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Abstract
This paper represents the first stage of a research project examining regional parks in Western Australia. The paper examines the evolution of the eleven regional parks in metropolitan Perth from concept to reality and explores some of the difficulties and benefits of managing parks in an environment where multiple tenure (including private landowners), community engagement and multiple agency involvement across different levels of government is the norm, rather than the exception. The Department of Environment and Conservation (DEC) has responsibility for the overall management of regional parks.

A number of planning and management issues are discussed in the paper, including the challenges associated with managing multiple tenured and physically fragmented large urban parks. Although not universal across local government, there are some exemplars of a co-operative approach between the DEC and individual local governments. There is also evidence of a high level of community engagement through both on-ground rehabilitation work and the regional park community advisory committees.

Introduction
Regional parks represent a relatively recent addition to, and a significant part of, the 72,918 hectares or 10.4 per cent of the Perth metropolitan area designated as Region Open Space. Described by Moir (1995) as an innovative approach to landscape conservation within the Perth metropolitan area, regional parks are identified by planning procedures as having regionally significant value for conservation, landscape and recreation. The parks most commonly comprise lands with a variety of tenures such as Crown lands vested in State government agencies and local governments, as well as
private lands where the agreement of the landowner is obtained (CALM, 2005). Because of this, their management necessitates coordinated planning by different agencies as well as collaboration with owners of private land. For example, Beeliar Regional Park in the southern suburbs of Perth consists of Crown reserves vested in the City of Melville, City of Cockburn, Town of Kwinana and the Conservation Commission of Western Australia as well as freehold land owned by the Western Australian Planning Commission (WAPC), other government agencies, companies and individuals. In addition to their multiple vesting, the majority of regional parks comprise an amalgam of multiple non-contiguous parcels of land.

There are eleven regional parks within the Perth metropolitan area (refer to Figure 1): Seven of the parks, Yellagonga, Herdsman Lake, Canning River, Woodman Point, Beeliar, Rockingham Lakes, and Jandakot, are located on the Swan Coastal Plain. The other four parks, Wooroloo, Mundy, Banyowla and Wungong are located in the Darling Range.

This paper represents the first stage of a research project examining regional parks in Western Australia. The paper outlines the evolution of regional parks in Western Australia, including the legislative and policy framework developed for managing regional parks in a multi-agency environment and the engagement of community members in both an advisory capacity and in on-ground rehabilitation work. The research methodology used combines critical insight gained through participant observation (through the respective roles of the authors as acting manager of the Regional Parks Unit and as chair of one of the community advisory committees), with a review of relevant publications and reports, including a questionnaire survey of community advisory committee members undertaken in 2006.
In terms of the management of parks and protected areas the management model developed for regional parks in metropolitan Perth provides the exception rather than the general rule at the level of state government. With this in mind the next stage of our research project (commencing in 2010) will examine the benefits of, and the key drivers of success and the challenges of the multi-agency approach used. This aspect of the research is particularly timely given the emerging trend in government (at least in Western Australia) towards planning for, and establishing parks and protected areas at a landscape scale, rather than as discrete land parcels. The recently established Swan Canning Riverpark provides such an example. Drawing, at least in part, on the regional parks multi-agency model, state legislation was passed in 2006 (the Swan and Canning Rivers Management Act) enabling the establishment of the Swan Canning Riverpark.

The final stage of the research project will involve undertaking a second survey of community advisory committee members to build on the survey data collected in 2006 (DEC, 2007) and to evaluate the roles and responsibilities of the regional park community advisory committees.

(insert Figure 1 here)

The origins of Perth’s regional parks

The concept of Region Open Space was introduced in Western Australia with the release of the Plan for the Metropolitan Region, Perth and Fremantle, 1955. More commonly
known as the Stephenson and Hepburn Report, the report recommended a statutory region plan be prepared for metropolitan Perth and that it include the identification and protection of large urban parkland and bushland reserves of conservation, recreation and landscape value. Stephenson and Hepburn provided a broad list of examples they considered appropriate for Region Open Space, including ocean beaches, rivers, river foreshores and other areas of landscape value such as nature reserves, as well as camping and recreational facilities including regional sport facilities such as stadiums (Singleton, 1992). This Region Open Space would include privately owned land and as indicated by the list of examples, be multi-purpose areas that met the needs of an entire region (Jennings, 2007). The Stephenson and Hepburn Report provided no more than a cursory overview of the natural assets of Perth. For example, the environmental significance of wetlands and of the groundwater mounds were largely overlooked, with Herdsman Lake (Figure 2) identified as an appropriate site for playing fields and other wetlands set aside for market gardening (Singleton, 1992). The introduction of the Metropolitan Region Scheme (MRS) in 1963 saw land reserved for ‘Parks and Recreation’ providing statutory protection for Region Open Space in a town planning context and a commitment by the State government to acquire the land where it was in private ownership. Throughout the decades that followed the State planning authorities continued to reserve additional land under the MRS for Parks and Recreation, with the land gradually acquired by the State government as open space of regional significance for conservation and recreation. Much of this land is now managed as regional parks. There are however other areas of Region Open Space outside of the regional parks network; these areas are generally discrete parcels of land which are owned by, or vested with, a single organisation, for
example Kings Park and Botanic Garden and Bold Park, both of which are managed by the Botanic Gardens and Parks Authority.

By the 1970s there was growing awareness of the need to better protect and manage our local (and global) environmental assets. The early work of Riggert (1966) brought into sharp focus the magnitude of the loss of wetlands on the Swan Coastal Plain as a direct result of European land use. A few years later, Seddon’s (1972) Sense of Place: a response to an environment, the Swan Coastal Plain Western Australia provided, for the first time, a comprehensive and reader-friendly description and analysis of the natural and built environment of the coastal plain. Seddon described the Swan Coastal Plain landscapes as ‘vulnerable’ and added to the Region Open Space discussion initiated by Stephenson and Hepburn by calling for ‘more powerful machinery for taking care of regional recreational resources such as river foreshores, the lakes, and the coast, through a consistent and comprehensive policy of acquisition, design and management’ (Seddon, 1972, Appendix 2, p. 266). The work of Riggert, Seddon and in later years many others, helped to raise the level of awareness and understanding of the need to both value and protect the natural assets of the Swan Coastal Plain.

The 1970s also saw the establishment (in 1971) of the Western Australian Environmental Protection Authority (EPA) and subsequently the Department of Conservation and Environment (DCE). At the inaugural meeting of the EPA a Conservation Through Reserves Committee was appointed to report on National Parks and Reserves throughout Western Australia. Their objective was to identify a comprehensive and representative set of reserves to provide for conservation of the State’s flora and fauna. The task was undertaken by dividing Western Australia into twelve regions (called Systems) identified as having similar natural and demographic characteristics. Metropolitan Perth is in
System Six, embracing the Swan Coastal Plain from the Moore River in the north, to Bunbury and the middle reaches of the Blackwood River in the south. System Six also extends some 80 km inland from the coast, with the eastern boundary aligned with the towns of Toodyay, Boddington and Boyup Brook (DCE, 1980). The state-wide assessment process was complete with the publication of the *Darling System – System 6* (parts 1 and 2) in 1983 (DCE, 1983a, 1983b). Drawing upon the Region Open Space concept proposed by Stephenson and Hepburn the System Six Report recommended specific areas of open space in the Perth metropolitan area for designation as regional parks. The resultant map presented in the System Six report highlights a dominantly linear pattern of proposed regional parks including areas of wetlands, rivers systems, coastline and the Darling Scarp (DCE, 1983b).

Building on the work of Riggert (1966), by the mid-1970s the EPA had also established an inter-departmental Wetlands Advisory Committee. A key outcome from the work of this committee was the long overdue recognition of urban wetlands as areas of high conservation value, rather than as swamps to be used as landfill sites, filled and used for housing, or drained (Singleton, 1992). By the 1960s approximately 50 per cent of wetlands in the Perth metropolitan area had been destroyed (Riggert, 1966) and the early work of the Wetlands Advisory Committee (Wetlands Advisory Committee, 1977) was of fundamental importance in helping to ensure that the conservation values of many of the remaining urban wetlands were protected through inclusion in the proposed and evolving regional parks (refer to Figure 2 and Table 1).

(insert figure 2 here)
The review of the Corridor Plan in the mid-1980s also brought a greater focus to the environmental assets within the Perth region, with the review process incorporating a biophysical ‘opportunity and constraints analysis’ (Rice, 1987) along with a review of the metropolitan parks system (Singleton, 1987). One of the important outcomes of the work by Rice (1987) was the identification of areas to be added to the Region Open Space system and an amplification of the functions of the proposed regional parks network. The latter identified the importance of flora and fauna conservation (with special attention to rare and threatened species); recognised the importance of maintaining natural environmental services; and, the importance of retaining locally distinctive landscapes for both cultural and natural values (Singleton, 1992). The subsequent release of Metroplan (Department for Planning and Urban Development [DPUD], 1990) included the identification of 14 proposed regional parks. The plan outlined that reservation, acquisition and park development would be pursued, where possible, to relate to the development of new urban areas. At about the same time, a task force report on the administration, planning and management of Region Open Space and regional parks recommended the consolidation and management of regional parks under a single administration (DPUD and Department of Conservation and Land Management [CALM], 1991). A Regional Parks Authority was proposed to be created under the Conservation and Land Management Act 1984 (CALM Act) as a controlling body with responsibility for the preparation and review of regional park management plans. Crown reserves within the regional parks would be vested in the proposed Regional Parks Authority. The new body would be in addition to the National Parks and Nature Conservation Authority (NPNCA).
The EPA’s Red Book Status Report (EPA, 1993) described the transformation of regional parks from concept to reality as being difficult due to the wide range of land tenure involved and the funding requirements for acquisition and continual management of the parks. Changing departmental responsibilities also had a significant bearing on the evolution and implementation of the Red Book recommendations. For example, the amalgamation of the Forests Department, National Parks Authority and Wildlife section from the former Department of Fisheries and Wildlife to form the Department of Conservation and Land Management was particularly significant in facilitating the development of a true conservation reserves system.

By the mid-1990s amid growing community support for the protection of large tracts of urban bushland the State government had initiated planning to create the first three regional parks - Yellagonga, Canning and Beeliar. The DPUD prepared planning studies to consider the establishment and administration of the parks. Importantly, these studies proposed boundaries for the parks and provided the community the opportunity to comment on proposed management arrangements. During the 1990s there was also early community involvement in planning for a regional park in the Darling Range. Established in 1990 the Darling Range Community Consultative Committee provided assistance in the identification of areas of conservation and community significance as well as advice on a range of planning and management issues.

In 1997, in a major undertaking to bring regional parks to reality the State government announced a commitment to give regional parks legal standing and vesting in the NPNCA, now the Conservation Commission of Western Australia. The coordination of management of the eight metropolitan regional parks (refer to Table 1) was progressively transferred to CALM, with the transfer of management responsibility completed in 1999.
Overall planning and administration of the regional parks network

The State government’s decision in 1997 was welcome news as the absence of a policy statement detailing the establishment and management of regional parks had been of considerable concern to conservation groups, local government, the WAPC and CALM. In establishing regional parks the State government provided clear direction to the prospective departments and agencies involved regarding their roles and responsibilities in planning for and managing regional parks and the broader Region Open Space network. The WAPC retained responsibility for overall planning of lands for regional parks and the broader Region Open Space system under the provisions of the MRS as well as retaining responsibility for the acquisition of land through the Metropolitan Region Improvement Fund (MRIF). The WAPC also retained the role of determining planning and development applications affecting those lands under its enabling legislation and continued to manage its remaining landholdings of Region Open Space that were not included within the regional parks. As a result, the WAPC retained the role of overall planning for, and establishing regional parks in consultation with CALM.

CALM was given responsibility for coordinating the management of regional parks. This involved the preparation of management plans for each of the parks, undertaking on-ground works including capital improvements and ensuring that on-ground work involved an integrated approach between the managing agencies and the community.

Management model for Perth’s regional parks
Under the regional park management model, the recently established Department of Environment and Conservation (DEC), formed by the amalgamation of CALM and the Department of Environment, prepares management plans for the parks through a consultative process with relevant agencies and the community to address issues across land tenures and management jurisdictions. As a result, one of the key roles of a regional park management plan is to develop land tenure and management arrangements that provide for the effective and efficient on ground management of the park, under the CALM Act and in the context of a multi-agency environment. In general, DEC manages conservation areas such as bushland and wetlands within the parks while local governments often manage the more intensive recreation areas such as sporting fields and picnic areas. Figure 3 shows how regional park management plans prepared under the CALM Act correspond to State government legislation and policies, and subsidiary plans that provide more detailed direction for on-ground management.

(insert Figure 3 here)

The management plans also guide day-to-day management of the parks which requires effective engagement with a range of different managing agencies, private landowners and the community. The importance of a partnership approach to the management of regional parks, especially between DEC and local government was recognised in the formative years of regional parks (Bowra, 1999). Figure 4 illustrates the key stakeholders embraced by this multi-partnership approach. In all, DEC works with 14 local governments and 43 community groups, with this engagement being critical in
galvanising support for regional parks and for the protection and enhancement of park values.

(insert Figure 4 here)

Given their urban location and the large number of park neighbours there is considerable interest in the management of Perth’s regional parks. As part of day to day management, DEC liaises with local government and the community in relation to specific land use planning issues within and adjacent to regional parks. This can include referrals relating to town planning scheme amendments, structure plans as well as subdivision and development applications.

The urban location of the parks also means they are subject to intense pressures with many threats to their intrinsic values. The need to balance the protection of conservation values while providing for community use is a constant issue for the managing agencies and the community alike (refer to Figures 5 and 6). While inappropriate development has adversely affected the parks, the requirement to develop park attractions and improve public access has significantly increased visitation and raised the profile of the parks. Appropriate and sensitive development in the parks has fostered community appreciation of the parks, which in turn has assisted the managing agencies in addressing ongoing operational issues such as frequent wildfires (refer to Figure 7), weed invasion, rehabilitation of degraded land (refer to Figure 8), rubbish dumping, poor water quality in lakes and wetlands and unauthorised off-road vehicle use.

(insert Figure 5 here)
Working with the community

As already noted community involvement is central to how DEC manages Perth’s regional parks. Since the establishment of regional parks in 1997, community volunteers have made a significant contribution to virtually every aspect of park management from management planning, capital works, daily operations, monitoring park activities and reporting on outcomes. The level of community engagement sought by DEC has also required the organisation to manage the parks in a transparent and inclusive manner. The following discussion provides a brief overview of the various ways in which the community participate in both the planning and management of regional parks. Community involvement in park activities is also encouraged through two other DEC programs, the Bush Ranger initiative and Healthy Parks, Healthy People.

(a) Community Advisory Committees

In order to provide a forum for on-going consultation with local communities the DEC established a community advisory committee for each of the regional parks on the Swan Coastal Plain. A single advisory committee covers all four regional parks in the Darling Range, a reflection of the original concept for a single Darling Range Regional Park. Given the scale of this park, and following consultation with the advisory committee it was deemed more appropriate to divide the area into four separate parks.
Membership of the advisory committees comprises community representatives, DEC staff, local government officers and councillors and an independent chairperson. Community representatives are selected on the basis of their expertise, local knowledge and interest in park management issues. Membership is advertised annually with the elected community representatives endorsed by the Minister for the Environment. The advisory committees meet bi-monthly providing a forum for community representatives to discuss park management issues, provide advice to managing agencies and resolve issues affecting individual parks. DEC also uses the committees as a sounding board for specific planning and management proposals. As such, the committees play an important role in DEC’s ongoing management of regional parks in providing comment at a strategic level and in helping to maintain a constructive relationship between all stakeholders.

(b) Consultation with indigenous people

Indigenous people are consulted in relation to regional park management. For example, advice has been sought from Aboriginal Elders to identify appropriate Nyungar names for the regional parks (most recently for the four regional parks within the Darling Range). Advice is also sought regarding site development works in the parks that may impact on Aboriginal heritage sites. In addition, at Beeliar Regional Park Aboriginal culture is promoted through ‘The Spectacles Cultural Tours’. The tours communicate stories about The Spectacles wetlands from an Aboriginal perspective and involve song, dance and bush tucker. This initiative is a partnership between the Town of Kwinana, the Medina Aboriginal Cultural Corporation, Alcoa and DEC.

(c) Volunteer groups and the Regional Parks Community Grants Scheme
In 2006, over 900 registered volunteers contributed more than 8000 hours to regional parks through weed removal, planting native vegetation, cleaning up rubbish and conducting informative tours. Volunteers were involved in the parks through local schools, 43 Friends Groups, recreation groups, corporate organisations and other organised activities.

Some of this on-ground work is supported through the Regional Parks Community Grants Scheme, whereby community groups apply for funding, to undertake a range of conservation, recreation and education projects in and around the regional parks. In addition to bringing tangible benefits to the parks, grant funding has also assisted in adding to the sense of community ownership engendered in volunteers. In the first six years of the program approximately 20 projects were funded each year (up to a maximum of $5000 per grant), with the volunteer groups required to contribute labour and expertise in designing and implementing the projects (refer to Figures 8 and 9). As part of an on-going audit and evaluation process all of the funded projects are acquitted by the DEC. The grants program has proved to be very popular with the 2007 requests for grants exceeding $125,000, more than double the available funds of $50,000.

(insert Figure 8 here)

(insert Figure 9 here)

(d) Environmental Education Centres

A number of the parks, for example Rockingham Lakes, Beeliar, Herdsman Lake and, most recently the Canning River Regional Park, have an Environmental Education Centre. Each centre provides interpretive information for visitors, promotes the opportunities available for participation in on-ground revegetation work and serves as a
dedicated venue for workshops, seminars and conferences. The centres reflect a partnership approach between the DEC, local government and community. For example, the Canning River Regional Park Eco Education Centre is an initiative led by DEC and the City of Canning with the 73 state primary schools and 15 state high schools within the Canning District a key target audience for this park.

The regional park model – strengths and challenges

Legislative and management framework
As noted earlier in the chapter, the 1991 Taskforce Report proposed that regional parks be managed under a single and new administration – a Regional Parks Authority. That proved unnecessary as DEC already had enabling legislation to manage conservation reserves and as such the coordination of regional parks by DEC did not require the establishment of new legislation or a new management authority. Instead, a Regional Parks Unit was established within DEC, where responsibility already resided for the management of complex conservation and recreation areas throughout Western Australia. To date, the CALM Act has not been amended to provide specifically for regional park management. The inclusion of some national parks within regional parks also led to some confusion within the community regarding permitted recreational activities. For example, walking a dog on a leash is permitted in most areas of regional parks, but not in national parks (unless specifically designated). The confusion was largely resolved with the separation of the Darling Range Regional Park into four separate regional parks with Mundy Regional Park the only one to include an area of National Park.
Resources
In establishing regional parks in 1997, the State government realised that additional funding was required to ensure the parks received adequate management. Prior to this the maintenance of the parks was funded through the MRIF, an arrangement acknowledged as unsustainable. While DEC has an ongoing recurrent budget for the management of regional parks from consolidated funding, it is limited and non-government organisations have requested the State government increase the budget allocated to regional park management. The DEC currently employs 25 staff with designated responsibilities for regional parks. Notwithstanding this, the current Australia-wide shortage of qualified planning officers over recent years has been a challenge for many local and State government agencies and has (as noted in the following paragraphs) impacted on the ability to deliver management plans in a timely manner. In light of the resource constraints, the multi-agency management approach to regional parks can provide tangible benefits in having more than one agency contribute funding and other resources. However, planning and management issues (including land tenure) associated with fragmented and large urban parks are complex and the various managing agencies will often have different priorities and internal competing demands on their resources.

Management Plans
The development of a management plan for each regional park provides for an integrated management system to be implemented for large, non-contiguous or fragmented areas of Region Open Space that have a variety of owners and managers. As already noted, objectives and strategies for each of the regional parks are developed through a
consultative process and following endorsement by relevant local government councils and approval by the Minister for the Environment the management plans represent an ‘agreed way forward’ for the parks. The ‘achilles heel’ with this process is that the management plans, although agreed to by the managing agencies, only represent a statutory document for DEC and there is no mechanism included in the plans to ensure that all agencies manage in accordance with the plan. Early attempts to do so were not supported by local government and other landholders. For some of the parks, this has resulted in a number of local governments declining to participate fully in a spirit of cooperative management for particular parks. This has been especially so for the more fragmented parks involving several jurisdictions. By contrast, the partnership approach has seen some very positive outcomes. For example, the Cities of Joondalup, Wanneroo Stirling and Canning have worked effectively with DEC in coordinating capital works (for example, shared pathways, boardwalks, canoe trails and picnic areas) across Yellagonga, Herdsman Lake and Canning River Regional Parks respectively. The City of Canning has also accepted management responsibility for the Canning River Regional Park Eco Education Centre.

The other challenge for DEC has been the extended time-frame involved in the preparation of some management plans. For example, work was mooted to commence on the Darling Range Regional Park Management Plan in 1999 (Bowra, 1999), yet completion of the draft plan is still some time away. Despite the absence of a management plan much has been achieved in the past decade. Many parcels of land have been added to the regional parks in the Darling Range (most of these purchased through the MRIF) and a broad range of on-ground operational work has been completed. By contrast and prior to the formation of the Regional Park Unit, there was some criticism
that the management plan (released in 1997) for the Canning River Regional Park had been prepared in haste, lacked detail and had failed to engage adequately with the local community (Robert, 1999).

Community engagement

As already noted DEC’s involvement with community groups and individual community members covers a diversity of activities from membership of community advisory committees, consultation on management plans, to on-ground work in weed control, revegetation and other tasks. The community consultation processes established by DEC along with the agency’s engagement with the community and other stakeholders in a partnership approach has provided a range of ways for the public to participate in the management of urban bushland reserves. It can also be argued that the level of community interest and ownership associated with the regional parks has led to improved agency performance (for example, in the improved application of agency responsibilities and statutory roles – less ‘buck passing’) and as a result, enhanced on-ground biodiversity and recreational outcomes.

Working in partnership with community also invites critical comment from those involved – in itself a healthy component of any partnership. For example, in the formative years of regional parks when the Department was given overall management responsibility, there was some criticism of the lack in continuity of officers assigned to particular parks and the need for more paid officers to assist volunteers (Robert 1999). At a time of significant change when regional park management systems were being introduced some local community groups, having invested a considerable amount of
volunteer work on specific sites over a number of years, also felt there was little respect for or understanding of their local knowledge by CALM (Robert, 1999).

As noted earlier, in the six years of the Regional Parks Community Grants Scheme volunteer groups were able to access a total of $50,000 each year. This enabled community volunteers to undertake a significant amount of on-ground work, provided the groups with a greater sense of ownership and multiplied the value of the agency’s investment. The willingness of volunteer groups to engage in on-ground rehabilitation work led to the static level of funding available through the grants scheme failing to match demand, with requests for funding in 2007 more than double the available funds. In 2009, the level of total funds available was increased to $105,000 along with a three-fold increase in the maximum funding available for each grant. There were 22 successful grant applications in 2009. Due to the increased funding limit of $15,000 per grant, most applications were for higher amounts than in previous years and as a result, the total amount of funding requested increased to almost $260,000, well beyond the available funds.

Conclusion

It is now more than 50 years since the concept of regional parks was first mooted and 25 years since the concept was formally proposed by the EPA in its System Six Red Book (DCE, 1983). The DEC has now been managing regional parks for a decade with some of the major landscape features and ecosystems of the Perth metropolitan area represented and protected through the regional parks network. In addition, valuable restoration work has been undertaken. Singleton (1987) encapsulated this long term view
when reviewing the metropolitan parks system, noting the establishment of the park system should be viewed as a long-term goal with the proposed regional parks viewed as the ultimate potential park system for the region.

There are further opportunities to expand the regional park network in the Perth metropolitan area and in regional centres of Western Australia. In Perth, these opportunities include the Wanneroo Lakes (Eastern Chain) over the Gnangara water mound, the lower Serpentine River, the upper Canning River and the banks of the Helena River. Some of the existing parks could also be extended to include adjacent areas identified through *Bush Forever* (WAPC 2000), particularly those over the Jandakot water mound. There is also merit in considering the inclusion of some large nature reserves such as Leda and Forrestdale Lake in the adjacent regional parks to ensure that they are managed for long-term sustainability.

At a time when Perth and the south west of Western Australia are experiencing unprecedented population growth, the wisdom of reserving and appropriately managing large areas of Region Open Space for the long-term sustainability of the region’s unique biodiversity and special character should be clear to all. As discussed in this paper the management of large urban regional parks, involving a multitude of land tenures, presents both challenges and opportunities. The regional parks management model has also been, at least in part, a catalyst for change in the way in which government is moving towards a more integrated and effective model of planning for, and establishing parks and protected areas at a landscape scale rather than as discrete parcels of land.

Notes
The views expressed are those of the authors and should not be read as representing the view of either the Department of Environment and Conservation or of the Parks of the Darling Range Community Advisory Committee.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Park</th>
<th>Local government area</th>
<th>Landscape features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Herdsman Lake</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Wetland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodman Point</td>
<td>Cockburn</td>
<td>Coast and built heritage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beeliar</td>
<td>Cockburn/Melville/Kwinana</td>
<td>Wetlands and banksia woodland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jandakot</td>
<td>Cockburn/Armadale/ Kwinana/ Canning/ Serpentine-Jarrahdale</td>
<td>Seasonal wetlands and banksia woodland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellagonga</td>
<td>Joondalup/Wanneroo</td>
<td>Wetlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canning River</td>
<td>Canning</td>
<td>River estuary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockingham Lakes</td>
<td>Rockingham</td>
<td>Wetlands and coastal vegetation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darling Range*</td>
<td>Swan/Kalamunda/Mundaring/Gosnells/ Armadale/Serpentine-Jarrahdale</td>
<td>Escarpment and jarrah forest</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* In 2008 Darling Range Regional Park was divided into four regional parks named Wooroloo, Mundy, Banyowla and Wungong.

Table 1: Perth’s Regional Parks - locations and key features
(adapted from Jennings 2007)