

Attachment C (d): Submissions made in Word

Contents Page for Word submissions

Name	Location (If known)	Page
Christine Byrch		2
Christine Gardner	Lake Hāwea	5
Don Lovatt		6
Monica Urquhart		8
Monica Urquhart		12
Prue & Mick Hollyer	Wānaka	15
Sally Buckenham	Lake Hayes	16
Sue Bradley	Arthurs Point	18

Submission on Draft Freedom Camping Bylaw August 2025

Christine Byrch [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

Camping in Residential Areas

I agree that freedom camping should be prohibited in residential areas. Although the Wye Creek subdivision is zoned rural, it is a residential subdivision and I think camping should be prohibited entirely along Drift Bay Road and Vista Terrace.

In the same way, camping should be prohibited within Jacks Point.

Prohibit Camping Near Waterways, Areas of Bush and On Scenic Roads

I think that freedom camping should be prohibited on all scenic roads, and on all roads adjacent to waterways, and on all roads near to bush and trees where there is a danger of fire.

Freedom campers near waterways wash themselves, their clothes and dishes in the waterway. I understand that they are not supposed to, but this is the reality. The cryptosporidium outbreak in Queenstown is a clear example of the risk to health of contaminated water. Although the Council now has an upgraded water supply, many individuals such as our household, take water from the lake, and we do not want the health risk from water borne disease. We also do not want to become sick from swimming in the lake.

Scenic values do not seem to have been considered at all in the Tonkin and Taylor report. This a major omission for the Queenstown Lakes District. Scenic values / beauty is the reason many people live here and the reason many people visit. Camper vans and freedom campers on the side of the road detract from the scenic value of our District and should be prohibited on such roads. For example, many people drive the Glenorchy Road simply to appreciate the scenic beauty. Further, there are many camping grounds, mostly provided by the Department of Conservation, where people can camp in these areas.

Freedom camping should be prohibited in areas of bush or forest where campers can tuck themselves away in the bushes, and light a fire. The fire at Rat Point is an example of this.

So I suggest that Freedom Camping is Prohibited at the following locations near to waterways and scenic roads. These are the locations / roads that I have noticed, there will be more:

- The entire Glenorchy Queenstown Road
- The entire Greenstone Road
- The Rees Valley Road
- The Paradise Road
- The Routeburn Road
- The Skippers Road
- The Macetown Road
- The Kingston Road from Lakeside Estate to Kingston
- The bridge over the Rees River
- The bridge over the Dart River
- Rafters Road in the Gibston Valley

- Beacon Point carpark
- Kingston Road carpark
- Homestead Bay (near Jack's Point)

Comments on the Bylaw

With respect to restricted camping conditions

Schedule 1A car parks:

- I think the time restrictions should be consistent between all car parks and also that 6pm is too early to be setting up camp for the night. In the summer, when freedom camping is at its height, people are still out and about enjoying the summer evenings. I think the set up time should be 8pm, or 7pm at the very earliest.
- I think there needs to be a condition relating to restrict noise.
- Condition 6., perhaps you could say something like "must not stay in this carpark for more than 2 nights in any 30 day period."

Schedule 1B (Section 8.3) roads

There needs to be some time limit on camping on the roads listed as restricted areas. It is possible that at a popular location, many vehicles could park up for two whole days. Should there be a time limit as for car parks?

b. perhaps say '... the entire vehicle and any camping equipment and personal effects must be at least 5m from ...'

c. is this trying to say access for other vehicles should be maintained? Perhaps write more clearly. And how is this dealt with? Does this mean that at a location where many people like to park, such as mountain bikers parking on Coronet Station Road, that camper vans must give others access to parking?

d. does this mean freedom campers can not park on grass? This is a good condition but needs to be written more clearly. What about parking in river beds, for example, the Rees River bed below the bridge, which would be gravel but we don't want people camping in any river bed.

f. this is not clear. Do you mean " must not stay at the same location, or within 500m of that location, for more than 2 nights in any 30 day period."

7.1 and 7.2 It is not clear what these clauses are trying to say. Is it simply that freedom camping is prohibited in areas marked as prohibited?

8.1 and 8.2 A bit convoluted. Are you trying to say that freedom camping is allowed in areas marked as restricted in schedules 1a and 1b provided that the associated conditions are complied with at all times?

Schedule 1A – Restricted freedom camping areas – specific locations

I think you need to make it clear that the conditions listed relate to being allowed to freedom camp in the restricted location, not the prohibited areas. For example, you could say “A person camping in this restricted camping area, the Boundary Street carpark, ...”

I don't think the entire Coal Pit road should be restricted camping, only the car park.

Submission for Proposed QLDC Freedom Camping Bylaw

I submit the following points:

- To ensure that this camping bylaw is effective in addressing Freedom Camping in our district, QLDC **must** engage with LINZ over enforcement issues and **must** come to an **enforcement agreement with LINZ**, in order to protect these areas, now that other areas in the district have been made available for Freedom Camping under the proposed new bylaw.
- All Freedom Camping vehicles in this district **must** be self-contained with the most recent and approved stickers of certification, checked by appropriate agencies.
- There should be a small charge, say \$5 per campervan, payable online, to stay in any of the advertised permitted areas overnight, as practised in overseas countries that have good management of their environment.

Comment:

I submit these proposals after seeing evidence of the freedoms and excesses from freedom campers, especially during the last year or so.

Most of our issues locally have involved LINZ land. We have seen people set up camp on the shores of the lake, with caravan, tent and toilet tent, only to leave the whole set up there once the summer is finished. Another incident was a set-up of two caravans concealed under tarpaulins, where someone was living for most of a year. I have liaised with LINZ over these two incidents, eventually having them both removed and cleaned up. While we are pleased with this outcome, LINZ, who has ownership of this land (actually representing the people of NZ) has said that only LINZ can ensure that there is no freedom camping in this area, but they have also stated that there is no budget to do so, and they do not have the staff to carry out this duty. We, as QLDC wardens, should be able to protect these areas from such freedom camping, hence the requirement for us to have an enforcement agreement with LINZ.

Most of the freedom camping in Lake Hāwea occurs on the southern foreshore of the lake, at John Creek Reserve and along the eastern foreshore of the lake. This draft bylaw will only cover a small area of the sites where freedom camping is occurring in our district, further evidence for the enforcement agreement with LINZ being imperative.

Until recently, QLDC has managed this area well, alongside the agreement with LINZ to manage the Southern Foreshore and John Creek Reserve general management, including lawn mowing, weed control, tree planting, etc. We look forward to this arrangement being continued.

Christine Gardner

Freedom camping warden at John Creek, Lake Hāwea, Warrant number [REDACTED].

Queenstown Freedom Camping Submission 2025

We promote both our beautiful country and physical activity. There is a need to encourage New Zealanders to explore their own country both for the financial benefits to the country and the people as a whole. (We spent \$9 billion on vocation overseas during the last pre-covid year). However, exploring New Zealand is becoming increasingly restricted around some areas of the country. Not helped by an increasing territoriality by some local residents, who presumably travel during their own holidays or have done so in the past.

Historically the Queenstown area appears to have had a difficult relationship with freedom camping resulting with both local and overseas visitors often being advised to avoid the area. The need is for a Bylaw that is functional, allows freedom camping within the spirit of the Freedom Camping Act, is easy to understand both for ease of use and that many using it will be overseas visitors. Furthermore, supports NZ's national Freedom-Camping strategy.

Freedom camping has been an option for generations. Overseas travel now seems to be the only holiday option for many.

Observation suggests:

- ☐ Many problems appear to arise because of restrictions seriously limiting the numbers of spaces available.
- ☐ Supposed freedom camping problems appear to be sometimes used as a scapegoat by those with other agenda's.
- ☐ Although "Freedom campers" seem to get the blame for all toileting and rubbish, it is often caused by the homeless, contractors, locals, day trippers, and cyclist. Some responsible freedom campers tidy up rubbish, broken glass etc. left by others.
- ☐ Locals often disregard the Laws, Bylaws, and DOC requirements in their own area.
- ☐ The homeless are causing many problems as they can currently legally stay in freedom camping sites without the certified vehicle requirements such as toilets, and a rubbish container. The public see the results and blame lawful freedom campers. This is a problem the requires a careful National Law change.
- ☐ The aim should be to deal with those that cause problems rather than restrict everyone.

The proposals relating to alternative organised sites seem positive. It would reduce the amount of freedom camping and provide for specific groups. Encouraging a low cost Kiwi camp type site appears sound as it caters for the budget end of the market and should reduce pressure on freedom camping. As is the proposal for a site for local workers to utilise. In a similar vein, encouraging a NZ Motorcaravan Association site in the Queenstown and Wanaka area would also benefit the area as it would reduce pressure on freedom camping and bring a group that offers economic benefits to the business community.

The size of the proposed individual car park sites appear to often limit the vehicles using them to small slider vans.

The proposal allowing for freedom parking on the side of Council roadways should be of benefit. However, the number of places that have a 7 metre wide side verge and the necessary the required formed gravel or sealed surface to park on appears few. There must also be other spaces on country roads that allow safe parking on grass verge areas. These should be allowed for in the Bylaw.

Similarly, a liberal attitude could be taken to freedom camping in river bed and other areas thereby allowing more options.

Encouraging freedom campers to explore off-centre sites further from the towns through more liberal laws in these areas could help spread freedom camping across the region. Thereby increasing awareness of lesser-known attractions, distributing tourism income more evenly.

New Zealand's stunning landscapes and vibrant physical-activity culture are key assets that should be shared with all citizens and visitors alike. Encouraging New Zealanders' to explore their own country is both a boost to the national economy and a way to build community pride. The need is for a liberal Bylaw that balances protection and openness while keeping to the spirit of the Freedom camping act.

Don Lovatt

Submission on the Draft Queenstown Lakes District Freedom Camping Bylaw 2025

Submitter Name: Monica Urquhart

Contact Email: [REDACTED]

Submission Topic: Camphill Bridge Oppose Freedom Camping

Requested Action: Include Camphill Bridge in **Schedule 2 – Prohibited Freedom Camping Areas**

Submission Summary

I strongly oppose freedom camping at **Camphill Bridge**. The site is an essential public recreation space used extensively by the local community and visiting outdoor users. It lacks the capacity, infrastructure, and layout to safely accommodate overnight camping alongside its existing day-use functions. The transformation of this site to a freedom camping location will have a **significant** negative impact on local residents and users. I request Camphill Bridge be included in **Schedule 2 – Prohibited Freedom Camping**,

There are three camping grounds within 3 km in one direction and 4km in another direction with two of these being low cost. Surely any surplus freedom campers from the Luggate red bridge site can be directed to these locations. This is a community facility and is widely used by the public to park at while enjoying the wave or the outdoor tracks.

Areas.

The Camphill site is an important location for local residents for recreation, and Freedom camping at this site is not consistent with the best interests of local rate payers, and visitors alike and is often in use early in the mornings and later in the evenings by the general public along with groups of younger people accessing the wave and the cycle tracks.

Submission Points

1. Vital Community Recreation Asset

Camphill Bridge is a key access point to the Hawea River corridor and is **extensively used year-round** by:

- Walkers
- Runners
- Cyclists
- Swimmers
- Surfers
- Kayakers and paddleboarders

This includes local residents from **Hawea Flat, Mānguawera, Alberttown, Wanaka** and surrounding rural properties, as well as domestic and international visitors. Especially in periods of high flow where the river gets significant use by kayakers and surfers due to the standing waves

The carpark is the only practical public access for many of these users and is often at or near capacity during weekends and holidays. Allowing freedom camping displaces these users and restricts access to a valued outdoor amenity.

As has been consistently experienced from other sites in this district, when freedom camping becomes allowed, the volume of traffic and use of space significantly impacts the public's ability to use these spaces.

2. Pressure from Limited Camping Locations

The draft bylaw allows freedom camping in very few locations across the district.

- This will **significantly intensify pressure** on any areas not explicitly prohibited.
- Camphill Bridge risks becoming a de facto overflow zone for campervans
- The result will be overcrowding, user conflict, and permanent damage to the site.

This is an obvious consequence of the proposed bylaw. By creating a few limited zones, the bylaw ensures that the areas allowed will be transformed into permanent freedom camping zones.

3. Inadequate Capacity for Co-Use

There is **insufficient space** at Camphill Bridge for both freedom campers and the public who use it daily for exercise and recreation.

- The carpark cannot absorb large campervans and still provide access for day users
- Informal use in recent years has already demonstrated the conflict, with access blocked or limited for paddlers, cyclists, and walkers
-

4. Lack of Essential Infrastructure

The site has:

- No public toilets
- No waste or recycling bins
- No fresh water
- No wastewater disposal or signage

Even self-contained vehicles cannot be safely managed without supporting infrastructure, particularly near a sensitive river environment. This has been proven in all other areas where freedom camping has been allowed, inconsiderate toileting and waste disposal presents a significant and inevitable risk to degrade the site. This will have a significant negative impact on current users and the general public. You can say campervans need to be self-contained. But we know that the users of especially the small campervans do not use their toilets, which are under their bed or next to their cookers.

5. Visual and Amenity Degradation

Informal camping at this location has led to:

- Visual clutter and loss of open space character
- Litter and overflow waste
- Diminished experience for recreational users and visitors

6. No Practical Enforcement

The remote rural location means:

- Very limited visibility for Council officers
- Low compliance with time or waste rules
- Ineffective enforcement based on past experience

If camping is allowed, it cannot be realistically managed or contained.

I do not accept that QLDC will provide sufficient resources to monitor maximum vehicle numbers or hours consistently so it is extremely unlikely that these conditions will be met.

7. Clear and Ongoing Community Opposition

Residents and landowners in Hawea Flat and surrounding areas have long opposed camping at this location.

- Prior submissions (e.g. 2021 bylaw review) raised these concerns
- The site's inclusion as a camping area would ignore longstanding, local feedback of those that pay rates to live in this unique environment.



Submission on the Draft Queenstown Lakes District Freedom Camping Bylaw 2025

Submitter Name: Monica Urquhart

Contact Email: [REDACTED]

Submission Topic: Mt Iron car Park Oppose Freedom Camping

Requested Action: Include Mt Iron Car Park in **Schedule 2 – Prohibited Freedom Camping Areas**

Submission Summary

I strongly oppose freedom camping at **Mt Iron Car Park**. The site is an essential public recreation space used extensively by the local community and visiting outdoor users. It lacks the capacity and layout to safely accommodate overnight camping alongside its existing day-use functions. The transformation of this site to a freedom camping location will have a **significant** negative impact on local residents and users. I request Mt Iron Car Park be included in **Schedule 2 – Prohibited Freedom Camping**,

There are two low cost camping grounds within 3 km along with another camping ground in Wanaka that campers can be directed to these locations.

Areas.

The Mt Iron site is an important location for local residents for recreation, and Freedom camping at this site is not consistent with the best interests of local rate payers, and visitors alike and is often in use early in the mornings and later in the evenings by the general public along.

Submission Points

1. Vital Community Recreation Asset

Mt Iron carpark is a key access point to Walking the Mt Iron track and is **extensively used year-round**.

The carpark is one of two practical public access for users and is often at or near capacity during weekends and holidays. Allowing freedom camping displaces these users and restricts access to a valued outdoor amenity.

As has been consistently experienced from other sites in this district, when freedom camping becomes allowed, the volume of traffic and use of space significantly impacts the public's ability to use these spaces.

2. Pressure from Limited Camping Locations

The draft bylaw allows freedom camping in very few locations across the district.

- This will **significantly intensify pressure** on any areas not explicitly prohibited.
- The result will be overcrowding, user conflict, and permanent damage to the site.

This is an obvious consequence of the proposed bylaw. By creating a few limited zones, the bylaw ensures that the areas allowed will be transformed into permanent freedom camping zones.

3. Inadequate Capacity for Co-Use

There is **insufficient space** at Mt Iron Car Park for both freedom campers and the public who use it daily for exercise and recreation.

- The carpark cannot absorb large campervans and still provide access for day users
- Informal use in recent years has already demonstrated the conflict, with access blocked or limited for paddlers, cyclists, and walkers
-

4. Lack of Essential Infrastructure

The site has:

- No waste or recycling bins
- No fresh water
- No wastewater disposal or signage

Even self-contained vehicles cannot be safely managed without supporting infrastructure. This has been proven in all other areas where freedom camping has been allowed, inconsiderate toileting (teeth brushing, washing bodies and clothes and waste disposal presents a significant and inevitable risk to degrade the site. This will have a significant negative impact on current users and the general public.

5. Visual and Amenity Degradation

Informal camping at this location has led to:

- Visual clutter
- Litter and overflow waste
- Diminished experience for recreational users and visitors

6. No Practical Enforcement

Low compliance with time or waste rules

- Ineffective enforcement based on past experience

If camping is allowed, it will impact on the early and late walkers that use these carparks.

I do not accept that QLDC will provide sufficient resources to monitor maximum vehicle numbers or hours consistently so it is extremely unlikely that these conditions will be

met. There is also the issue that the majority of these campervans have a toilet that will never be used, as no camper is going to use their toilet in a box under there bed and next to the cooker. Especially if there are two in the van.

7. Clear and Ongoing Community Opposition

Residents and landowners in the area have long opposed camping at this location.



To: Queenstown Lakes District Council

Submission on Freedom Camping proposed bylaw 2025

While we would rather not have freedom campers in Wanaka at all we accept that is not possible so we welcome the proposed new bylaw and have no issue with its provisions.

However, it does not matter what restrictions are in the bylaw if there is no effective enforcement.

This requires constant monitoring and therefore staffing in the urban areas in the district both in designated parking areas and outside those areas.

Vehicles in designated areas not complying with the conditions imposed on those areas and vehicles outside those areas should be clamped with a fine notice and advising that the clamp will be released after payment of the fine to QLDC.

There should be signs at all entrances to urban areas advising of the Bylaws, a webpage where they can be seen, where the areas are, and that they are rigorously enforced including clamping and fines.

The revenue derived should be sufficient to cover the monitoring cost/staffing costs.

One of the conditions for designated areas should be that all users must use the toilet facilities provided in their vehicle.

Prue & Mick Hollyer

[REDACTED]

Wanaka 9305

[REDACTED]

To Whom it may concern

8 August 2025

For some reason this did not attach to the online submissions form on Friday and as a result is out of time for submission by a day. I ask that you please accept it. I have been told to email it to you at this email address. I reside in the Lake Hayes area, so my submission relates specifically to that area.

SUBMISSIONS

I oppose the bylaw because it designates Rutherford Road as a restricted camping area which is not appropriate or sensible and is also a dangerous proposal.

I am concerned that Rutherford Road Lake Hayes will have freedom campers as there is a small gravel carpark at the end of the road near the lake. It is apparent that no one has thought about this.

The road is extremely narrow even now without camper vans going down it and is used by runners, bikers and walkers as well. Marathon runners take this route (Rutherford Road) as do people walking the length of New Zealand - the Te Araroa Trail. It goes directly up Rutherford Road from the Lake. It is already dangerous with the increasing number of lake goers but to add more traffic would make it even more so. This is particularly the case because the walking/biking path around Lake Hayes cuts right through the small car park at the base of the road meaning that campervans would block people utilising the tracks and reduce their enjoyment of this beautiful track and peaceful environment.

This area is also next to wetlands which need to be protected from being damaged particularly at the early stage of growth. These wetlands are extremely important to the health and revival of Lake Hayes. This area is a scenic reserve and needs to be supported as that in terms of its purpose. This bylaw therefore compromises environmental values and intentions in the area.

There is limited space for parking and any parking space and setting up of campervans would be dangerous with the flow of people through the car park area enjoying the Lake Walk. There is also likely to be damage to the planting immediately alongside the small area which is gravel/dirt when large campervans park and turn within an incredibly small space,

Another primary reason why this is not suitable is the issue of public safety. How will these campers be monitored and what if these vans block locals' access to the area.

There is also a natural spring at that location, and this could likely be contaminated by freedom campers washing and possibly defecating etc in it as there are no facilities. There are facilities at the other side of the Lake at the public area.

A blanket proposal is not appropriate. It needs to be site specific, and this is one particular site where it is not appropriate.

Sally Buckenham

Lake Hayes.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Submission on QLDC FREEDOM CAMPING Proposed By law..

Friday 8th August

In principle I am against visitors 'freedom camping'. I do not understand why freedom campers cannot pay for our relatively cheap campsites, and why they expect us 'locals' to pay through our rates for providing a 'service' for them. As well as having our favourite spots taken over by these visitors, and often abused.

I do understand the legal obligations which have led to this situation and thank the QLDC for trying to come up with a compromise that will still protect locals as much as possible.

However, you have acknowledged that some freedom camping activities have adverse impacts on the district and its community. These impacts have been widely reported through concerns and complaints to QLDC. Also that in the QLDC area we are overly affected by this with International Freedom Camping numbers multiplying 10 fold between 2008-2018, and that our area has the most pressure of numbers in the whole country.

Given this and the negative local impacts already recorded, I feel that the draft by law is too permissive. I believe that we should only be doing the bare minimum provisions to comply with the law and should be choosing those options that are easier to monitor and have least impact on locals.

In particular;

- **1. On the Use of Car Parks.** In general, I think this is the best approach, so that the freedom campers can be limited to certain defined areas that will be easier for QLDC to monitor and to issue enforcement fines for non compliance.
- Boundary St Car park. However, I do not support having any parks at Boundary St. I don't understand why visitors should be allowed to 'freedom' camp in the incredibly popular and central Boundary St car park when local ratepayers can't get a park to go into town to support local businesses. If there is spare capacity in the campervan spaces at night then, with all due respect, I think these should be turned over to general parking for locals with cars wishing to come to town. Personally, I used to enjoy coming to town to get takeaways and dine out at least once a week. I no longer do this as trying to get a park even after 6pm is such a nightmare.
So although I agree that using the 'car parks approach' is probably the best option for least impact on locals. I don't think they should be allowed these key parks in such a central area.
- **2. General**
- Enforcement costs and fines. I think, there should be a very clear section of the by law on "Fines and Enforcement", making it very clear that QLDC will be taking the 'restrictions' very seriously and will be proactive in fining people who do not comply. . . I believe that we should have very strong enforcement plans & high penalties and that we should strictly follow these up to make our enforcement costs funded by abusers. I propose that in any guidelines or information about Freedom Camping in the area, and through the freedom camping staff, that there should be a section which should be clearly visible and stresses this enforcement approach.
- The 'Permitted approach but with restrictions' I believe gives the wrong message. I think that "allowing" camping in certain areas, but under certain restrictions will be very much abused by campers. I believe the 'permission' aspect will be viewed by them but the 'restrictions' will not be taken seriously or even looked at. I think the whole wording and focus of the by law and supporting advice for campers should be reversed with more focused on the "restrictions" This point is especially relevant to the rural roads section but applies also to the Car parks 'restrictions'.
- Unreasonable costs to fall on locals. I find it sadly ironic that as local ratepayers we should have to pay to have 'security' doing checks on visitors. This particularly applies to the section on using rural roads and trying to do checks in the middle of the night. It is not fair that legal costs of monitoring and responding to complaints should fall on us local ratepayers. This will be especially onerous if all local

rural roads are included. This is sure to lead to multiple locals complaints and monitoring staff cannot possibly be expected to monitor all these routes each night.

-
- **3. On the Rural Roads proposal.** *I am completely against this.*
- For the following reasons I propose that we should reject your second set of proposals 'use of rural roads' and that the only provisions should be 'in the car park areas' where this use can be monitored carefully without further additional costs to the ratepayers from enforcement staff. This would hugely minimise the impact on 'locals' and would ease monitoring and enforcement for QLDC.
- Local Treasures lost. I don't believe it is fair for international visitors to be allowed to use valuable local facilities for free and potentially block off locals access. There are many treasured local spots which are much used by locals throughout the summer especially for picnics, recreation, fishing, etc. rather than risk campers blocking us off from much. If allowed to park up on rural roads such as Glenorchy Road from 6pm.
- Rural Walks and car parks. There are countless spots on our rural roads that are used by locals to park their cars to go on walks and dog walks. In my own area, The Moonlight Track and Oxenbridge Tunnel are very good examples. Both finishing with a turning/parking area. If campers are allowed to fill these areas from 6pm, it would be a huge loss of access and facilities for locals. I do not believe that the restriction guidelines about leaving enough space for someone else to park can possibly work. *"Restrictions such as...ensuring there is room for other users of layby areas"*. The logistic of this would imply if all spots were taken, we locals would need to get an enforcement officer to come out (when they are monitoring hundreds of local roads), and determine which vehicle was the offending last one who didn't leave a spare park. It is an unworkable restriction and if its unrealistic to be able to monitor it then it should not be allowed.
- Toilets and pollution threats. Especially for waterside spots. I personally do not trust campers to use their toilets. Many rental companies encourage non-use. Clients are given bonds back if the toilet is not used. Thus even if they are accredited self contained campers we know in reality they are not using their own facilities. Thus I do not believe we should not be permitting them anywhere near our waterways. Or we will have them doing their laundry, washing up, personal washing as well as toileting nearby and in our local lake, rivers and creeks.
- Loss of local amenity values to residents. There will be local residents on these rural roads who do not want to be exposed to other peoples washing and general paraphernalia outside their properties from freedom campers. Quite understandably so. How are we to deal with this loss of privacy & amenity value? It will be impossible for enforcement staff to move these campers on. It is just not fair for people who have deliberately planned their property purchase for rural privacy to have their outlook so changed.
- Unrealistic and expensive monitoring costs to locals. My point above about the Enforcement Costs would be hugely onerous if rural roads are included in the plan.. This rural roads plan is sure to lead to multiple locals complaints and monitoring staff cannot possibly be expected to monitor all these routes each night. The plan is unrealistic to monitor and thus should be rejected on the grounds that it is not fair to locals. .
- Hours. I have stated that I disagree with allowing any form of camping on rural roads. However, if this is draft plan is continued, then at least the start time should be 8pm as per the events centre, for the same reason, to allow locals to use these areas. I feel that allowing camping from 6pm especially on the rural roads is way too early in summer with plentiful evening light. Any ability to camp should be after 8pm to allow locals to use the areas.

Sue Bradley.

[REDACTED], Arthurs Point, Queenstown.

[REDACTED].

I wish to be heard at any hearings on the submissions.