable experiences that are diverse to meet the changing expectations of visitors, which aligns with the Strategic Priorities listed in the management plan. | Visitor Experiences | 2C - Already noted or considered | Already considered and provided for under initiative 2.3 (Innovative and world-class experiences). Specific requirements for bookable experiences are too detailed for the intent of this management plan. | Not required. |
| 36 | 152 | Tourism Council WA believes that the current zoning for passive recreation unnecessary impedes upon the BGPA's ability to enhance visitor experience and provide new, diverse attractions while limiting innovation. It is suggested to remove zoning within the Park that limits the ability to provide more opportunities for the improvement and creation of tourism services. | Visitor Experiences | 2F - Unclear or incorrect | This statement is considered to be incorrect. There is no current zoning that impedes BGPA's ability to enhance visitor experiences and provide new attractions. BGPA is however bound to comply with the BGPA Act and other government legislation and policy. | Not required. |
| 36 | 153 | To fulfil the strategic theme and goal of providing "truly local experiences" more effectively, Tourism Council WA believes that the facilitation of market-led proposals should be a clear objective within the management plan. | Visitor Experiences | 2C - Already noted or considered | Already considered. The existing direction and initiatives outlined in the plan are considered appropriate. | Not required. |
| 36 | 154 | Tourism Council WA believes the pre-existing the Swan Dive zipline proposal should be a priority to effectively achieve the management objectives within the Kings Park and Botanic Garden Management Plan 2021-2025. | Visitor Experiences | 2C - Already noted or considered | The plan provides for such proposals to be considered. The plan is not specific on attractions or experiences and the Board will consider market-led proposals on a case by case basis in accordance with its revised new business and events policy. | Not required. |

| Submission Number | Comment Number | Summary Comments | Section of Draft Plan | Response Criterion No. | BGPA Response | Final Plan Amended? |
|-------------------|----------------|--|--|----------------------------------|--|---------------------|
| 36 | 155 | Tourism Council WA would support a plan to change or remove facilities or attractions that are not suited to the current needs or expectations of the local community and visitors. Attractions that have low community value or are not unique should instead be replaced with local experiences; a key strategic goal, to elevate Kings Park and Perth as an attractive destination. | Visitor Experiences | 2C - Already noted or considered | The existing direction and initiatives outlined in the plan are considered appropriate. | Not required. |
| 36 | 156 | Tourism Council WA supports the idea for providing sustainable transport, as per key management initiative 7 listed under the "Visitor Experiences" section in Planned Activities. | Visitor Experiences | 2A - Support or neutral | Supports draft plan. | Not required. |
| 36 | 157 | Tourism Council WA believes the creation of major attractions should be a clear objective in order to promote tourism services, enhance the natural environment, and meet evolving visitor expectations. An attraction such as the Perth Cable Car should be a fundamental piece in the Kings Park and Botanic Garden Management Plan 2021-2025. | Visitor Experiences | 2C - Already noted or considered | The BGPA Board of Management is required under legislation to conserve and enhance the natural and cultural values of Kings Park and Botanic Garden, which provides a basis for assessment of any formal proposal for attractions that require significant new built infrastructure. The Board has not received any proposal for a cable car in Kings Park and Botanic Garden. | Not required. |
| 37 | 158 | While we support the proposed initiatives, we wish to note our particular support for several proposed initiatives. | Overall | 2A - Support or neutral | Supports draft plan. | Not required. |
| 37 | 159 | We wish to note our particular support for the following initiative; Community Engagement and Participation - Initiative 10 (expand the park's smoke-free areas to encompass the whole park). This would enhance visitors' experience of the park and assist in reducing the risk of bushfires. | Community Engagement and Participation | 2A - Support or neutral | Supports draft plan. | Not required. |
| 37 | 160 | We wish to note our particular support for the following initiative; Visitor Experiences - Initiative 7 (Sustainable transport services), which should reduce vehicle congestion in the park and improve visitors' experience. | Visitor Experiences | 2A - Support or neutral | Supports draft plan. | Not required. |

| Submission Number | Comment Number | Summary Comments | Section of Draft Plan | Response Criterion No. | BGPA Response | Final Plan Amended? |
|-------------------|----------------|--|--|----------------------------------|---|---------------------|
| 37 | 161 | We wish to note our particular support for the following initiative; Visitor Experiences - Initiative 8 (Develop interactive web presence and social media strategy), which would also be of benefit to Bold Park. | Visitor Experiences | 2A - Support or neutral | Supports draft plan. | Not required. |
| 37 | 162 | Visitor Experiences - Initiative 3 (Novel, innovative and world-class experiences; The park itself, with its magnificent outlook over the city, and its wonderful botanic gardens, provides a "world class experience". We are concerned that recent proposals, such as a cable car up the face of Mt Eliza, would in fact detract from the park's value. Already the park contains many structures that are beginning to compete for attention with the park's natural elements and gardens. The park is in danger of becoming cluttered with infrastructure. We request that this management initiative be modified to reflect our concerns. | Visitor Experiences | 2C - Already noted or considered | Noted. The BGPA Board of Management is required under legislation to conserve and enhance the natural and cultural values of Kings Park and Botanic Garden, which provides a basis for assessment of any formal proposal for attractions that require significant new built infrastructure. The Board has not received any proposal for a cable car in Kings Park and Botanic Garden. | Not required. |
| 37 | 163 | Science and Environmental Conservation - Initiative 2 (Protect and restore Kings Park Bushland); we believe this should refer to the two Threatened Ecological Communities by name, and the Act which applies to them. This would better communicate the seriousness of their need for protection. Rewording this initiative to clarify and improve its readability is also advised. | Science and Environmental Conservation | 1A - Additional info | Introductory text amended to reference listing under the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 (EPBC Act) and initiative wording amended to refer to the two Threatened Ecological Communities by name. | Plan amended. |

| Submission Number | Comment Number | Summary Comments | Section of Draft Plan | Response Criterion No. | BGPA Response | Final Plan Amended? |
|-------------------|----------------|---|---|----------------------------------|--|---------------------|
| 37 | 164 | Amenity and Infrastructure - Initiative 8 (Linkages to reconnect Kings Park and Botanic Garden and the Swan River); This should specify that options should not have an adverse impact on the park's natural and cultural values, and on its value as a key element in the city's landscape, overlooking the river. The park should continue to provide a natural backdrop to the city, without prominent built infrastructure, such as the proposed cable car, located on its steep slopes. Linkages could instead take the form of an improved trail network. | Amenity and Infrastructure | 2C - Already noted or considered | As stated under Our Intended Focus within Amenity and Infrastructure, management activities and initiatives will be undertaken whilst conserving natural and cultural heritage values. | Not required. |
| 37 | 165 | Policies applied in the management of Kings Park and Botanic Garden - New Business and Event Policy; While we agree that proposals should be assessed "on their merits and in terms of net public benefit they can generate", we also feel that the key criteria should refer to the overall 'Statement of Purpose' for the park, which refers to a wider range of matters in addition to 'public benefit', such as 'environmental conservation'. | Introduction and Background Information | 2C - Already noted or considered | The need to review the New Businesses and Events Policy has been identified as a key initiative in the plan; see Initiative 2.6 (Review New Businesses and Events Policy). This suggestion will be considered in the review of the policy. | Not required. |
| 37 | 166 | We would like to see an additional management initiative with specific reference to the use of 'citizen science', with the dual aims of increasing the level of community involvement in the park's management, and in increasing the level of understanding of the park's natural environment. Programs could be extended to include Bold Park. | Community Engagement and Participation | 1A - Additional info | Initiative 1.5 (Meaningful volunteering) modified to include reference to citizen science programs. | Plan amended. |

| Submission Number | Comment Number | Summary Comments | Section of Draft Plan | Response Criterion No. | BGPA Response | Final Plan Amended? |
|-------------------|----------------|--|--|----------------------------------|---|---------------------|
| 38 | 167 | The Wildflower Society of Western Australia is happy to endorse the Draft Kings Park and Botanic Garden Management Plan 2021-2025, and we have no strong opinions, objections or suggestions to the draft. The management plan will help continue the Kings Park leadership in best practice for bushland restoration, conservation, the cultivation of the Western Australian flora, education, scientific research, and in helping us appreciate, enjoy, and care for our natural environment. | Overall | 2A - Support or neutral | Supports draft plan. | Not required. |
| 39 | 168 | The National Trust of Western Australia congratulates the Botanic Gardens and Parks Authority on a considered plan for the ongoing management of Kings Park. | Overall | 2A - Support or neutral | Supports draft plan. | Not required. |
| 39 | 169 | The National Trust recognises Kings Park as a site of outstanding natural, Aboriginal and historic cultural heritage and to this end will assess and consider the inclusion of the place on its list of classified places. | Overall | 2A - Support or neutral | Neutral statement. | Not required. |
| 39 | 170 | The Botanic Gardens and Parks Authority is also encouraged to acknowledge the place's cultural heritage values by supporting and progressing the inclusion of Kings Park on the State Register of Heritage Places, and emphasising in the management plan its cultural heritage values, in particular the considerable social significance as a place of community and family gatherings, cultural events, festivals and commemorations. | Community Engagement and Participation | 2C - Already noted or considered | Previously considered. The Board of Management resolved the current legislation and governance is adequate to protect, conserve, promote and provide for cultural heritage. May be further considered in the future. Although not using the same words as the submission, the sentiment of the social and heritage values are sufficiently reflected in the introduction 'The natural heart of Perth' . | Not required. |

| Submission Number | Comment Number | Summary Comments | Section of Draft Plan | Response Criterion No. | BGPA Response | Final Plan Amended? |
|-------------------|----------------|--|----------------------------|----------------------------------|--|---------------------|
| 39 | 171 | Whilst acknowledging the need to explore options and opportunities to establish new linkages to connect Kings Park and the Swan River, the National Trust is concerned that the mooted proposal for a cable car connecting Kings Park to Elizabeth Quay, may have a detrimental impact on the landscape values of the Mt Eliza Escarpment and the Swan River as viewed from both the river and Kings Park as well as on the environmental and cultural heritage values of the place. | Visitor Experiences | 2C - Already noted or considered | The BGPA Board of Management is required under legislation to conserve and enhance the natural and cultural values of Kings Park and Botanic Garden, which provides a basis for assessment of any formal proposal for attractions that require significant new built infrastructure. The Board has not received any proposal for a cable car in Kings Park and Botanic Garden. | Not required. |
| 39 | 172 | In its efforts to provide welcoming links to local neighbourhoods, the Botanic Gardens and Parks Authority is encouraged to re-establish and enhance the traditional link between Kings Park, Fraser Avenue and the Old Observatory at the northern end of Fraser Avenue. Fraser Avenue was designed to make a direct visual link across to the Observatory. This has been lost over time and the National Trust considers that it would be appropriate to re-establish this link. | Visitor Experiences | 2C - Already noted or considered | The BGPA acknowledges this historic link and its potential to enhance parkland amenity and will consider any and all opportunities to enhance that connection in its dialogue with relevant land managers and planners. | Not required. |
| 40 | 173 | Overall the Management Plan is supported by the Office of the Government Architect with only minor comments below for the Botanic Gardens and Parks Authority's (BGPA) consideration. | Overall | 2A - Support or neutral | Supports draft plan. | Not required. |
| 40 | 174 | Pursue listing Kings Park on the State Register of Heritage Places to support improved recognition of Kings Park's cultural significance and aid in the protection of its place values and character. ('Key management initiatives' page 29) | Amenity and Infrastructure | 2C - Already noted or considered | Previously considered. The Board of Management resolved the current legislation and governance is adequate to protect, conserve, promote and provide for cultural heritage. May be further considered in the future. | Not required. |
| 40 | 175 | Identify the need to implement best practice water sensitive urban design in and around road and carpark environments. ('Key management initiatives' page 29) | Amenity and Infrastructure | 2C - Already noted or considered | While not mentioned specifically under Our Intended Focus or listed as a key management initiative, implementing water sensitive urban design is consistent with intended embracing of environmentally sustainable design. | Not required. |

| Submission Number | Comment Number | Summary Comments | Section of Draft Plan | Response Criterion No. | BGPA Response | Final Plan Amended? |
|-------------------|----------------|--|---|----------------------------------|--|---------------------|
| 40 | 176 | Include a map showing the extent of areas where masterplanning activities are proposed (e.g. Fraser Avenue West) as well as the location of proposed works and upgrades to infrastructure. | Amenity and Infrastructure | 1D - Omission, inaccuracy etc | Map amended to include location specific key management initiatives. | Plan amended. |
| 40 | 177 | In addition, the OGA would be pleased to offer its advisory services in future as well as the services of the State Design Review Panel for expert independent review and advice on major capital works projects within Kings Park – as befitting a place of State significance. | Amenity and Infrastructure | 2A - Support or neutral | Noted with appreciation. | Not required. |
| 41 | 178 | I fully support the direction and planned activities presented in the Draft Kings Park and Botanic Garden Management Plan 2021-2025. | Overall | 2A - Support or neutral | Supports draft plan. | Not required. |
| 42 | 179 | I partially support the direction and planned activities presented in the Draft Kings Park and Botanic Garden Management Plan 2021-2025. | Overall | NA | Response provided to specific comments which explain reason for partial support. | Not required. |
| 42 | 180 | Funding by sponsorships - disagree with the commercialisation of public spaces and associated advertising for the sponsor. | Introduction and Background Information | 2D - Among divergent views | Selective partnerships with sponsors support ongoing management activities. Naming rights only considered for substantial investment. | Not required. |
| 42 | 181 | Page 15 mentions extensive weed control - I see lots of weeds in the park so there is much more to be done, but this is not listed as an initiative for 2021-25. | Introduction and Background Information | 2C - Already noted or considered | Whilst not specifically mentioned, weed control is covered in the plan under Initiative 3.2 (Protect and restore Kings Park Bushland). | Not required. |
| 42 | 182 | I wasn't aware of the Biodiversity Conservation Centre - I would be interested in touring this facility so perhaps visits or an open day? | Community Engagement and Participation | 2A - Support or neutral | Neutral comment. The Biodiversity Conservation Centre is a working facility for BGPA staff, as such is it not open to the public. | Not required. |

| Submission Number | Comment Number | Summary Comments | Section of Draft Plan | Response Criterion No. | BGPA Response | Final Plan Amended? |
|-------------------|----------------|---|--|----------------------------------|--|---------------------|
| 42 | 183 | 9. Augmented reality/mobile apps: Augmented reality make me envisage something like Pokemon Go. Nature is restorative so the park experience should limit use of online information. It would be useful to have an app that helps to navigate through the park and its trails or an exploration map(s) would be an interesting way to explore the park, but something that could either be app-guided or on paper (just for navigation, then you see the thing when you're there rather than having the info in the app). Signposts at significant locations would be good to tell stories of what has occurred or what used to be there. | Visitor Experiences | 2A - Support or neutral | These comments are considered to support Initiative 2.9 (Multimedia technologies to enhance experiences and learning). These suggestions will be considered but is beyond the level of detail included in the management plan. | Not required. |
| 42 | 184 | I'd like to know the potential for KP to assist with counteracting urban heat island effects from the CBD or anything to fight climate change. Large grassed areas may not be appropriate in future - how can the park adapt? | Science and Environmental Conservation | 2C - Already noted or considered | These comments will be considered in the implementation of Initiative 3.1 (Respond to climate change and show leadership in environmental sustainability). | Not required. |
| 42 | 185 | 6. Develop new plant species appears to be at odds with conservation. Shouldn't the park be promoting existing species (into appropriate environments) to keep them endemic to WA rather than creating species that could displace them? | Plant Collections and Displays | 2C - Already noted or considered | Initiative 4.6 (Develop new plant varieties) relates to the development of new varieties of Australian plants with improved characteristics better suited to horticultural use than species direct from the wild. | Not required. |
| 42 | 186 | I would like a crosswalk on Fraser Ave for people who walk through the park to get from Perth to Subiaco (i.e. near to Kings Park Rd), as it is hard to cross there when the park is busy. | Amenity and Infrastructure | 2B - Beyond scope | This suggestion will be considered as part of Initiative 5.6 (Integrated transport planning) but is beyond the level of detail included in the management plan. | Not required. |
| 42 | 187 | initiative 5.3. Upgrade park security - I do have some concerns about how safe it is to use the park for exercise given that the walking trails are relatively isolated. It would be good to have some safe transit routes through the park for walkers and pedestrians. | Amenity and Infrastructure | 2B - Beyond scope | This suggestion will be considered but is beyond the level of detail included in the management plan. | Not required. |