

## Response to submissions on the draft Hill End Interpretation Plan 2014

Issues/comments	NPWS response	Proposed changes
1. Comments relating to the <i>Hill End Historic Site Conservation Management and Cultural Tourism Master Plan 2013</i>	<p>These comments related to the <i>Hill End Historic Site Conservation Management and Cultural Tourism Master Plan 2013</i> (Master Plan) and not the draft <i>Hill End Interpretation Plan 2014</i>.</p> <p>The community was provided with an opportunity to comment on a draft Master Plan when it was publicly exhibited in 2012. Following consideration of submissions the Master Plan was finalised and subsequently endorsed by the NSW Heritage Council in 2013.</p>	None required
2. Lack of consultation with the local community	<p>GML Heritage, Trigger and Simon McArthur and Associates, the contractors preparing the Interpretation Plan, consulted extensively with the local community. The local community was provided with a number of opportunities to contribute to the Interpretation Plan between January and May 2014. In addition to local community forums in January and April 2014, the draft Interpretation Plan was placed on public exhibition from 12 April to 25 May.</p>	None required
3. Opposition to the relocation of the Hill End visitor centre, museum and NPWS office to the village centre	<p>Relocating the Hill End visitor centre, museum and NPWS office to the village centre was a recommendation of the Master Plan. This recommendation was accepted by NPWS as it would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• create a place of arrival for visitors that is in proximity to visitor services and facilities</li> <li>• encourage visitors to explore Hill End Historic Site rather than drive from the current location of the visitors centre 'through' the village</li> <li>• provide a more dynamic experience for visitors with less static displays</li> <li>• reduce operating costs.</li> </ul> <p>Funding has been allocated to this element of the Hill End revitalisation project and works have commenced.</p>	None required

Issues/comments	NPWS response	Proposed changes
4. Relocation of the Hill End visitor centre, museum and NPWS office to the village centre will create parking problems	<p>Parking within the centre of the village may become an issue with the relocation of the visitor centre, museum and NPWS office.</p> <p>Parking areas and roads in the centre of the village are Bathurst Regional Council (BRC) lands. NPWS will monitor parking and traffic flow in the village centre following relocation of the visitor centre, museum and office and liaise with BRC as required. However, it is anticipated that any impact from increased demand for parking will be offset by the visitors' proximity to accommodation and interpretation under the new arrangement. The visitor centre and office will be closer to campgrounds and local accommodation, encouraging visitors to park and explore on foot rather than have to drive (as is the current normal practice).</p>	<p>None required.</p> <p>Traffic parking and flow within the village centre to be monitored in liaison with Bathurst Regional Council.</p>
5. Non acceptance and/or questioning of visitor data	The visitor data presented is based on NPWS campground and museum visitation records, market research conducted in 2011, and traffic counter data.	None required
6. Opposition to 'authentic cottage accommodation'	The adaptive reuse of heritage buildings as 'authentic cottage accommodation' is a recommendation of the Master Plan accepted by the NPWS and endorsed by the NSW Heritage Council.	None required
7. Concern about lack of residential accommodation	Residential accommodation is outside the scope of the Interpretation Plan. NPWS currently provides 16 buildings for residential accommodation. The recommendations of the Interpretation Plan will not affect the number of buildings available for residential tenancy.	None required
8. Concern about changes to the appearance and/or feel of the village	<p>Maintaining the authenticity of Hill End Historic Site is a priority identified in both the Master Plan and the Interpretation Plan.</p> <p>Apart from adaptive reuse and maintenance of existing buildings there are two sensitive extensions proposed in the draft Interpretation Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• extension of the former CWA building to house the NPWS office</li> <li>• extension of the Holtermann's Corner Stores to create a photographic interpretation space.</li> </ul> <p>The draft Interpretation Plan also proposes plantings and fencing along Clarke Street to represent the now missing buildings and allow visitors to better understand how the village appeared in 1872.</p>	It is recommended that the <i>Hill End Interpretation Plan 2014</i> is amended to state that prior to installing plantings and fencing along Clarke Street a small trial site is established to enable an assessment of the change on the appearance of the village.

<b>Issues/comments</b>	<b>NPWS response</b>	<b>Proposed changes</b>
9. There are too many management plans and development of plans is not a proper use of funds	Each of the plans – Plan of management, Master Plan and draft Interpretation Plan serve a different purpose. This comment is general in nature and outside the scope of the Interpretation Plan.	None required
10. Confusion over different plans	The confusion is because there has been a misunderstanding of the differences between the draft Interpretation Plan and the preliminary research and review report prepared by GML Heritage, Trigger and Simon McArthur and Associates.	None required
11. Family history is not mentioned	Family history is identified in the draft Interpretation Plan. The draft Interpretation Plan recommends that self-service digital family history research tools are provided within the photographic interpretation space at Holtermann’s Corner Stores.	None required
12. History Hill and The Hill End Lodge are not mentioned	These are private enterprises outside the scope of the draft Interpretation Plan. The operators of both businesses were however formally invited to community meetings regarding the Interpretation Plan in January and April 2014.	None required
13. Lower level operational comments that are not directly related to the draft Interpretation Plan	These comments are either outside of the scope of the draft Interpretation Plan or relate to local operational matters such as signage for the current visitor centre and staffing.	None required
14. Comment on minor omission or inclusion not seen by reader	These comments relate to perceived omissions. All issues identified as an omission are encompassed by the draft Interpretation Plan.	None required
15. Positive comment not requiring response	Outside the scope of the draft Interpretation Plan or general in nature.	None required
16. Negative comment not requiring response	Outside the scope of the draft Interpretation Plan or general in nature.	None required

Office of Environment and Heritage  
59 Goulburn Street, Sydney NSW 2000 | PO Box A290, Sydney South NSW 1232  
Phone: (02) 9995 5000 (switchboard)  
Phone: 1300 361 967 (national parks, general environmental enquiries, and publications requests)  
Email: [info@environment.nsw.gov.au](mailto:info@environment.nsw.gov.au) | Website: [www.environment.nsw.gov.au](http://www.environment.nsw.gov.au)  
OEH 2014/0565 | July 2014