

I'm:	Org:	Name:	Stance:	Please explain your stance on the proposed amendments:
An individual		Michelle Munro	I support these changes	Freedom camping has caused much damage to Queenstown's environment and water ways in terms of rubbish, human waste and congestion. The campers are also low value to the community in an rapidly crowded tourist environment. All campers should be restricted to formal campground with full services within the Southern Lakes area to help preserve both the environment and desirability of this important tourist destination and home to its locals
An individual		Olivia Brummer-Taylor	I support these changes	Lake Hayes is lovely to visit now without all the freedom campers
An individual		Jan Rae	I support these changes	Protecting recreational access to lake Hayes is extremely important. Cluttering this area up with overnight camping is not conjusive to this.
An individual		Jeremy knight	I support these changes	I support the banning of freedom campers at both lake hayes and the shotover delta. I dont like seeing people using these areas to wash thier clothes (in lake hayes with detergent) or the surrounding areas as a place to deposit human excrement. We swim (when not polluted) there.
An individual		Sue	I support these changes	North end of Lake Hayes is an area of significant beauty and should be cared for.
An individual		Paul Jobbins	I support these changes	These are public reserves designed to be enjoyed by all (locals and visitors). The misuse by a group of campers this last summer meant these areas essentially became off limits. Until a suitable solution can be found I agree that the total camping ban should remain in place. This will allow the reserves to once again be used by the majority, as opposed to abused by the minority.
An individual		Terri Anderson	I support these changes	I support these changes as a minimum. It absolutely doesn't go far enough. We collected more than 15,000 signatures around this issue. Without making things very clear, this summer will be as bad as last year or worse, just moved around a bit to other places. The Freedom Camping Act of 2011 states that vehicles must be self-contained. The definition of self-contained has been tightened by the NZMCA and our enforcement of the bylaws must reflect that. Nothing in the Act refers to the blue stickers as defining self contained. From NZMCA: "A certified self-contained vehicle meets the ablutionary and sanitary needs of the occupants for a minimum of three days, without requiring any external services or discharging waste. Wastewater is then safely disposed of in approved dump stations, which can be found in most camping-grounds and public areas. A self-containment certificate, displayed warrant card, and blue responsible camper sticker demonstrate compliance with the minimum requirements of the Standard. Under the Standard, it is a requirement for a vehicle to display the warrant card and provide the certificate on request, in order to remain certified. Displaying the blue responsible camper sticker does not verify certification." From 1st February 2018 only vehicles with an on-board toilet will receive the "self-contained! certificate. Toilets must be accessible and usable at all times. Here is where we need to be bold. We do not wait for current certificates / blue stickers to expire. They are NOT evidence of self-contained and we KNOW they are the problem. Therefore we need to publicise that the existing blue stickers are no longer proof of self-contained. Step up wardens, stick in in CamperMate, tell the rental companies, signage up and job done.
An individual		Bev Bradford	I support these changes	I strongly agree that freedom camping needs to be prohibited from Lake Hayes reserve and the Shot over Delta to protect our waterways, environment and recreation Ares for all to enjoy without overcrowding of campers.
An individual		Paul Anderson	I support these changes	Stay in a camp ground freeloader .
An individual		Xavier Radic	I oppose these changes	Hello, As an NZMCA member, I suggest the offending areas be made secure and leased to NZMCA Management, for use by NZMCA members only. This would curtail all environmental issues and secure them for NZ use in the future. thanks, Xavier
An individual		Judith Chaffe	I oppose these changes	These proposed amendments do not in any way reflect the value of the responsible self contained freedom campers to the Queenstown economy. These changes will confirm the view of many that Queenstown is not motorhome friendly and is in fact actively discouraging this increasingly valuable tourist sector.. It is not uncommon for people to comment that this town is not worth visiting, because of the attitude of the Queenstown Council. Queenstown needs to develop an overall strategy to manage the tourist numbers and provide, as far as is practicable, suitable locations for all types of tourists. It may be that the provision of comparatively low cost sites with water, toilets and rubbish removal available may reduce the pressure on the affected sites. Making select areas certified self contained only would be a good start. These somewhat knee-jerk responses do not reflect the views of the community group which made the submissions leading to the temporary closure but instead reflect an entrenched attitude that this type of tourist is of no value to the Queenstown economy. It would be interesting to hear on what basis these assumptions have been made.
An individual		Vivienne Smith	I support these changes	Please ban freedom camping at Lake Hayes Reserve and the Shotover Delta - toomany people are abusing our beautiful area. Thanks (and I'm a camper and caravaner too)
An organisation	Central Park Camping		I support these changes	As a business owner with a motor home park freedom camping in my district is having a significant negative affect on business discouraging me fro further investment in more sites and facility's the same will be occurring in the Queenstown lakes district If freedom camping policy is balanced and longer term instead of reactive Business will be keen to pick up the extra numbers and develop the require facilitys
An individual		Hamish Bryce	I support these changes	
An individual		Chris Blackford		Rather than take the easy option of prohibiting freedom camping, QLDC needs to spend some money to formalise freedom camping in those areas and provide some facilities. It is generally accepted that some vehicles displaying "Self Contained" stickers are something of a joke and that the system is vague enough to open it up to abuse. The QLDC needs have a definition of Motor Home in the by law that clearly and unambiguously states "Motorhome means a vehicle designed to provide sleeping facilities and toilet facilities, in a separate room to the sleeping facilities". This would cut out the vast majority of the vans and station wagons that we all know are the major source of the problem. Just don't allow them to camp anywhere other than at approved DOC or commercial sites. It would not be difficult to enforce. I have travelled in over 20 countries in my motorhome, almost every one had far superior facilities for motorhomes than NZ. Motorhomes are not a cheap holiday alternative with most costing many thousands of dollars they are an alternative holiday choice thats not going to go away and only increase.
An individual		Guy hughes	I support these changes	Freedom camping at lake Hayes has reduced its value to locals and visitors by creating pollution and congestion. The concept of freedom camping locally is dated and needs to be reviewed and changed to user page we ratepayers all pay and visitors should too.

An individual		Richard Bowman and Barbara Horrell	I support these changes	As a long time property owners at Lake Hayes and regular users of the Council reserve land we strongly support the proposed changes to the Freedom Camping Bylaw which will prohibit freedom camping on all of the Lake Hayes reserve land. We along with many other users of the reserve land were very relieved last February when Council installed lockable gates at the access to the reserve at Mill Creek to stop the complete abuse of the current policy by hundreds of campers over the summer season. We believe that the prohibition should now be continued with no exceptions being made. It was clear to us that because so many people abused the privileges allowed by the existing policy that the Council and the community must send a clear message that freedom camping is unacceptable at Lake Hayes and won't be tolerated there under any circumstances in future.
An individual		marg katon	I support these changes	have seen the misuse of these areas
An individual		Lisa	I support these changes	Freedom camping in its current form and volume is untenable for the reasons you have mentioned above. Low cost campgrounds need to be provided instead with clamping and fines as a disincentive to illegal freedom camping.
An individual		Sheree Newsome	I support these changes	For the sake of preserving these two iconic locations from not only an environmental stand point but to ensure continued local enjoyment I fully support these changes proposed by Council.
An individual		John Alexander	I support these changes	Submission on Freedom Camping at the Lakes Hayes North End Reserve. I am a regular user (3 or 4 times a week, spring, summer and autumn) where I launch my kayak. I have been doing this for 3 or 4 years. Over that time I have observed the freedom camping grow from just a few camper vans most nights to many, estimating up to 50 on occasions, including some which park up for several to many nights. I have observed items of rubbish, including disposable nappies, left in the area on occasions but cannot always be sure that the freedom campers are responsible for this. Last summer the Council built a fence line at right angles to the lake approximately splitting the reserve in two. Overnight camping was restricted to the area adjacent to the Arrowtown-Lake Hayes Road. On heavy use evenings this restricted access to casual visitors (mostly locals) to almost half the lake frontage as most vans seem to park as close to the lake as they can. I have to admit for most of the 7-8 months I visit the reserve there seems to be few locals in the area but on hot summer days it does get very full and busy. We are a tourist destination and I believe we need to provide for freedom campers wherever possible. My suggestion for this reserve then is to alter the fence alignment so that it runs along the northern side of the access road and that overnight camping, preferably in self-contained vans only, be restricted to the northern side (Arrowtown side) of this fence and road. That way the lake side of the road remains accessible to casual day visitors and also allows walkers the space and freedom to walk along the lake side of the access road without threading their way through randomly parked camper vans and maybe even feeling intimidated by them. Furthermore camper van numbers staying overnight should, I believe, be controlled (say maximum of 50) and multiple night stays prohibited. I'm not sure how these matters could be controlled but the setting out of individual parking spaces might be one way. It might also be necessary to build another toilet block and maybe even another small building with a sink and running water where dishes could be washed. More gravelled roadway may also need to be built and even some shrub planting would enhance this area. I would support the Council in providing ratepayers monies to further development of this area. I note that Option 3 states that "Approve the initiation of the public consultation process for the proposed Freedom Camping Bylaw 2018 and amended Arrowtown-Lake Hayes Reserves Management Plan 2013 to prohibit freedom camping through the bylaw at both areas! however in the detailed explanation further on it states "In addition, Council also proposes to amend the current Lake Hayes Reserve Management Plan to provide that freedom camping can be regulated through the bylaw!. I find this option confusing and I cannot be sure what is being recommended here. In light of my comments above I support Option 4 of the Queenstown Lakes District Council Freedom Camping Bylaw 2018 and Arrowtown - Lake Hayes Reserve Management Plan 2013 document.
An individual		Dale Parsons	I oppose these changes	I am an ORC ratepayer and the owner of a fully self contained campervan. I have spent many happy days camping at Lake Hayes and the Shotover delta in the past. These are the only places that are adjacent to the cycle ways and the only low cost parking before Queenstown. The Queenstown area is the most campervan unfriendly region in the entire country and as a rate payer I find this unacceptable, we require low cost parking areas with easy access to the cycle ways.
An individual		Tara Nathan	I support these changes	I concur that the current Freedom Camping Bylaw should be amended by; Updating the maps to include the Lake Hayes Reserve and the Shotover Delta reserve in the areas where freedom camping is prohibited; and The Lake Hayes RMP be amended by amending policy 17.1 as follows: 17.1 Freedom Camping is permitted in the Reserve only to the extent allowed in Council's Freedom Camping Bylaw Policy 17.2 of the Lake Hayes RMP should be deleted. As a regular walker around the district and user of both these locations, I totally support the removal of freedom camping from these locations in particular, but would add that controls continue to be needed throughout the district to maintain our beautiful environment in a clean and uncluttered state for all to enjoy. The proposed camping hubs should help and should be located well away from any waterways.
An individual		Karen Miles	I oppose these changes	I am unable to read the Freedom Camping bylaw on website?? I would like to see total freedom camping ban at Lake Hayes reserve. Am worried though that the Lake Hayes pavilion parking area will then be used instead so total ban at lake Hayes. Anywhere there is vehicle access to the track needs signage including Rutherford Road.
An individual		Kathryn	I support these changes	I stronger support stopping all freedom camping within an area where there is a camping ground and accommodation available
An individual		Matthew Tyrrell	I support these changes	As a resident of Lower Shotover (Quail Rise) I have had first hand experience of the disruption caused by the minority of campers at both the Old Shotover Bridge carpark and lower carpark (by SH6). Quite simply these areas are carparks, not campgrounds and are woefully inadequate for the numbers of campers descending upon them in the summer. I would question this location for freedom camping full stop given the pressures we have with increased traffic numbers on SH6 and the Tucker Beach Rd junction already. We need to keep areas like this as an amenity to the locals, which is why a great number chose to live here - for the unfettered access to biking tracks, dog walking and general recreation.
An individual		Hudson Turnbull	I support these changes	This is a sensible move although some genuine campers may be affected. The blame sits squarely with the 'Careless Campers'.

An individual		Michelle McQuoid	I support these changes	Please keep areas that locals enjoy a place we feel safe with kids, and places we can swim free of human waste and everything else that goes with Freedom camping. We want to enjoy living here, otherwise you may find the locals get so fed up Queenstown and areas lose their appeal as a place to live if Freedom campers take over our recreational areas.
An individual		Ben Rotto	I support these changes	
An individual		Brian J. Marquand	I oppose these changes	There is a real need to provide well managed freedom camping areas in and around the Queenstown Lakes District. Significant attempts have been made to address the issue including the designation last year of using the northern reserve end of Lake Hayes. I do believe that this area could still be used, as it is a very good site, but it needs to be well managed. However I would recommend that the following be done: 1. Create a fenced off designated area along the northern boundary away from the willows and the lake itself 2.Increase the toilet facilities to cater to the increase in numbers as experienced last year (The current 2 toilet block is in sufficient, and should be kept for the park recreational users ) A special block created and placed inside this designated area would be absolutely essential 3.Create separate washing facilities for dishes etc. An extremely good example of how this has eliminated issues elsewhere, can be seen at the Lumsden freedom camping area at the old railway station 4. A managed system of entry and exit to the Freedom camping area throughout the peak periods, and a managed infringement system for people who try to use the reserve outside the designated area (Clamping and fines payable) 5. A small fee could be instigated per night Fortunately, the government has recognised the issue, and has allocated funds to help, but the QLDC need to accept there is and always will be a need to cater to these freedom tourists, both NZers and foreigners, and a designated area, within the valley, needs to be permanently established and managed . The area needs to be large and open.
An individual		Greg Thompson	I support these changes	Freedom camping at Lake Hayes or Shooter Delta is inappropriate without sufficient facilities to cope with the numbers potentially using the sites. In particular personal washing and doing dishes in Lake Hayes itself is a major threat to the water quality of the sensitive lake.
An individual		Ryan Newsome	I support these changes	For environmental reasons I don't believe freedom camping should be allowed.
An individual		Stephanie Jones	I support these changes	I don't believe people should be able to freedom camp in New Zealand at all. Its ruining the country both environmentally and socially for New Zealanders.
An individual		Sharne Newsome	I support these changes	
An individual		C Beer	I support these changes	I agree with points 1,2 and 3 of the proposal. I think it is important that camping on public land be managed with certain caveats and restrictions to reflect local priorities and protect the environment both physically and visually. Issues around freedom camping are not just created by tourists in vans. Campers in fully self contained vehicles may not be using the bushes as toilets but many of these vehicles are 2-3 times the size of tourist vans which means they create visual pollution - a wall of steel. The council should be putting the views of the residents first rather than those of organisations such as tourist groups or NZMCA, when considering any aspect of the freedom camping bylaw. No camping should be allowed within popular reserves that are frequented by both locals and visitors, no camping sites should be designate within areas close to residents properties.
An organisation	Friends of Lake Hayes Society	Jules Tapper	I support these changes	"I make the following submission with the concurrence of and as an Executive Committee member for the Friends of Lake Hayes Society (FOLH) FOLH was incorporated over a decade ago when a group of local residents became very concerned with the degrading state of Lake Hayes water quality and the lack of serious remediation measures undertaken by the local Regional Council. However we are also concerned with any issues which negatively affect the public enjoyment of this area and its surrounding reserves. Rabbit infestation, native revegetation and inappropriate use of the surrounding reserve lands are issues with which we may wish to express a viewpoint from time to time. In recent times the northern end of the lake reserve area experienced extreme pressure from unregulated freedom camping with associated despoliation in the reserve, along with health and rubbish concerns. The QLDC is to be commended for moving swiftly to curb and regulate freedom campers use of this and other areas. The QLDC suggested small modifications to current freedom camper conditions to include other council reserve areas in the immediate vicinity ( including the Bendermeer Bay reserve area) is a practical and sensible extension to the existing restrictions to prevent unnecessary future problems in the area. Camping grounds and other authorised places have been set up to cater for visitors wishing to 'freedom camp' and we see no sound reason why our local reserve areas and lake area should be spoilt in any way by those not contributing to their upkeep

An individual		Donald Putan	I support these changes	Dear Sir / Madame. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on your proposed bylaw amendment. As someone who is planning a long holiday in the South Island I have taken an interest in freedom camping. I live in the North Island. I note your problem definition is as follows "" Council officers have reported a significant increase in issues relating to freedom camping at Lake Hayes Reserves and Shotover Delta. These issues include for example: - overcrowding due to excessively high numbers of freedom campers; - evidence of human waste in reserves that is creating health and safety risks - large amounts of litter; - people washing themselves and clothes in waterways and hanging clothes through out the reserves; and - significantly limited accessibility and enjoyment experienced by other members of the general public of reserves "" I would like to make the following observations. 1 These problems have occurred in areas where freedom camping is limited to those with a certified self contained vehicle. The fact you are having so many problems leads me to conclude that there are just as many people using this type of vehicle who are disregarding common decency, as there are in any other group of freedom campers. Given that the bulk of sites available for freedom camping in your region are limited to certified self contained vehicles it suggests that you will have a repeat of these problems throughout your entire region. I suggest you prepare for the issues that certified self contained vehicles will bring and have brought to these two spots. 2 I see you considered 4 solutions. I agree that trying to limit the number of parking spots available will not work. New Zealanders are notorious for bad parking habits and any form of parking restrictions usually fail. Not just for freedom campers but for anyone with a motor vehicle. So I agree in principle with your preferred option which is to ban vehicles from this area. 3 Banning vehicles from these 2 areas will increase pressure on the remaining available freedom camping areas. You will need to plan for this otherwise you will just move the problem from point A to point B. 4 An alternative solution ( but probably politically unacceptable) is to allow 3 vehicles at a time to camp at 240 to 300 m spacing. This would spread the load and lower the concentration at any one point which will be visually and environmentally better for all concerned. This would spread around the lake but I do not know if it is a feasible option at the delta. At the moment I only have a tent but whatever solution you choose will not affect me initially but the flow-on effects of your decision may at a later date. Once again I thank you for the chance to contribute. Kind regards Donald
An individual		Vanessa	I support these changes	Both locations are frequently used by local residents who have been negatively impacted due to them being over utilised by freedom camping. Issues such as having to queue for the toilets - some campers setting up their solar showers within the cubicle! Litter and toilet paper is often distributed across the sites. Until such time as there is a way to better manage the numbers of freedom campers accessing these locations, along with their rubbish and increase the number of toilet facilities, no camping should be permitted.
An individual		Don Lovett	I oppose these changes	Freedom Camping Control Bylaw & Arrowtown-Lake Hayes Reserve submission This submission opposes a total ban on Freedom camping on the Shotover Delta and the Lake Hayes reserves The community surveys do not appear to support a total ban on freedom camping. With the Responsible Camping Forum working on the problem, there appears little justification to enact a total ban until the forum has had a chance to promote changes. If a ban is introduced it may be difficult to alter. Only a percentage of freedom camping vehicles are presumably creating the problems complained about by residents. Observation of such areas suggests that there are non-certificated vehicles staying in the certified only areas. This is likely to be contributing to the toileting and rubbish issue. Around the country some camping grounds and accommodation providers appear to be promoting freedom camping restrictions at the cost of other local community enterprises. Personally I would rather see money go to other local enterprises rather than attempts to force responsible freedom campers into camping grounds they don't want or need. Slowly more and more areas are being closed to responsible campers through the actions of a few or the agendas of others. It is New Zealand resident's freedom to travel and enjoy their country that is also being affected being affected and restricted, as well as overseas visitors. From personal observation: -Although "Freedom campers! seem to get the blame for rubbish, often it is caused by locals, day trippers in cars, and cyclist. Some responsible freedom campers tidy up rubbish, broken glass etc. left by others. -Supposed Freedom camping problems appear to be sometimes used as a scapegoat by those with other agenda's. -Restricted certified only Freedom camping areas often have non-certified vehicles parked amongst the certified vehicles. -Problems often appear to arise from a small percentage of those in non-certified vehicles or small vehicles. Often young overseas visitors. -Enforcement appears necessary to obtain compliance by some people. -Obtaining the \$200 fines from overseas visitors is a problem needing a solution if enforcement is to be taken seriously. The use of improved enforcement and restrictions on those using the areas could go a long way to solving the situation. The Government freedom camping task force will hopefully quickly solve some of these problems. But in the meantime a proactive innovative approach by council targeting the causes of the problems could lead the way to solutions. There is a need restrict the activities of those causing problems, not restrict all responsible campers. I would like to thank the Council and staff for encouraging submissions and providing detailed information on the issues. Don Lovett
An individual		Bridget Burt	I support these changes	Freedom camping at Lake Hayes was a terrible idea. There was rubbish everywhere, the campers were inconsiderate playing music at all hours of the night and lighting fires down at the Lake. It also took business away from camping grounds and pushed out people who wanted to visit for the day. The toilets were absolutely disgusting and dirty and never had any toilet paper because too many people were using them. I do think the Lake Hayes reserve management plan should prohibit freedom camping explicitly rather than just refer back to the bylaw. It appears to be opening the door to a further change in the bylaw to permit freedom camping at some future date.

An individual		Rachel Burt	I support these changes	<p>I have holidayed at Lake Hayes for 40 years, since I was a young child. My family and I spend numerous weeks a year there. It is an area that it is very dear to my heart. I was therefore absolutely dismayed to see how the Freedom Camping impacted on the area over the recent Christmas holidays in Dec 2017/Jan 2018. Lake Hayes is a stunningly beautiful lake. It is frequently used in promotional shots of NZ. It seems to perfectly capture the golden quality of the area, and has incredible reflections of the mountains and surrounding hills. Because of this beauty, I understand that it became a top spot for freedom campers - who flocked to the area. The freedom camping area was hugely crowded. The majority of the visitors did not seem to respect the landscape or environment, and I frequently observed people washing dishes in the lake, themselves in the lake, peeing by the lake and worse. The whole area was crowded and noisy, and the front of the lake became a dustbowl with all the foot traffic and cars. There was often loud music playing - day and night. People were unaware of or unconcerned by the fire ban, and frequently lit candles and fires by the lake. This was incredibly upsetting and stressful for myself and family. We live only a short distance away from the lake and observed the nightly fires. There were also times when cars would hoon around the lake and play very loud music at night. We also saw that numerous people flouted the rules around length of stay. Security and oversight seemed wholly inadequate for the huge number of people staying there. It completely destroyed the serenity and beauty of the lake and the environment. We did not enjoy being at the lake because of the over crowding and pollution. There were also far more dogs there than ever before, which I consider also negatively impact on the environment. It was genuinely heart breaking to see how much the freedom campers destroyed the area. I understand that we want visitors to NZ to be able to visit and enjoy our attractions. However, given that Lake Hayes is such a small lake, and such a beautiful spot - we need to look after it and preserve it. So, I consider it is better that visitors come to the lake for day trips and stay overnight in surrounding areas, rather than right at the lake side, spoiling the natural beauty of the area for everyone else. I consider any ban should be permanent and complete. The Lake Hayes Reserve Management Plan should prohibit freedom camping explicitly. It should not just refer back to the bylaw.</p>
An individual		Mary & Edgar Burt	I support these changes	<p>We support a total ban on freedom camping at the north end of lake Hayes without any right for the council to subsequently vary its rules. Lake Hayes is a taonga (a national treasure and greatly admired by all. It has rightly been recognised by council as an outstanding natural feature. The lake itself is in a delicate state and along with its surrounds requires to be protected.. Our extended family has been going to a holiday home overlooking the lake for over 40 years. We go often and are always completely blown away by the natural beauty of the whole area, no matter what the season. We were incredulous when campervans were allowed to overnight on the reserve, ,No doubt the many people who used to stop on the road above to take photographs, would have been similarly affronted. Apart from the "visual pollution" there was also rubbish and human waste left behind, campers washing themselves and their clothes in the lake, excessive noise from music and yelling at times and a greatly increased fire risk. Last summer was particularly hot and dry and with a hay paddock adjacent to campers with open candle flames ,fire pois and barbecues there was some real anxiety from all in our home. We went down and talked to one group and called the fire dept on two other occasions. The campers just jeered and laughed at them. We noted that there were two serious fires in the Lake Hayes area at the time. While it was extremely hot last summer, we have on other visits noticed that the area concerned has been subject to surface flooding. This is doubtless due to the height of the water table as set by the lake and the storm water from the road and the hillsides. The soft soils and the lack of hard areas at such times make the reserve an inappropriate place for any vehicles ,let alone large campervans. One only has to look at the access road and the deep gouging which has been left on occasions to appreciate this concern.</p>
An individual		Helen	I oppose these changes	<p>I feel that there should not be a blanket ban as this will impact on us locals who would like to take our children/grandchildren for an overnight stay. I'm fully contained. There should be better control over the non self-contained.</p>

An individual		Nigel Zega	I oppose these changes	<p>As a long-term QLDC ratepayer and a member of the NZMCA who has travelled widely throughout New Zealand I do not support the proposed all-inclusive ban on camping at the two sites indicated. I do support moves to prevent such areas being spoiled by the actions of a minority, but banning all camping denies access to the responsible majority of campers, which is surely not the intention. I would submit that NZMCA members, whose membership requires stringent certification of self-containment (CSC) are not the problem, and neither are many non-NZMCA motorhomes. The very nature of motorhomes that may often be valued in six figures indicates that owners have all facilities on-board and are unlikely to despoil the areas they value and visit. Problems of overcrowding and disposal of all kinds of waste have arisen in recent years in tandem with the increase of tourists in camper-cars. Many of these carry CSC stickers supplied by budget rental companies who bend the rules by offering impractical solutions to self-containment. They claim to follow the letter of the law but they most certainly do not follow the intention of the law, which proves the need for current moves to change those laws. Having said that, many budget campers both with and without CSC stickers on their vehicles do try to be responsible, but the current infrastructure in New Zealand simply can't cope with the increasing numbers. We are in danger of allowing tourists to destroy the reasons they come here -and the reasons we live here. Blanket bans on traditional New Zealand activities are not an effective solution. Rather than imposing indiscriminate bans, the problem should be approached from several different directions, which I understand is the approach of the current Responsible Camping Working Group, which includes representatives from national and local government and the NZMCA. The NZMCA is already working on raising the bar for CSC standards and ending certification of non-NZMCA vehicles. Revised CSC regulations should prevent budget rental operators being so casual with their CSC accreditation. This would make it easy to allow only CSC vehicles to camp responsibly, which would reduce both irresponsible campers and numbers at the same time. New Zealand doesn't need more budget tourists, but more high end tourists, and our marketing should encourage that. At the moment we can't even provide enough of the basics like toilets for budget visitors, let alone big spenders. We desperately need better infrastructure to accommodate ever-swelling tourist numbers, particularly in places like the Queenstown Lakes District. The problems of overcrowding spoil places for both tourists and locals and only tourist business get a direct benefit. We need more and better facilities across the board -not just toilets and campgrounds and roads -and local ratepayers should not be paying to provide solutions for problems caused by growing tourist numbers. The sooner we follow the lead of other countries and impose such things as tourist taxes and bed taxes the better. So support initiatives for national funding to cope with the numbers. Design and police reasonable bylaws that could get responsible campers on side. Work with them to police well-equipped sites. Work on making rental companies liable for fines incurred by their clients. Please do not impose a blanket ban that will do more harm than good. By all means be more discriminating. Try allowing NZMCA vehicles in overnight. Consider locking overnight parking vehicles inside gates if necessary at some sites -we've seen it work elsewhere in the country. (That might also reduce the practice of some camper-car visitors of arriving after dark and leaving before dawn to avoid paying fees to DOC rangers.) If you take away New Zealanders' ability to camp responsibly in their own country, you're eroding one of the basic freedoms that makes this place special. Does anyone really want to do that?</p>
---------------	--	------------	------------------------	--



An individual		Cath Gilmour	I oppose these changes	<p>Dear Council commissioners, thank you for the opportunity to submit on this. My fundamental opposition is that it seems precipitous to prohibit freedom camping from these two areas when Council has not completed its overall freedom camping strategy. This strategy might suggest an alternative response is better, as part of a broader and more well thought out approach to freedom camping. News in yesterday's (29.8.18, page 16) ODT about THL's record profit and its JV plans with US campervan manufacturer Thor Industries should sound alarm bells for tourism across the country, and for our district in particular. Even before this JV, THL boasted 1.13 million campervan rental days in the last financial year with 5731 vehicles on the books. And it is only one of New Zealand's freedom camper rental companies. Many of these are of the "self-contained" variety where the toilet capsule remains in its plastic bag for the entirety of every trip made. This is a nationwide problem that needs central government response, in terms of change definitions et cetera (as elaborated on below). Instead of the proposed amendments, I suggest that Council leave the current restrictions in place, until the community has a chance to consider and the council has a chance to change/confirm the broader freedom camping strategy Mr Cloete is preparing. I append below the feedback I sent in February when you initially closed these areas. Please take the time to read this, and I trust it will be fed into the freedom camping strategy thinking.</p> <p>SUBMISSION Dear Mayor Boulton and Councillors, Thank you for the opportunity to give feedback as you look to how to best deal with freedom camping in this district. Not an easy task, considering the legislative constraints and political ramifications. Upfront disclosure: John and I are the proud owners of a new fully self-contained camper, in which I am now sitting with my voice activated laptop writing this submission, with a view of the Lake Hayes freedom camping area in front of me. We have spent a couple of days here - among the poeey people, in the interests of research and a pleasant camping experience :-). We also freedom camped our way around the States, Canada and Mexico for 1.5 years 20 odd years ago, in the back of a converted Chev Suburban. So we probably cover the gamut in terms of freedom camping types - younger travellers seeking "real experience!" of natural environments on the cheap, and grey nomads looking to experience our own country from the comfort of a mobile crib. We have never left a place we have stayed worse for our visit. From this background, I feel closing Lake Hayes completely to freedom campers was a precipitous move in response to social media pressure. I was reassured to read that Thunes Cloete was pushing to have a districtwide review over the next six months. This will hopefully allow more evidence and less emotion to be applied, to create a sound freedom camping policy framework for Queenstown Lakes District Council. From reading both mainstream and social media, it would appear there are two main concerns: -Public outcry because of the perceived effects of freedom campers on the environment and locals' use of the reserves.</p>
---------------	--	--------------	------------------------	--

The perception that some people are freeloading, at the expense of locals. From my understanding, there are several basic parameters within which council operates; - The genie is already out of the bottle in terms of freedom camping. New Zealand Motor Caravan Association now has 80,000 self-contained vehicle owning members. According to Stuff's tourism writer Amanda Cropp, last year there were some 118,000 van tourists in NZ. Changes to marketing, recreation habits, fuel prices, self-contained vehicle definitions and legislation et cetera might change numbers a bit, but freedom camping will remain part of our cultural and physical landscape. That means we must look to ways to control and manage the issues so that benefits (tourism, enjoyment of NZ's great environment, continuation of NZ cultural traditions et cetera) are maximised and damage (environmental, impingement on local enjoyment/property et cetera) minimised. - We can't legally ban freedom camping in the district. - There is a lax legal description of "self-contained vehicle." - Central government legislation restricts how local authorities can deal with freedom campers. On the latter two fronts, I support council's lobbying efforts to strengthen the self-contained vehicle definition (so that users must have access to the toilet at all times) and strengthen council's ability to best manage freedom camping for the local environment and community. Achieving progress on these two fronts could take longer, however, than the community wants to wait and there are moves council can make more quickly. Before I move on to these, I would like to urge council to first seek evidence of the alleged problems. I totally understand people being peeved when they see poo, paper and rubbish littering our reserves and freedom campers exiting the bushes having dropped their load. This kind of behaviour is damaging, unacceptable and disrespectful - from freedom campers or anyone else. However, freedom campers aren't the only culprits. I specifically asked Lee Webster if there was any evidence linking freedom camping at Lake Hayes to degradation of the water. He said there wasn't. Furthermore, you will have seen recent media coverage (The Mirror, February 14, page 5) identifying that ducks were the cause of E. coli contamination in Lake Dunstan, not the nearby Bendigo freedom camping site. You will note a lot of ducks and swans on Lake Hayes. And in the ODT, again this week, a story about the closure of Lake Hayes to recreational swimming because of cyanobacterial scums, caused by our intense summer, temperature stratification and an abundance of nutrients. Furthermore, eutrophication caused by this abundance of nutrients leaching from surrounding properties has been a problem for decades.

It is this that has caused the murky green muck that bedevils Lake Hayes and it would be great to see the same passion and commitment from community, council, ORC and the lake's neighbouring property owners to dealing with its primary causes. In terms of perceived freeloading, freedom camping has long been part of New Zealand's culture and it would be sad to see this opportunity lost for responsible freedom campers through prohibitive responses to a problem caused by a minority of freedom campers and many unrelated factors (e.g. eutrophication). Many tourists pay a significant amount to hire fully compliant self-contained vehicles as a result of New Zealand Tourism PR encouraging this approach to travel. For instance, our German exchange daughter rented a basic Jucy van, with a toilet they could not practically use, for 20 days for a,~2100. That is around \$NZ170 a day. Asking such travellers to then pay the rates we charge at the council campgrounds in Queenstown (\$60), Frankton (\$50 a couple) and Arrowtown (\$42) is not a realistic option. Mayor Boulton has suggested that only 10% of freedom campers cause the problem. Observing freedom campers at Lake Hayes, and speaking to the warden at 12 Mile, I would suggest this figure was 5% or less. Where else do we ban the 95% of "good" operators from an activity because of the 5% dickheads? What's more, we make it difficult for people to be responsible freedom campers. For instance, at Lake Hayes, we fenced them off from the only toilets and provided no rubbish facility. If they then go to the dump station at BP in Frankton to try and be responsible campers, there is nowhere to put their rubbish or recycling. No drop off facilities are provided in the CBD or Frankton retail centres either. From my understanding, Council cannot ban freedom camping in the district under current legislation. I question whether we would want to anyway. Although it is currently getting a bad rap, with some justification, it remains a valuable source of tourist dollars and a valid way to travel if done with respect. The difference, as media now so labels, is between freedom camping and careless camping. If this is the case, then the question becomes how to allow/control freedom camping to maximise the benefits (to tourism business, the community and visitors) while minimising the negatives (to the same groups and the environment)? Suggestions Enable freedom campers to be responsible Ensure that rubbish and recycling facilities are clearly available and easily accessible. This works well in Wanaka - where rubbish and recycling bins are provided at the dump station, immediately adjacent to the central campground. Not so at the BP station in Frankton, where access is difficult, especially for big vans, and rubbish/recycling drop-off not available.



Perhaps Council could look at providing this at the Glenda Drive recycling and refuse station? Or near the Shotover Ponds? If we want to encourage responsible freedom camping, we need to provide the opportunity to be responsible. People can't drop rubbish in town rubbish bins or at Frankton shopping centre rubbish bins. Maybe it is time to look at providing rubbish/recycling bins at the most popular areas - understanding that costs of collection mean this will not happen everywhere. We accept that people create rubbish and want to go to the loo at Queenstown Bay - there are six huge rubbish and recycling bins, public toilets plus two businesses with accessible toilets. No payment is required and most of the time, the people enjoying this great environment behave and are perceived positively - except, perhaps, on the drinking side. Extending this acceptance to the rubbish and toileting requirements of freedom campers in specific areas around the district would enable more of them to be exemplary visitors. Assess where and how freedom camping could best be allowed - and where it should not be. There might be some places freedom camping should not be allowed, because of environmental or local community considerations. Others where it could be allowed only for those campervans with a permanently accessible and plumbed toilet. And some where other vehicles that meet the current definition of self-containment are also allowed. Council can design its Freedom Camping Bylaw to differentiate in this way across sites (see Appendix A). This analysis should be based on both environmental and community considerations. So both objective data (environmental vulnerability, rubbish/toilet resources available, proximity to important local recreation areas et cetera) and subjective feedback (community discussion, focus groups, community associations et cetera) should be assessed. I'm sure some work on this has already begun in the background. Perhaps it might identify commercial/retail car parks that could be used on a restricted hour basis (8 PM to 8 AM?), with (in future) access to toilets and perhaps coin-operated showers. This approach has been used elsewhere in New Zealand and overseas. Some of these might be temporary - reflecting current land availability, freedom camper numbers and legislation/definition of self-contained vehicles. This assessment should also consider the problem of displacement. If 50-100 vans a night are not allowed to park at Lake Hayes, for example, they and their negative effects are likely to be exacerbated and spread further out around the district; i.e. a bigger impact, across a wider area, harder to clear up. This also raises the question of whether the basic premise of the current system, where it is allowed outside of identified urban/settlement boundaries except where expressly banned, should be changed?

If instead freedom camping were only allowed in specified areas - where effects could best be managed - this would reduce potential problems from people spreading out along rural roads (road safety, rubbish spread et cetera) and reserves/open spaces. This would also allow some level of local control in terms of numbers (through areas allowed). The review should also keep in mind basic practicalities such as connectivity (neither cell phone nor Internet coverage is available at 12 Mile or Moke Lake, for example), accessibility, road safety and the capacity of DOC and other basic camping sites to absorb camping numbers. Continue lobbying to change the definition of self-contained vehicles and increase councils' powers to control the same. The definition of a self-contained vehicle should ensure campers have access to its toilet at all times - many currently don't. This problem is exacerbated by the commercial power of rental companies marketing these vans as a cheap and easy way to get around New Zealand - and actively discouraging users from actually using their vans' toilets. This will no doubt be a strong lobby group against any such change. Alternatively, an alternative solution would be to have a two level definition with campers without a fully accessible toilet being restricted to areas with toilets available, as I suggest QLDC could apply within its own bylaw. See Amanda Cropp's article: [www.stuff.co.nz/business/87714815/inside-loo-rule-for-self-contained-camper-vans-and-motorhomes](http://www.stuff.co.nz/business/87714815/inside-loo-rule-for-self-contained-camper-vans-and-motorhomes) And in terms of where power to legislate should be located, freedom camping should be controlled at the level at which the effects thereof are felt - i.e. local authorities. Lobby via LGNZ and relevant ministers to change NZ Tourism message - and force vehicle rental companies to recover fines from renters. Freedom camping and general tourist numbers are revealing creaking infrastructure and damaging environmental impact around the country. Perhaps it is time for NZ Tourism and vehicle rental companies to change their message, to ensure NZ gains good value from visitors as well as vice versa. And if rental companies are going to profit from freedom campers, they should also be forced to recover fines from customers' credit cards when they have broken our laws/bylaws. None of them want to be the bad guys who do this - but if the government insists that all do, it is a level playing field and at least local authorities would get more of the infringement notice fines paid. Lake Hayes. Turning to this specific example, as this is the site that seems to have most upset people, we spent three days here over January and February and observed nearly everyone treating the site with respect. We saw a large number of vans labelled self-contained that were not being used as such, because the way the toilet was stored made it inaccessible during normal use.

We saw some cars/vans without self-contained vehicle labels that were clearly flouting the bylaw. During several "site visits! into the primary area of concern under the Willows over the three days, we saw very little rubbish, no poos, and just a couple of pieces of toilet paper. It was certainly not the messy mayhem that I had expected from media and social media reports. Speaking to a man who does volunteer monitoring of the reserve (and works as a reserve maintenance contractor for council), he said it did seem to have improved since publicity on the problem had begun. I would like to offer some alternative approaches to the total freedom camping ban being imposed (labelled council's "initial response! to the issue) this week: - Change the location of the freedom camping zone. The map at the reserve showed freedom camping was only allowed under the trees, on the lake side of the road. This is exactly where it shouldn't be allowed, as it's the primary area of both concern and problem. It should be moved to the open area on the other side of Lake Hayes Reserve Road. Many campers already use this. This would keep freedom camping vans out of the main area of conflict (although they, like locals, could picnic under the trees by day, just not park there). It would also make it much less likely that people did poo in the area - squatting in the open is a less attractive option to most people. Similarly with rubbish, less likely to be left behind when you can only do so in open view of fellow campers and locals. - Restrict its use to only self-contained vehicles with permanently plumbed and accessible toilets. (This is a legal option available to Council, Appendix A.) - Accept that even fully plumbed self-contained vehicle users will often use public toilets, so that they don't have to keep emptying their poo tank. By fencing off the public toilets as has currently been done, Council has exacerbated the problem. In reality, having just two toilets for the extent and usage level of Lake Hayes reserve (even just by locals picnicking) is inadequate. Two more toilets should be provided at the southern end. - If possible, charge say \$5-10 per night per van to cover basic capex and opex costs of this (acknowledging that locals and day visitors will also use the toilets, in terms of cost allocation). NZMCA and POP camping sites do this. So some licensing agreement might be an alternative, if Council can't do so under its own guise. Perhaps the same business that currently runs 12 Mile, Moke Lake and The Outlet camps? - Continue with the two day/month limit to ensure turnover and that it doesn't become a de facto campground. - Clamping is threatened - has it ever been used? The (strengthened) bylaw should be monitored and strictly enforced. Social media would get the message out quickly if we take our own rulings seriously. - Limit numbers by limiting the area available. Its popularity would also decrease, I think, once the opportunity to park under the trees has been removed and the bylaw enforced. - Improve and simplify the signage. Use graphics rather than so many words. You have this talent already on staff! Screeds of legalese English doesn't get the message across.

Either provide rubbish bins or signal clearly where rubbish and recycling can be dropped off. Lastly, on a broader Lake Hayes front, I would like to raise the question of council's plans for the extensive reserve land holdings at the lake? The other side of the eastern reserve, over Mill Creek and accessed by Rutherford Road, is very little used. The lake frontage has been nicely landscaped. I am sure the two or three houses that look out onto this extensive and little peopled reserve love the view and would wish to retain it. However, is that its best use in terms of "public good!?" There is also substantial public reserve land on the southern side of Lake Hayes - the Bendemeer Reserve plus the extensive reserve recently added around the Showgrounds. I note also that there has been substantial clearance of vegetation at the western end, adjacent to the walkway, though I am unsure if this is on private or public land? I submit that Council should look at all these holdings in terms of - long-term recreational, environmental and visual resource for our local community - environmental buffering, mitigation and protection for the lake - and potential for providing well monitored, adequately resourced and attractive freedom camping for locals, New Zealand and overseas tourists within a comprehensive plan for the district. Freedom camping will no doubt continue to be an emotive subject, on which Council cannot please everyone. Now is a great opportunity to look at the subject broadly and objectively, in terms of where a reasonable level of freedom camping provision can be achieved with best protection for locals and our environment. There will no doubt be areas within QLD that are better suited/able to absorb freedom camping than others. Such analysis might rule out Lake Hayes; on the other hand, good planning might equally make it a good spot. Wanaka Chamber of Commerce's proposed campaign (ODT, 6/2/18) to counter the negative effects of tourism through engendering greater respect for the community from visitors is one that would be well worth emulating in this arena too. Thank you for your work to create a better system. Kind regards Cath Gilmour Appendix A follows Emailed information from James Imlach, national policy and planning manager for New Zealand Motor Caravan Association: Local authorities are empowered to define 'self-containment vehicle' in their bylaws as they see fit and most (if not all) refer to the Standard in some way

For example QLDC states: Self-contained vehicle means a vehicle designed and built for the purpose of camping which has the capability of meeting the ablutionary and sanitary needs of occupants of that vehicle for a minimum of three days without requiring any external services or discharging any waste and is certified that it complies with New Zealand Standard 5465:2001. If QLDC finds it necessary to further restrict freedom camping in certain areas to certified vehicles with fixed toilets only then it will require an additional definition to rely on in the bylaw, for example Fixed toilet means a cassette toilet or permanent fixed toilet as defined under NZS 5465:2001 and excludes a portable toilet. Note: A self-containment certificate denotes whether a vehicle has a portable or fixed toilet. NZS 5465:2001 requires a copy of this certificate to be kept inside the vehicle at all times. Enforcement officers may then request a copy of this certificate to help verify compliance. The bylaw would then state for particular areas that freedom camping is restricted to self-contained vehicles with fixed toilets only. Enforcement officers would then be able to request a copy of the certificate if they're in doubt, check the toilet type noted on the certificate, and move on people/issue an infringement notice if the toilet type is portable. Because of the limited search powers, enforcement officers are unable to simply look inside the vehicle and make a judgement call on whether the vehicle has a fixed or portable toilet. It's best to rely on what the Standard provides to avoid confusion and potential challenges.