

Analysis of Minister Jacob's response letter 7 December 2016

The planning process being led by the Government is inclusive and the Department of Parks and Wildlife continues to engage with Wedge Island Protection Association and the Grey Conservation and Community Association to work towards achieving a compromise plan.

- The 'planning process' does not define a shared (or any) vision of what is intended to be the outcome, the achievement of the process
- DPaWs engagement with WIPA & GCCA is superficial- decisions made unilaterally
- 'Stakeholder' meetings are simply used by DPaW to reinforce established positions
- Any alternative view put by the associations is dismissed, immediately or subsequently
- There is no collaborative activity to resolve issues or decide a course of action
- DPaWs 'compromise' plan is for WIPA & GCCA to accept its pre-determined position and the process purely formalises that position

The State Government considered and approved the Preliminary Plan in February 2015, which recommended the examination of options for public recreation and tourism, in conjunction with a level of shack retention that contributes to public use. Retention of all shacks is not being contemplated as part of this process and subsequent studies and planning advice suggests that the level of shack retention will be constrained by a range of statutory and policy requirements.

- Presumably it was the DPaW June 2014 Preliminary Planning Report that was 'approved' in February 2015. There was no formal input to, or endorsement of the PPR by the associations. DPaWs unilateral 'constraints' defined the parameters and direction.
- What findings of studies suggest the level of shack retention will be constrained?
- The 'planning advice' being chosen to be taken is that which will constrain the level of shack retention, not that which would minimise loss.

I reiterate the Government is offering you the opportunity to be involved in the planning process, which is nearing a stage where informed decisions can be made and options for the various uses formulated. Once these options are developed, formal consideration of the proposed listing of the Wedge and Grey settlements on the State Register of Heritage Places can take place.

- The planning process is flawed, DPaW will not modified it and in fact further restricts capacity for options to be considered (evidently with the Minister's endorsement).
- 'Participation' in the planning process by the associations is taken as endorsement of it. Therefore it serves no constructive purpose for the associations to continue to be involved.
- The associations have made constructive suggestions as to how to modify the process and lead to a plan more likely to be sustainable and deliver better public outcomes.
- Delaying application of a major constraint (heritage) till after planning decisions have been made is a major reason the process is considered flawed.
- Pretending to protect heritage values over sites which will be decimated, when the values require significant retention of the settlements, is a shallow 'compromise'

I emphasise to you again the importance of working with the Department of Parks and Wildlife and the other Government agencies involved to provide realistic input into the option development process.

- There will be no realistic 'options' developed, only the pre-determined level of shack removal dictated by DPaW/DoP as the primary objective.
- 'Realistic input' in reality is agreeing with the criteria set unilaterally by DPaW.
- Therefore participation in the process will be considered as agreeing with the output.