

Attachment C: Submissions

#	Name	Surname	Organisation	Heard?	Support /Oppose	Comment
1	Dianne	Aitcheson		No	Oppose	I believe a well policed area for fully self contained vehicles near a bus stop would benefit businesses in the town. Putting MHers way out of town when there is no parking for them in town or alternative transportation benefits no one. Perhaps an area where land is being reclaimed below where all Rental Motorhomes are parked near Airport or even a trial at the property / house purchased on ladies mile. Trial a limited number strict rules and area out of sight of road and homes. And police it or have security cameras. Make it so thoroughly enforced people know there will be fines penalties. Most of the reason the massive freedom camping issues exist is because NZ has been seen as a soft touch and fines can be ignored by tourists who just fly home. Also locals are equally responsible for some of problems. Lake Hayes still has rubbish excrement and disposable nappies lying around so banning camping has not entirely resolved the issues. As with a lot of decisions they are made without viewing full picture and media beatup being main source of information. The Motorhomers that spent months cleaning up the wash out tip on the Westcoast and helped after Kaikoura earthquake. Those that stay in centre of Lumsden and help with Doc plantings etc are never in the news nor are the 1000s that obey all the rules.
2	Monika	Fry		No	Support	I support people to be able to camp in certified self-contained vehicles at the five areas specified although I cannot understand why Coronet Peak Road/Skipper Canyon Road (to Skipper Saddle) is not allowed.
3	Nicolet	Simon		No	Oppose	Why is it necessary to have freedom camping spots. Can we put self contained motorhomes in DOC run camp sites so that DOC can collect the revenue to use for conservation. When we have tried this previously people were buying fake self containment stickers, defecating in parks, washing themselves with soap in streams that contain fish, ecoli turned up in our districts lakes, and Juicy rental vans were incentivising people to not use the onboard toilets by refunding the deposit of the toilet is not used.
4	Brandon	O'Callaghan		No	Oppose	I don't think it is necessary to have freedom camping areas in the Queenstown Lakes. Any camping areas should be paid for and have toilet facilities available. The areas should be monitored by a camp manager.
5	Lara	Waenga		No	Oppose	I don't think it is necessary to have freedom camping areas in the Queenstown Lakes. Any camping areas should be paid for and have toilet facilities available. The areas should be monitored by a camp manager.
6	David	Barber		No	Oppose	Regarding Camp Hill carpark not being a suitable location for freedom camping. 1. "The Wave" on Hawea river is very close by, and would pose considerable threat of drowning to the uninitiated, (especially if intoxicated, to whom warning signs mean very little). This stretch of water is subject to rapid increase and decrease in flow, which can further elevate the risk of drowning. 2. During the summer months this carpark is very busy with people using "The Wave", and cyclists, walkers and dog walkers using the nearby Newcastle Track. Limiting numbers of freedom campers in this situation would be extremely tedious, administratively. What would the "limited" number of freedom campers be and how would that be policed? Car parking on the roadside is not an option here. 3. The carpark entry is in a 100kph speed limit section. The road is frequented by quarry trucks. This along with the one lane, give way bridge and increased traffic at the entry, would necessitate considerable traffic control measures to make the entry safe. Couple this with the known road ice risk in winter, would make the increased traffic created by freedom camping uneconomic to control.
7	Carolyn	Dakin		No	Oppose	There is no place for freedom camping in Glenorchy. There is already a campground.
8	Gareth	Thomas	Glenorchy community Golf course	Yes	Oppose	I oppose the bylaw allowing freedom camping at the Glenorchy recreational grounds, freedom campers bring minimum income into the town and do not support the community and businesses. There is a perfectly good camp ground that they can stay at if they wish to sleep in their vans which supports the town and its residents incomes. Allowing freedom campers to stay at the recreation grounds will be detrimental to the users of the grounds including the rugby club, golf club, tennis club and cricket club. Parking spaces are at a premium in the area and I feel the area will be disrespected and left a mess. The area is a host to a wide variety of activities and should not be opened up for people to stay there overnight.
9	Gillian	Terry		No	Oppose	I live in Glenorchy where there are already sites for camping .eg. diamond lake, lake sylvan, moke lake .you have purpose the Glenorchy domain where there are no public toilets. the facilities there are the rugby clubs and they will lock them .also there are multiple sports played there which could damage vehicles parked there. this is where people go . and explain how you are going to monitor to rules you are implementing. the water front is the most obvious if we have to have something

10	Ingrid	Temple		Yes	Oppose	<p>I oppose any freedom camping within the Glenorchy township. In 2016 the Glenorchy Community and GCA agreed that no freedom camping sites should be allocated in the township when we have a functioning commercial camp ground in the township. We already have 3 DoC campgrounds (12mile Delta, Kinloch and Sylvan Lake carpark) as well as Precipice Creek carpark - all in close proximity to Glenorchy and the Head of the Lake.</p> <p>I am especially opposed to designating the Glenorchy Recreation Ground for freedom campers. This area is well patronized by locals for golf, tennis, cricket, netball, and not to mention the dog walkers on a year round basis. The toilets are inadequate and often not functioning, which will give rise to campers finding other spots, such as under the pines for ablutions.</p> <p>Finally how does this possibly fit with the Restorative Tourism plan Queenstown is currently undertaking? We would like to retain our natural environment and control tourism/visitor activities so that it benefits a destination rather than degrade it!</p>
11	michael	spencer		No	Oppose	no freedom camping anywhere in queenstown lakes district.
12	Vida	Laird		No	Oppose	I oppose the inclusion of the proposed restricted sites. Campers can stay at motor camps where they pay to use facilities.
13	Brylee	Percy		No	Oppose	<p>I feel that Queenstown council is pushing these freedom campers to out lying areas where they won't be policed properly as they aren't at the moment and there is issues with toilet paper and human waste as well as rubbish now. Spots where you use to be able to walk down to the lake with children to go fishing are now like a minefield and uninviting for families.</p> <p>Why do we need to create spots (free spots) for tight arse campers there are plenty of DOC camp sites in the area with minimum costs as well as camping grounds within the township. Having these campers within the Recreation ground is going to effect sports clubs that use this area.</p>
14	Andrew	Clark		No	Oppose	There is no control on what is a self contained vehicle.
15	Katherine	Cahill	Camp Glenorchy	No	Oppose	
16	Debbie	Milliken		No	Oppose	<p>I oppose the proposal to allow freedom camping at the Glenorchy Domain carpark. This is a multi purpose area heavily used by Glenorchy residents for tennis, netball cricket, golf, dog exercising, walking etc. There is only a small area of hard surface for parking that the locals need for car parking at all hours. Cricket is played in the evenings as is netball. Those of us who use the Domain for walking and exercising dogs walk through the carpark and would find it restrictive if we had to negotiate freedom camping vehicles. I can't imagine that there would be no vehicles parked on the grass areas without putting up barriers. People naturally will want to push the boundaries and park just that little bit further away and then the next and so on and so on. You may put a restriction on numbers but these are never adhered to or policed nor are the number of nights permitted to stay. I strongly believe that any freedom camping area needs to be away from an area that is used so much by local residents. Our Rec ground (as we call it here) is a haven that I would hate to see spoilt. It has been a lovely peaceful place to go to get away from all the other tourist inundated places in 'town'. Self containment is still such a contentious issue. We don't have a dump station here in Glenorchy and because there are toilets in the rugby club building, these would end up being used to dump toilet waste from the vehicles that do actually use their onboard toilets. (as a user of these toilets I can tell you it is very hard to empty them into a toilet without some spillage!) PLEASE leave us a place to call our own that remains unspoilt.</p>
17	Kirsty	Pope		No	Neutral	<p>Support in principle, but not the prohibited and restricted areas in Schedule A</p> <p>In general freedom camping areas should not be visible from residential areas, or interfere with use of community facilities. For this reason the proposed Glenorchy Domain freedom camping area is unsuitable as it is visible from residential properties and will restrict use of the tennis courts, Rugby Club rooms, golf course and use of the grounds for cricket. The site is also used for the annual Glenorchy Races, and camping overnight has traditionally been permitted adjacent to the racecourse. This would not be able to continue under the proposed bylaw.</p> <p>I am also concerned about freedom camping being permitted along the roads north of Glenorchy. This is a remote rural area with spectacular scenery, and to allow freedom camping along these stretches of road would spoil that vista. It may also interfere with local farming activities that use these roads.</p>
18	James	Dipper		No	Oppose	<p>I'm a resident of Kevin Heights with a self contained vehicle. I maybe bias for freedom camping but I would like to put forward my view. Currently anyone caught in the red zone freedom camping overnight gets a fine of \$200. Over the years I have heard of multiple of people going out for drinks in town not wanting to drive home or to a freedom camping carpark way out of town so instead sleep in there van and get punished for it. Like myself there are hundreds or thousands of visitors who want to spend money here in bars and clubs that are just passing by in there self contained van but are unable to do so because of your high level of restrictions. Alot of the time these rental companies charge a hefty amount of money per day to use the vans so it means if these people want to stay and spend money in our town they have to pay double on accommodations. That's going to put off alot of people. Getting to the point I would like to see every carpark restrictions lifted between 8pm and 8am with a limit of 2 to 3 days for self contained vehicles only so that theses thousands of paying visitors or some of us locals can stay the night without paying for expensive taxis or even god forbid driving home under the influence. Please consider my suggestion and look forward to your response.</p>
19	Kris	Gallagher	RCAi	No	Oppose	<p>Where there is public toilets, there is no need for certification.</p> <p>Self containment is all that is required in any area. Certification is only a money making exercise and means nothing.</p> <p>Education for responsible camping is the only way forward.</p>

20	George	Keith		No	Oppose	I don't support the Bylaw as don't know what makes you think that a Certified mode of camping is better than a non certified mode. CSC is only a Club level requirement. It is only the Mode that is Certified not the people using that Mode. Education is what is Required, and that includes Council's that believe CSC is the answer.
21	Nicky	Hewson		No	Oppose	I do not agree to freedom camping at Camphill Road carpark or the other new proposed sights. There are ample camping grounds for people to use.
22	Matt	Welsh		No	Oppose	We have camp grounds they can stay at. Non of witch are full to capacity so I don't see the need for them to have other options at this stage.
23	Ben	Carson		No	Oppose	I understand the Freedom Camping act 2011 states the council cannot prohibit freedom camping in an area unless there is good reason; A local authority may make a bylaw under subsection (1) only if it is satisfied that— "the bylaw is necessary for 1 or more of the following purposes: (i) to protect the area: (ii) to protect the health and safety of people who may visit the area: (iii) to protect access to the area; and (b) the bylaw is the most appropriate and proportionate way of addressing the perceived problem in relation to that area" I'd be interested to see what issues have arisen in any of the areas where you have prohibited freedom camping, or plan to now prohibit freedom camping? I don't believe QLDC's freedom camping bylaw is justified in some of the previously prohibited areas, and proposed prohibited areas.
24	Kevin	Cameron		No	Oppose	CSC does not make a person or people a responsible camper, it is education that does that. My van is not self contained as we only park where there is toilet facilities available which should be allowed under any by-law. We don't drop waste water on the ground we contain it in a separate container until we can dispose of it correctly. I feel the regulations as suggested will deter mum and dad campers from enjoying our countryside.
25	Steve	Sharp		No	Oppose	Council is over reaching and trying to prevent responsible CSC on roads that are public roads. Why is the council so obsessed with eradicating responsible campers, when it is obvious that the damage that is being done to these sites is being done by locals and not campers travelling to visit the Queenstown area. If council wishes to proceed with this extreme course of action, then they have to provide visble alternatives for campers. \$60 per night for a campsite is not a viable alternative. Allowing an NZMCA site may be an option. Or setting up a KiwiCamp site like the one currently being setup in Kaikoura. Offer solutions rather than just increased legislation...you are just making people angry instead of trying to solve the problem.
26	Cherilyn	Walthew		Yes	Neutral	I'm not sure the Bylaw is fit for purpose and actually meets the aspirations of the district. For example, the Camphill Rd carpark is meters from a Commercial Camp site which are designed for self contained vehicles. Having campers in our carparks feels like we are encroaching on their privacy and makes me and others avoid the area whereas, the campers are the ones actually encroaching on our public spaces. You are giving Freedom Campers the greenlight to take over these areas and spitting in the face of commercial operators one of which, a few more miles down the road from Camphill Rd, is leasing a site from QLDC! Our public spaces and lands are for us, and the often frequented areas around town (including our swimming/recreation spots) are not suitable for freedom camping. That's why we have campgrounds. Freedom Camping should be reserved for those areas without campgrounds.  I'm tired of my rates being spent to service a problem that could be pushed into existing facilities. The casual pollution is disheartening and the loss of our public spaces is reprehensible.

27	Heidi	Locher		No	Oppose	<p>A freedom camping bylaw should not even be discussed when the current rules are not being upheld and council staff can not be held accountable. As mentioned in numerous reports, "council officers continue to observe poor behaviors from campers leaving an environmental impact. Freedom campers can pose health and safety risks from fire, human waste, litter and reduce the accessibility of waterways and reserves to others."</p> <p>I personally have seen many freedom campers already using the morven ferry road area and have personally complained to the council office, with little to no action from council being taken. It gives me no confidence on the regulations if the proposed areas are going to be monitored by the same compliance team that has taken no action in other cases.</p> <p>another quote from your summary is this : "Council staff continue to receive anecdotal and photographic evidence of freedom campers defecating on the land (ie rather than using toilets). Public concerns around freedom camper behaviour also remain, such as washing in lakes and rivers, causing damage to the environment and overcrowding. The Council issues up to 60 infringements per month for freedom camping". Im not sure how, when you have supplied this information yourself, you feel it is appropriate to put freedom campers right next to the Arrow river on the Morven Reserve, a historic landmark and one which is used by so many locals in the area.</p> <p>Another point i would like to make is the safety concern on having the bike trail running along this street, with camper-vans and freedom campers driving down the road which would have multiple vehicle movements per day. The bikers along this track have already expressed their concern of their safety with how the vacuum of the cars passing can cause them to lose balance on their bike. Then there is also the added concern of the campervans and self contained vans crossing SH6 across to Arrowtown from the Morven reserve, with Arrowtown being of course the closest shops and amenities to this proposed area.</p> <p>As a final comment, i fear for my safety. Living in a rural area is quaint and lovely and a real community feel. However, it can also be an intimidating place to live when living alone, with strangers sleeping in vans at the end of your drive way.</p>
28	Budi	Surjawan		No	Neutral	Please make more freedom camping at Queenstown
29	Gary	Stenersen		No	Oppose	CSC is not a law it is only suggested plus your freedom camping by laws don't comply with BORA
30	Peter	Lynch		No	Oppose	Freedom camping is a right for every new Zealander on public land Being CSC does not make you a responsible camper
31	Matt	Suddaby		No	Oppose	In my opinion it is inappropriate to promote the Camp Hill Bridge site for Freedom Camping. This is an open, exposed site which receives regular and frequent use by the community. The car park is used by track users, and when the Hawea River is flowing at high levels, the carparks on both sides of the river are full with kayakers, surfers and spectators. Designation of this area as a camping site has the likely potential to force community members to park on the shoulder of Camp Hill Road which would seriously affect road safety. Cars parking on the shoulder obscure visibility of pedestrians and others crossing the road and bridge. The Wave and the associated car parks should be retained for day use only, and no overnight camping should be permitted. The site is currently maintained by a small group of locals, with club working bees and the like; if freedom camping was permitted, then the requirements for maintenance and upkeep of this area would significantly increase, and this is not a responsibility that the locals would be prepared to accept.
32	Monica	Urquhart		No	Oppose	The car park on camp hill road was built for those wishing to use the river park, or park safely to cycle the bike trails. Not for freedom camping. Not when they can be directed to the motor camp 6km away. Or to the temporary campervan park by the luggate red bridge. Or to the doc camping ground in alberttown. At \$10 a night, that is very cheap accommodation. By creating a camping spot on camp hill road, you will force people to then park on the road,creating a possible dangerous situation. We really don't need another overnight freedom camping area, for people to camp in.
33	Sarah	Power	Na	No	Support	
34	Sanjesh	Naidu		No	Oppose	I oppose the freedom camping at Glenorchy Domain which a recreational park for the community. I am not against parking at the lake front.

35	Raewyn	Green		No	Oppose	<p>Definitely add in the the 8 areas where freedom camping would be restricted please.</p> <p>We do not need 5 more areas added in though please.</p> <p>Do we really need more sites added to the area that self contained campers can stay ??? No we do not.. there are currently sufficient places for them to stay..what is the benefit of adding more ??? Its just spreading the work, mess ( they still poo in the bushes )and disruption to adjacent areas over wider areas. You still get people with a blue "self contained" sticker in a station wagon or shonky van pulling into stay in the "self contained only" ares. Often arriving late and leaving early... I know.. I have seen them leaving these areas early. We all know that this goes on and that they are not self contained at all. We also know that if the people who hire camper vans do not use their on-board toilet they get some form of discount....so what's happens when nature calls ??? The woods of course.. We really do not need this happening in 5 more areas in our region.</p> <p>Please as a sideline, there should absolutely be no facilities for freedom camping available for non selfcontained vans / cars. The campers in these vehicles should be staying in our camp ground facilities paying market rates and contributing towards our local economy...</p> <p>We should absolutely not be providing rate payer or government funded "hubs" or freedom camping ares... A very high percentage of these freedom campers are travelling through our region on minimal budgets contributing very little of benefit to our area. A couple of years ago there was a segment on freedom campers on Seven Sharp where they were interviewing freedom campers... the campers were amazed that they could stay in NZ for free and that commented that this didn't happen elsewhere in the world... well how made are we as a country to let them!!!! Get them in to the camp ground facilities and not crapping in the woods or washing their bodies in our rivers and lakes..</p> <p>We do not need more selfcontained camping areas added in our region.There are sufficient places for these people to camp for the night. Please...</p>
36	alan	temple		No	Oppose	<p>The proposal t have a part of the Glenorchy Domain as a Freedom Camping area flies in the face of the community's specific wishes and common sense. The community made it load and clear in 2016 that it did not want ANY freedom camping within the township whilst there was a commercial camping ground available. As well, this area is totally unsuitable in that there are no public toilet facilities in the area which will lead to further use of the 'tree toilets' in the vicinity. This area is also in the middle of a golf course and beside tennis/netball courts which is totally impractical. Once a year the area would have to be vacated of campers to allow the Glenorchy Races to be held which again is not practical.</p>
37	Ros	Goulding		No	Oppose	<p>I consider no spaces should be available for freedom camping.</p> <p>The council should make a limited number of places available within all campgrounds within the district available to freedom campers, once those places are filled then payment would be required. This means that associated services are easily accessible to campers. Campgrounds would be compensated and residents would be happy that camping was occurring in a managed way.</p>
38	Clement	Lejean		No	Oppose	<p>I oppose the freedom campaign at Glenorchy domain as this area should be only for locals community</p>
39	Ian	Gosling		No	Oppose	<p>Freedom camping is not necessary where there are existing camp sites.</p> <p>The ammenities cost money and should be paid for by the campers and not the community.</p> <p>Remote areas are ok (crown range) but facilities should not be provided.</p>
40	Trish	Fraser		No	Neutral	<p>In Glenorchy I think there needs to be a freedom camping area set aside in the town so the poor suffering businesses get a boost to their trade. I'm not opposed to the recreation ground but it seems like quite a few in town are. What about the parking area on the Reserve behind the hall where there are public toilets. I don't think there should be random camping from the Rees Valley bridge - there are a couple of good camping areas around Glenorchy eg Kinloch, Lake Sylvan.</p>
41	Tom	Irwin		No	Oppose	
42	Dennis	Rogers		Yes	Oppose	<p>The Morven Ferry site is totally unsatisfactory for a freedom camping site. This area is used in large numbers by bikers, walkers and dog users</p> <p>The Morven Ferry site is too confined and will result in overflow campers using the roadside to stay. Already the freedom campers use Morven Ferry Road roadside unlawfully leaving their rubbish and other refuse behind and permitting camping at the proposed Morven Ferry site will increase this nuisance.</p> <p>The site is already used extensively by walkers, bikers and is used as a drop off site for bikers using the cycle trails and allowing freedom camping is incompatible at this site.</p>
43	Stephen	Jarvis		No	Support	<p>Authorised freedom camping vehicles need to have built in bathrooms , no portable toilets as they will not be used. Also freedom campers should be members of association like NZMCA.</p> <p>Work needs to be done on what is a self contained vehicle and enforcement of non certified vehicles displaying stickers and camping in freedom camping spots.</p>

44	Charlotte	Chittock		No	Oppose	I believe there are plenty of places currently available for people to camp cheaply in the area of Camp Hill Rd eg. Lake Hawea Motor Camp, Alberttown Motor Camp. In the current lack of tourism market we should be encouraging tourists to support local businesses, which includes camping facilities. When the river is flowing high, the 2x car parks at the bridge are full. With extra campers, people will park on the road causing more hazards in a 100km zone. More people will be trying to get across the single lane bridge by foot (and this will include at night in the dark) causing a hazard with traffic. Even with a toilet available in one of the car parks we still have people urinating up our driveway (which clearly states private property), and I have also seen a male attempting to poo on the public Hawea River track in the middle of the day. One toilet on one side of the river is too difficult for some people to access obviously! I can see the campers dumping their toilet waste in the one toilet available. I can see extra litter/rubbish being left. The lovely river sounds will be drowned out by campers partying through the night. There are a number of houses in close proximity that will be affected by more traffic parking wherever they can in high peak times. I've seen campers cleaning their dishes in the river....I've seen people drying all their camping gear (tents, sleeping bags etc) on the neighbouring deer fencing. We've had people asking for water, people asking to camp on our property. All of these incidents will increase as people 'self contain camp' when human behaviour often takes over and if you can use someone else's resource (eg, toilet, water, rubbish dumped) instead of your own, you will. When it's busy and the allocated car parks are full, people will still park up and camp. And for people just wanting to park up and play in the river, I feel some will potentially feel quite intimidated with people 'camping', like they are intruding on their 'space'. Please keep this area as it is, and for people to rest up somewhere else helping out a local. It is not suitable for overnight camping.
45	Peter	Groves		No	Oppose	I object to freedom campers being able to use the Camphill Road carpark, as this is already frequently full with vehicles of paddlers (using the wave features) and of other locals who access the river track for exercise or dog walking. The carpark already presents a traffic hazard alongside this busy section of road, which is also crossed by cyclists, walkers and kayakers (carrying boats). There are already great DOC facilities at Albert Town and plenty of commercial campgrounds. If we ratepayers must provide for freedom campers, at least concentrate them into the facilities we have already created at the Red Bridge, which is less than 15 minutes from Camphill Road, and not create more eyesores, traffic issues, and overcrowding at Camphill Road.
46	Craig	Palmer	RD1	No	Oppose	I have concerns about the process vehicles go through to be certified as self-contained. At the moment it seems like a basic blue sticker is all that's required. Prior to the pandemic when there were more people freedom camping I saw little evidence of monitoring and enforcement by the QLDC. I have no confidence the situation would be different under the new proposed bylaw. From a Gibbston perspective, I oppose the idea of allowing freedom camping in the Gibbston Reserve car park. The area is not fit for purpose and is right beside a private residence and a business. On the bylaw map, Gibbston is referred to as Gibbston Valley which is incorrect. It should be just Gibbston. Gibbston Back Rd is also incorrectly labelled as Coal Pit Rd. In the past, freedom camping has been a major problem at various spots along state highway 6 from the Nevis Bluff to Arrow Junction. Freedom Camping should be prohibited along this entire length of the highway.
47	Anthony	Hill		No	Neutral	I think it largely misses the point One of the major problems is the the definition and enforcement of what is a self-contained vehicle. The current set of "stickers" are applied to a wide variety of inadequate vehicles and which should not let them use even appropriate areas for freedom camping. Instead such inadequate vehicles need to be restricted for fully managed camping grounds. The Wakatipu basin is fragile enough that in actual fact there should be no freedom camping at all, but instead this high density visitor area should only provide fully managed camping grounds. Wakatipu is unique in that it really has only 3 points of entry (Kingston, Gibbston & Crown range) which would make it very easy to identify and tithe freedom camping in the area. That is, if a freedom camper does not stay at a registered camping facility or accommodation provider then they pay a nightly charge for their presence in the area. This could be easily managed based on a simple vehicle detection system at the 3 points of transit into the area.
48	Nicky	Busst	Arrows Prom & Business Association (APBA)	No	Oppose	APBA supports the draft Freedom Camping Bylaw 2021 as it stands with the new boundary and changes, particularly in support of maintaining "Whitechapel Reserve" as part of the proposed areas to prohibit freedom camping to ensure this area is protected. In relation to the proposed areas to allow restricted freedom camping in certified self-contained vehicles at Gibbston Reserve car park and Morven Ferry Reserve. APBA have a neutral stand on this however feel that the area could withhold it as long as it is restricted to a min. number of vehicles that are genuinely certified self contained vehicles (not just a sticker bought from the dollar store) and this is actively patrolled. They would also recommend signage where they are near waterways (eg Morven Ferry) to understand the importance of protecting the river and is not to be used for washing clothes or dishes.
49	Jo	Sedon		No	Oppose	Freedom camping should not be allowed at the Camphill Rd Carpark as this should be saved for walkers and kayakers for day use only as there will not be enough parking for everyone if freedom camping is allowed here

50	Gary	Angus		No	Oppose	<p>At present the regulation around self contained vehicles is well out dated. A lot of vans etc supposedly self contained are not used as intended because they are to cramped and to much hassle for people hiring to use which means they would use the surrounding areas which I have witnessed.</p> <p>So until the rules around self contained vehicles are reviewed I believe there should be no free parking for self contained vehicles even though this would punish people with a well designed self contained vehicle/caravan.</p> <p>Visitors to our county should have to stay at camping grounds etc and pay their way.</p> <p>You don't get anything for nothing in other countries, we need to support our businesses.</p> <p>We are in a position to hit the reset button so lets get it!</p>
51	Valerie	Meyer	Queenstown Lakes District Council Parks Team , Level One	No	Support	<p>I support the prohibited areas for Freedom Camping as outlined in the draft Bylaw.</p> <p>Restricted areas could be introduced but controls should be in place. The monitoring and enforcement of any breach of the controls described needs to be really tight to protect the areas where freedom camping is restricted.</p> <p>When I say protection, this is for residents living nearby, the environment, and the overall enjoyment and access to any of the areas for residents and visitors alike.</p> <p>We live in a beautiful place.</p> <p>Consideration of the commercial campgrounds that are trying to make a living in this area should also be front of mind.</p> <p>Queenstown Lakes District has few areas available for freedom camping, this is because of the geography of the area.</p> <p>There are DOC campgrounds in the surroundings.</p> <p>What is being offered in the draft Bylaw is more than sufficient.</p>
52	Roland	Meyer		No	Oppose	<p>I oppose ANY freedom camping within the QL region .</p> <p>There are plenty of excellent official camp grounds freely available to campers (run by various providers/ organisations both within and outside of the different townships).</p> <p>I see no reason why as a rate payer I am to contribute to free facilities for the so called freedom campers.</p> <p>I have no confidence in the current legislation and enforcement of "responsible" camping - there are numerous vehicles without adequate in-built facilities= toilet (shower) using real or fake "permit" stickers . I see no benefit of over-sized "true" self-contained vehicles parked night and day in our beauty spots , admiring tourist's underwear on washing lines or finding their food waste after leaving . Even a limited acceptance of freedom camping - i.e. in the proposed locations does invite tourists to camp elsewhere . I have little confidence that enforcement of the current rules is effective.</p>
53	Craig	Palmer	The Gibbston Community Association	Yes	Oppose	<p>On behalf of the Gibbston Community Association, I submit our comments and objections to the proposed “Draft Freedom Camping Bylaw, 2021”.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Gibbston Reserve Car Park is not “fit-for-the-purpose” of Freedom Camping. Referring to it as a “car park” in its current state is a misrepresentation. It is a small uneven gravel area that can only accommodate a handful of parked cars and is currently used by people to access the Community Reserve. To even consider the possibility of allowing a limited number of Freedom Camping vehicles to spend the night there would require a significant upgrade, including earthworks and resizing of the area.</li> <li>• The Gibbston Reserve has private residences on both sides as well as a business. We do not believe freedom camping should be permitted in such proximity to permanent residences or businesses.</li> <li>• Before the pandemic, when Freedom Camping was more prevalent, there was little evidence of monitoring or enforcement by the QLDC, despite residents regularly reporting Freedom Camping in prohibited areas of Gibbston. We have no confidence that monitoring or enforcement would improve under the new draft bylaw. We also understand there is a real chance that the funding allocated to the QLDC by Central Government to manage Responsible Camping will cease shortly. This would further limit the Council’s ability to ensure Freedom Campers stick to the rules.</li> <li>• In the past, Freedom Camping has been a major problem at various spots along State Highway 6 from the Nevis Bluff to Arrow Junction. Freedom Camping should be prohibited along this entire highway length, as it is on other roads linking communities. It is unsightly, hazardous to traffic, especially during the commuting hours between Cromwell and Queenstown, and unhygienic as many Freedom Campers do not obey the rules of “self-containment”. The Crown Range Road, and Glenorchy-Queenstown Road, are good examples of other local roads where freedom camping is prohibited.</li> <li>• In addition, Gibbston is referred to as “Gibbston Valley” on the bylaw map, which is incorrect. Our community is called Gibbston. The “Gibbston Valley” name is legally owned by Gibbston Valley Winery. The Gibbston Back Road is also incorrectly labelled as Coal Pit Road.</li> </ul>
54	Ruth	Saavedra		No	Oppose	
55	Robert	Yang		No	Oppose	I disagree that the Gibbston Reserve carpark should be used for freedom camping. It is not suitable.

56	Neil	Marshall		Yes	Oppose	<p>We oppose the proposal to allow restricted freedom camping at the five proposed sites.</p> <p>We approve of the proposed freedom camping ban at the named sites.</p> <p>We would approve a total ban of freedom camping in the whole district.</p> <p>In our opinion this would ensure a clean, safe environment and, in the long term increase high quality domestic and international tourism.</p> <p>Camping grounds would also find an increase on revenue.</p>
57	Jane	Shearer		Yes	Oppose	<p>I oppose the Bylaw on the basis that the proposed Freedom Camping site in Gibbston is completely inappropriate. This leads me to think that other sites, which I don't know as well, may be similarly inappropriate. I also wonder whether the choice of sites has been on the basis of numbers of submissions, related to numbers of people who live in an area, rather than on the sense of any particular site as a freedom camping area.</p> <p>The proposed site in Gibbston is a strip about 30m long by 5m deep. It slopes at quite an angle and is right beside the road. To accommodate vehicles in a way that they were not on a lean would require considerable earthworks. Further, the vehicles would be right beside a road on which locals frequently travel. Given that freedom campers typically open up back doors of vans and sit outside them, there would be unreasonable road hazards. Not to mention that people freedom camping tend to walk around the area in which they are camping. There are no pedestrian areas to walk on Coal Pit Road. There is a corner just above the proposed area with very poor sightlines.</p> <p>There are adjacent private residences close to the site. No private residence should be subjected to campers who may be present 24/7 for 365 days of the year, that is an unreasonable intrusion on people's privacy.</p> <p>Without a doubt, freedom campers will leave rubbish at the toilet block. That is what some people do and no amount of information or encouragement will stop the behaviour. We don't want our community reserve to turn into a dumping area. The very presence of the toilet block will also encourage people in vehicles which are not properly self contained, or people who who don't want to use the facilities in their vehicles. The ability and desire of QLDC to manage undesirable behaviours has been proven ineffectual in the past, and there is no evidence that it can or would be any better in the future.</p> <p>The whole concept of Freedom Camping is, sadly, outdated. It has become aligned with the word 'free' rather than 'freedom'. Freedom means the ability to go places unfettered, which is not what our camping laws are actually about. Free means not paying. People should pay for the privilege of parking their unsightly vehicles in public spaces. We can't put any other personal possession on the roadside, why should people be able to put vehicles there? Each person will think of themselves as an individual, only making a small impact, but the impact of many freedom campers, which is the nature of this region's tourism, is huge. Let's be like the majority of the developed world in which you have to park vehicles at facilities designed for them and pay a fair price, like in North America, for example. We don't need to offer anything for free, people will come either way, so we might as well get a financial benefit from their presence. This is a potential business opportunity that, for some reason, we want to chuck in the bin. During and post COVID we should be taking all the business opportunities we can get, shouldn't we?</p>
58	Bridget	Martin		No	Oppose	<p>Certified and managed Camp Grounds with full facilities, who responsibly adhere to reducing their environmental footprint are where Freedom Campers should go. The people of who live and care for their communities are the same people who daily observe the behaviour of Freedom Campers and understand the negative impact Freedom Campers have on natural Community Spaces.</p> <p>It is well known the "Self Contained" sticker on so many converted People Movers/Mini Vans is just for show and the supposed "porter potty" is seldom used (if at all) coupled with no ability to have regulatory oversight of this. Fines issued to Freedom Campers for non compliance are rarely paid. Vehicles are bought and sold with no compliance checks and some have fake "self contained" stickers.</p> <p>The washing of dishes, clothes, campers themselves in the Arrow and discharging grey water into the river will affect the water quality and therefore the eco system it supports. Arrowtown will have little to no benefit from Freedom Campers, instead ratepayers resources (public money) will go towards providing facilities, cleaning up and paying for enforcement.</p> <p>Arrowtown has beautiful walking tracks, cycleways and river spots however allowing Freedom Campers to "camp" vehicles in these locations will create an eyesore on this route and no longer reflect a beautiful journey the walking/cycleways are.</p> <p>With COVID now being part of our daily lives, health &amp; safety, QR scanning, social distancing and hygiene is priority and overcrowding in Freedom Camping sites does not reflect better practices. Perhaps COVID is the vessel on which Queenstown Lakes District Council could be brave enough to say "for now campers will use managed camp grounds with full facilities or approved DOC Camp sites".</p> <p>Furthermore Arrowtown has a strong community quality of life and if residents feel it is being eroded by having Freedom Campers at Morven Ferry (so near swimming spots), it may underpin hostile relationships where the freedom campers are treated unfairly.</p>

59	Lucy	Fullerton		No	Oppose	<p>I oppose the proposed restricted freedom camping in the CAMPHILL ROAD car park.</p> <p>1) There are 5 alternative options for camping all within 5km of this point. There are 2 DOC camping areas in Albert town, The Camp holiday park at Lake Hawea, the Outlet camp ground in Alberttown, and the Luggate RED bridge restricted zone.</p> <p>2) This car park is used by many locals, schools and visitors for accessing the Contact Wave, surfing, kayaking, walkers, runners and bikers. Also during competitions, both car parks are full.</p> <p>3) It is a car park that is highly visible from the road and river track.</p> <p>4) Who will enforce this? I have no confidence that this will get done daily.</p>
60	Kate	Campbell		No	Oppose	<p>I don't support Morven Ferry Reserve being a freedom camping zone. This is an area used frequently by local families and their children. It is tranquil and a place for locals to congregate and feel safe. With it being available as freedom camping would limit access to this space as they'd be no parking. The river has limited seating and space and it's a place where we should let local children and families use and enjoy without tourists bathing in the river. It is similar reasons as to why lake Hayes was removed.</p>
61	Ryan	Hobbs		No	Support	<p>I agree that all freedom camping should not be allowed to just park anywhere and must use the allocated areas, they already get a free ride and some leave rubbish behind</p>
62	David	Wallace	Na	No	Oppose	<p>Freedom camping should not be allowed in Aotearoa</p>
63	Kirstin	Roberts		No	Oppose	<p>After witnessing some atrocious mess left behind at the Red Bridge site, I am absolutely appalled that you would even entertain the idea of having a similar site at The Wave on Camphill Road, Hawea Flat.</p> <p>In the meantime local camping grounds are struggling to be full. These camping grounds are what they were designed for - camping. I'm almost thinking you don't wish to support small local businesses as you seem to push these dreadful sites on us all the time. It needs to stop. These are the tourists we're wasting our time on - and money with having to support this lifestyle by cleaning up after them. They freedom camp because they have little money and they don't shop locally. They buy from supermarkets where the money goes to Queen Street, Auckland, or overseas. They don't partake in local activities because \$150 for a great time is too much. They instead climb a mountain, spending nothing.</p> <p>Environmentally this decision to open up more sites is the best way to trash what we have left. Sadly fining the ones who choose to break the freedom camping laws now doesn't work either with a lot of them returning home fines unpaid. If you make it blanket ban on freedom camping full stop and put them all in camping grounds where they belong, less money would be spent maintaining these eyesore places which were once untouched spots to park your car before going for a walk/bike on a local track.</p> <p>Leave our spots alone!</p>
64	Cristobal	Nelson		Yes	Oppose	<p>The time for freedom camping is over. New Zealand does not need it for tourism to be successful. Private sector businesses will be more than happy to provide camp sites to people who are willing to pay. Private sector businesses would have to go through a consenting process which would interact with the community where they intend to provide the service. This level of engagement, with the community, is the key factor, the focus should be on the community not the tourists!</p> <p>With reference to the proposed Gibbston Reserve camp site, which is the one I am most familiar with. The Reserve is immediately bounded by two houses. The impact of the proposed camp site would be absolutely devastating on these properties! Given the freedom camping model, those houses could have people camping/holidaying/partying right next door 24/7 and 365 days off the year! To contemplate that tis is a fair thing to do to ratepayers is a complete travesty!</p>

65	Nicole	Schofield		No	Oppose	<p>The Gibbston Reserve Car Park is not “fit-for-the-purpose” of Freedom Camping. Referring to it as a “car park” in its current state is a misrepresentation. It is a small uneven gravel area that can only accommodate a handful of parked cars and is currently used by people to access the Community Reserve. To even consider the possibility of allowing a limited number of Freedom Camping vehicles to spend the night there would require a significant upgrade, including earthworks and resizing of the area.</p> <p>The Gibbston Reserve has private residences on both sides as well as a business. We do not believe freedom camping should be permitted in such proximity to permanent residences or businesses.</p> <p>Before the pandemic, when Freedom Camping was more prevalent, there was little evidence of monitoring or enforcement by the QLDC, despite residents regularly reporting Freedom Camping in prohibited areas of Gibbston. We have no confidence that monitoring or enforcement would improve under the new draft bylaw. We also understand there is a real chance that the funding allocated to the QLDC by Central Government to manage Responsible Camping will cease shortly. This would further limit the Council’s ability to ensure Freedom Campers stick to the rules.</p> <p>In the past, Freedom Camping has been a major problem at various spots along State Highway 6 from the Nevis Bluff to Arrow Junction. Freedom Camping should be prohibited along this entire highway length, as it is on other roads linking communities. It is unsightly, hazardous to traffic, especially during the commuting hours between Cromwell and Queenstown, and unhygienic as many Freedom Campers do not obey the rules of “self-containment”. The Crown Range Road, and Glenorchy-Queenstown Road, are good examples of other local roads where freedom camping is prohibited.</p> <p>In addition, Gibbston is referred to as “Gibbston Valley” on the bylaw map, which is incorrect. Our community is called Gibbston. The “Gibbston Valley” name is legally owned by Gibbston Valley Winery. The Gibbston Back Road is also incorrectly labelled as Coal Pit Road.</p>
66	Grant	Mcfaul		No	Neutral	Fully self contained motorhomes should have no restricted camping areas in the Queenstown district. They bring income to the region and so long as they are nzma members they should have the ability to park and stay at any site that is accessible and practical.
67	Fiona	Garlick		No	Oppose	<p>I don’t think freedom campers should be allowed in these special areas. They will spoil them.</p> <p>Whoever chose these spots/ locations obviously has no idea of their value to the locals of the area.</p>
68	Daniel	Martin		No	Oppose	There should be no free camping in town areas including the camp hill bridge area. We have accomodation suppliers and cheap campgrounds that already exist such as Albert town campground. We have just finished travelling for 18 months in WA and there are no free camping areas except for the 24hr road stops there for long distance drivers. We are not here as tax payers to support or pay for international travellers travel by creating free camping areas. The council need to wake up to this and support the current campgrounds that have been and will be affected by your incompetence.
69	Eddie	Gapper		No	Support	
70	Brett	Harris		Yes	Support	<p>I support an extended set of areas for Freedom Camping to be banned but I am concerned that areas in town to the East or above Hallenstein Street may, according to Maps 2 and 3 be outside the residential zone - allowing freedom camping. The maps are not clear and I would not support any residential Freedom Camping contained or otherwise in Hallenstein Street or Gorge Rd.</p> <p>While supporting the idea of restricted areas for Freedom Camping and for making these decisions now before our borders open again - I believe we must make these Rules and these Zones as clear and as strong as possible. People and young people from overseas trying to save money will not necessarily follow directions unless these Zones are obvious, well explained, colour coded perhaps and ENFORCED! So enforcement must go hand in hand with these plans please - for the sake of the Community and for all of us in the area - or visiting.</p>
71	Carl	Johnston		No	Oppose	I don’t believe the area should support freedom camping in any form other than at the current DOC sites.
72	Anna	Caudle		No	Oppose	I am opposed on one of the proposed areas of the bylaw, which is freedom camping at the carpark of the rugby club in Glenorchy. The rugby club grounds (golf course, tennis court, cricket pitch, club room, etc) is the only public place the community has to gather, socialise, and play sports. I feel having camping there would be a hindrance to this as the carpark is already so small and people would inevitably park up on the golf course and rugby field, especially in the summer when we have a social cricket league taking up the entire area and more campers are around. I believe this would interfere with the our ability to gather freely as a community. As there is a paid camping option in the busier season in town and DOC sites outside of Glenorchy, I don't see a need to have a free camping option in the township. I can also imagine the toilets could be a problem, which I believe are owned by the rugby club anyway.
73	Paul	Hedwig	Nil	No	Neutral	<p>I support parts of the proposed by law but not in it entirety.</p> <p>More thought needs to be given to additional overnight camping locations for fully self contained vehicles closer to town as there is currently limited options handy to shops and activities. Frankton foreshore maybe? Also adds parking requirement closer to town for longer vehicles.</p>

74	JAY	BERRIMAN		Yes	Oppose	I recently attended the regenerative tourism forum supported by QLDC - the main driver of this forum is to alleviate the tension that exists between residents and tourists due to the strain that tourism has put on our local facility's and community and try to create a more welcoming and positive experience for both locals and tourists. Dropping freedom camping areas into long established community areas like Morven Ferry Road will have the opposite effect of the touted goals of regenerative tourism - Why should we as long time local residents that have grown up and shaped our community have to give up our privacy, safety, noise and wellbeing..and so on - so tourist can have a free place to stay - they need to go to a DOC or payed Campsite - if they are not willing to pay to visit NZ then they should not come. WE DO NOT WANT A FREEDOM CAMPSITE ON MORVEN FERRY ROAD - or any other locations around our district. It's very important that QLDC not create more tension and problems in the community with regard to tourism.
75	Jeff	Jones	Queenstown Trout Safaris	No	Oppose	This land of New Zealand belongs to the people ,no-one can own land but just the privilege of occupation.I feel the draft bylaw has been heavily influenced by accommodation providers in the district who believe they have a form of ownership of the regions scenic attractions.
76	Norm	Dolamore	None	Yes	Oppose	Where there are existing established camping facilities provided, then Council should not be allowing freedom camping to take place, ie;like at Glenorchy and at Gibbston, Council is effectively competing against its own ratepayers. This is not the function of council I believe, rather Council should be encouraging the freedom campers into camping facilities.
77	T. A	Homer		No	Oppose	The freedom camp sites on Gordon Rd and near the Red Bridge are an eyesore, but moreover, my issue is that there are Motor camps and camp grounds trying to survive amidst reduced visitor numbers. The business owners now have to compete with the Council they pay rates to. People should expect to stay in current campgrounds or motor camps if they want to stay in the town or immediate surrounding area. If they cannot pay a small fee for a campground, they are unlikely to contribute towards the economy of the town. And if they really want to come to this area, they could plan and save like we were taught to do if we wanted something.
78	Mike	Wynne-Jones	For and on behalf of family and self	No	Oppose	No future vision for this form of tourism... have been a self contained motorhome for 8 years and respectfully travelling on holiday throughout NZ over this period of time my view of the Lakes District Council is that they are the most short sighted council in the country. We have many friends who have Motorhomes and most of their vehicles are well into 6 \$ figures....many of which have retired in their 50's with high discretionary income. For the Lakes District Council to snub this sector of tourism is ludicrous. At a time when all we hear from the Queenstown Mayor, Jim Boulton, is his insistent bleating of wanting NZERS to support local Lakes District businesses ... yet clearly with his head so far up his backside to appreciate the market he is looking to banish is probably the market most likely to be the areas saviour. Instead of reducing opportunity to freedom camp would it not be more sensible to provide more overnight parking options,( even if slightly out of town centres), amenities and facilities, and look at options to transport freedom campers to local attractions and the town centres . Make the area thrive with diversity rather than make the area that it's fast becoming recognised as, as an over inflated experience, costly diversion, solely for the perceived wealthy. We have traveled to Queenstown and Wanaka 4 times since the lockdown of 2020 staying in hotels, private houses and Airbnb... motorhoming is a option that looks to be reserved for everywhere else in the South Island except the Lakes district ... if your happy to ignore 100,000 NZ Motorhome owners good luck to you!
79	Bruce	Steenson		No	Neutral	Any bylaw is useless if it is not enforceable. In times past freedom campers have simply been issued with infringement notices and allowed to remain where they are (illegally) camping. If you are a foreign tourist then you sell or leave your van before departure and walk away with a string of unpaid fines. How many infringement notices are currently outstanding?

80	Robert	Kyles		Yes	Oppose	<p>The appearance of this draft is to actively discourage "freedom campers" (FCs) from this district altogether. It is not necessary to ban them completely, you just need to make it really hard to find a place and the result will be the same. The QLDC is definitely towards the "We don't want freedom campers" end of the scale, visitors are made to feel unwelcome. I believe it is not allowed for Council to defacto ban freedom camping in the district. Much has been made of freedom campers leaving a mess - and some do. However most campers in GENUINE self contained vehicles (SCV) leave no mess and make very little impact on the environment.</p> <p>* Generally speaking Council provided FC sites have toilet facilities, then require FCs to be SCVs anyway. This is not sensible. Genuine SCVs do not need toilets. Save these sites for the young people in Subarus and HiAces who are pretending to be fully SCV. Let genuine SCVs camp elsewhere to disperse the crowded sites.</p> <p>* It is highly stressful for visitors to go to a SCV site and find the miserly three or four spots already taken. It is often hard to ascertain whether the people already there are going to leave before nightfall or not, so they have to move on to the next place.</p> <p>* FCs are often not interested in being forced into paying for crowded camping grounds with concrete block toilets and kitchens they don't need or use. FCs will however visit a nice camp occasionally to use nice facilities and do their laundry. Money saved from camp fees is very often spent on other attractions in the town.</p> <p>* Towns which allow SCVs to use carparks overnight and vacate during the day have no extra costs other than enforcement, and if they are not right in front of residences they don't need to be an eyesore.</p>
81	Tracey	Joyce		No	Oppose	<p>I oppose the bylaw as I oppose having the Camphill Rd bridge carpark being allocated as a freedom camping area. This area is a heavily used access point to tracks both up and down the Hawea river and also for the Hawea wave. Having any number of freedom campers will detract from this recreation area and realistically policing 'restricted numbers' is problematic. There is a strong likelihood of large numbers of water users staying overnight each time the wave is running and with insufficient toileting and bathroom facilities available for these number of people, Personal observation of freedom camping behaviours in our area shows that campers may have a self-contained sticker but their vehicle is NOT. These campers are often are not focused on respecting the river environment in a way it needs to be regarding toileting, rubbish removal, washing of clothes and bathing, etc.</p>
82	Laetitia	Bottollier		No	Oppose	<p>Hi, DOCave concern about the Camphill road Freedom camping area. Honestly, the Luggate one is already pretty hugely, I'm worried it'll be the same on Camphill.</p> <p>The Hawea river track and the wave are lovely (popular) recreation area, could be tricky to find a place to park sometimes so I wonder what it could be if you add campers on top of this. I'm worried that it will be crowded with self contained as it's really nice, just beside the river with shade options. I believe it would be even more popular.</p> <p>On an environmental point of view, even well managed, we all know that more " human presence/pressure" has a direct impact on our environment, river are pretty sensitive, even if it's a controlled river.</p> <p>Do locals really want to have a constant flow of campers in this lovely place?</p> <p>It sounds a bit "NIMBY" but we know the area is popular and really close to town.</p> <p>If you think about all the various camping option around, holiday park &amp; DOC campground between Makarora, Wanaka &amp; Luggate plenty of choice. In term of budget DOC options are really affordable. To me, a new freedom camping zone doesn't look respectful towards locals businesses and doesn't really serve the community people in term of employment. Financially supporting DOC or private campground owners could be a good solution of using these founds rather than create new places.</p> <p>Thanks</p>
83	Nigel	Smith		No	Support	<p>I agree with the additional sites for both responsible self contained and banned in named area BUT enforcement and consequences are key. "Cars" cannot comply. Red bridge needs to be capped.</p> <p>The "low cost" unmanaged camp sites like Albert town &amp; Hawea river need to increase in price then reinvest in upgrading facilities. Most importantly these "free camping" sites can't continue to undermine our camp grounds at the level they have been. These camp grounds need to be financially sustainable and continually enhanced. They are an iconic asset in kiwi living and fine right can generate positive rate payer revenue.</p>
84	Miriam	Richardson		No	Oppose	<p>It fails to properly cater for visitors to your area who travel and sleep in motorhomes. It demonstrates unfriendliness, exclusion, and a requirement for visitors to be very wealthy. It excludes a huge section of the NZ people who travel the country. The world has changed, NZ has changed: families now buy motorhomes instead of cribs; you, as an area, need to get used to this change and embrace it rather than trying to squash it. This is the way NZers are now.</p> <p>As a visitor, if i were welcome, i would spend in food and activities. I would also be happy to make a donation for using free camping areas. There is currently no way to do this. An online way to contribute would be a good idea. Or a pass of the sort used in the Gisbourne area.</p>

85	Kristin	Darby	Private	Yes	Oppose	I believe all freedom camping should be directed toward camping grounds or alternative approved facilities. I do not believe freedom camping in any form adds value to any areas in New Zealand and indeed is derogatory to our precious environment. Why should camping be free and why should the campervan companies be the only benefactors at the expense of all accomodation providers? They should work side by side, work together to ensure benifit for all. If campers have private understandings with land owners and can access places to stay through this source then great, but when did free lunches start being handed out in our country to those who probably don't need them? Why are we encouraging very cheap tourism when we should actually be seeking out visitors who are prepared to invest in our country's sophisticated tourism industry. We have a wonderful range of accomodations that provide the appropriate levels of infrastructure to support and provide essential facilities to protect our environment and our beautiful places.
86	Lester	Bulmer	Sole user	No	Oppose	Certified self contained should be allowed to park one night in any of the named prohibited areas All areas should be patrolled If you want people to come to your area and spend money make them welcome Your proposal is too restricted so i will not be coming near Queenstown
87	Peter	Drake		No	Oppose	Freedom camping should be allowed on any public land (for the alliance of doubt this includes council managed land). Campers should be self contained and take all waste away with them, but certification cannot be a requirement as this excludes tents, for example, and infringes on BORA.
88	Terry	Nicholas		No	Oppose	The law requires that Freedom Camping is permitted apart from reasonable areas where it may be excluded. The provisions of this bylaw do not comply with the legislation. As a past supporter to the region, having travelled in the past years and having probably spent \$100k in the area on tourism, accommodation and hospitality, I believe a more welcoming and pragmatic approach would encourage me to return rather than turn my back on the region and visit alternative, more welcoming regions. Other regions have, for example allowed overnight parking for limited spaces in many areas - this could work in the wider QT area, which would align with visitors riding trails, walking, wine tastings, hospitality and adventure events on offer. I submit that the section of the bylaw that creates a blanket exclusion of freedom camping be removed and 10-20, limited number overnight parks be provided for in the bylaw.
89	Gillian	Johnston		No	Oppose	I believe all areas should be available to those that are self contained. With very significant fines for those not containing waste or rubbish. If we see people are reported by other campers urinating or if there is evidence of rubbish huge fines should be in place
90	Nicky	McCone		No	Oppose	Freedom canping should not be allowed.
91	Kirsten	Rabe		No	Oppose	Really don't want freedom camping at the Camphill Bridge. It's well used by locals and there is plenty of room at the Red Bridge
92	Lynette	Valk		No	Oppose	I think that Queenstown and surrounding areas need to make their items more friendly and open to freedom campers. We live in our motorhome permanently and do not like to be look at as freedom camper as to us we are kiwis traveling our country .  We seem to be all put into the same basket yet a very high number of us are responsible people whom do what is required. Queenstown has been bleating on about struggling during these covid times yet if they were not so anti freedom campers they would find LOADS more people would be supporting them , but you know what ourselves like MANY others are not interested in going anywhere near Queenstown as you didn't want us before do you not getting us now . Think about it! It could be like this for a few years to come so maybe you should take a closer look at shutting us out !!
93	Henry	Barker		No	Support	
94	Peter	Shepherd		No	Oppose	To date, there are 59 MOTORHOME FRIENDLY areas that welcome certified self contained vehicles and their occupants. Queenstown lakes district never has and never will. Now with covid, Jim Boulton and his cronies want us kiwis to visit the area. NOT a chance with their current stance. Jim Boulton and his cronies need to stop interpreting the Freedom Camping Act 2011 to suit themselves and the lakes district..
95	Ian	Saunders		No	Oppose	too restrictive  Still not enough sites and time frame needs extended to 4nites in winter for skiing purposes 3nites to do summer activeties

96	Rick & Gayle	Pettit	Local Land owner	Yes	Oppose	<p>With respect to the proposed site at Morven Ferry Road. I OPPOSE.</p> <p>1) This is a very busy area with respect to the cycle and walking trail. it is the confluence of the trails from Arrowtown, Lake Hayes/Frankton &amp; Gibbston. The roads around that area are for the most part relatively quiet wrt vehicle movements and as a consequence the road way itself is relatively narrow in comparison to other two lane road in the district. Riders and walkers (there is no foot path) are oblivious to vehicle movements. I drive the road daily and see people wandering/biking down the middle of the road. To a degree safety on these roads are primarily the responsibility of the driver - with local knowledge and understanding. It will be an accident waiting to happen.</p> <p>2) Do cyclist and pedestrians want to negotiate through a camping area to get to a local trail amenity. I would not have thought so.</p> <p>3) Morven Ferry is the equestrian "centre" of the Wakatipu Basin. I see more horses on the roads than cars. Most motorists are not used to "considering" riders and horses - because for obvious reasons they are not seen very often on public roads. A lot of the riders are young . It will be an accident waiting to happen.</p> <p>4) Freedom camping implies it is self sufficient. But this is highly questionable and in general campers prefer to use facilities rather than "filling their own". There is one composting toilet at Morven Ferry which quite clearly will not handle high daily usage by more people than was intended when installed.</p> <p>5) There is of course a public camp ground in Arrowtown - that is Council owned and a five minute drive from Morven Ferry. Why not use that where all the facilities are in place ready to go?</p>
97	Lyn	Hamilton		No	Oppose	<p>My submission relates specifically to the reserve located at the intersection of Morven Ferry Road and Arrow Junction Road described as 'Morven Ferry Reserve' as this is where I live. I oppose this reserve being used for Freedom Camping for the following reasons:</p> <p>The reserve is already a well used recreational site for cyclists parking and using the bike trail. Using the reserve for freedom camping would impact this amenity for local and visitor users.</p> <p>The Arrow river is accessed regularly by local adults and children from this Reserve and is a popular recreational site. Access along the river is limited due to the topography and swimming is constrained to a small eddie 'pool' which cannot, by it size, accommodate a lot of people. Adding freedom campers to this site would impact negatively on the amenity values for local people.</p> <p>The river has significant cultural value that must be protected from over use.</p> <p>Although there is a toilet at the reserve (which would see a much higher use and need regular monitoring - at the local ratepayers expense) there is a high likelihood that some campervan users would use the river for their ablutions.</p> <p>There has been no consideration of the health and safety risks posed by potentially large, slow-moving campervans negotiating the tricky access onto state highway 6 from both the Morven Ferry and Arrow Junction ends of the road. Both intersections have limited views of oncoming traffic that require a speedy exit to get across the road. This could cause accidents with visitors unfamiliar with road conditions.</p> <p>I would like the concept of 'Freedom Camping' to be examined in the context of regenerative and sustainable tourism. Tourists should pay their own way and if there are negative impacts to our natural resource and our local community then tourism needs to make up for this. I think the local community would be much happier if they could see this sector paying for the amenities that local people support with their rates and taxes. It does not seem fair to me that Freedom Campers can use local reserves without paying something for this amenity. The Morven Ferry Reserve is already well utilised by locals and visitors. It is at capacity for its intended use and I don't believe it can sustain any further change of use.</p>
98	Jay	Berriman		Yes	Oppose	<p>I am a local resident of Morven Ferry Road and would like to submit against based on my knowledge of this site.</p> <p>Morven Ferry Reserve / 000089</p> <p>This is an established Rural community with very close links to this site.</p> <p>With regard Protection of this area 6.1 through 6.3</p> <p>The Protection of Health and Safety of those visiting this site has not been assessed correctly and is a very significant health and safety concern. re the Morven Ferry and Arrow Junction road intersection with SH6.</p> <p>It appears there has been no consideration of the extremely dangerous junctions of both Morven Ferry and Arrow Junction rd onto State Highway 6, both of the junctions have high crash rates and are notorious blind corners when trying to pull out. When turning right from Morven Ferry you have approximately 4 seconds to get up-to 100 km an hour to avoid the consequences of vehicals coming from Lakes Hayes end of SH6 at the speed limit - this is near impossible in a camper van - especially with the lack of experience that tourists have of these junctions and of our driving conditions. Arrow junction also has a terrible blind corner towards Gibbston and a blind rise towards Lake Hayes and has seen some awefull crashes in the past. Camper-vans either coming and going from the Morven ferry site will have to negotiate either one of these junctions with extreme high risk to both themselves and others. As a local resident I would be very concerned at numbers of tourists using these junctions as an access point to the Morven Ferry Reserve in addition we have large numbers (and growing) of recreational cyclists using the cycle tracks - they use the road as there is no shoulder or trail on these two roads that both have to be negotiated to reach the Morven Ferry Reserve - tourists in camper-vans have no experience on these two roads - this is a safety risk to the cyclists.</p> <p>We have no pavements on either road and local children walk and cycle these roads - and are at risk from camper-vans..</p> <p>Horses are also walked freely on both these roads and residents drive with this in mind, horses are very flighty around traffic - especially at speed - tourists and especially large camper-vans may have no appreciation of the speed and care that needs to be taken around horses or animals in a rural community and will come and go 24 hours a day..</p> <p>Extreme risk of damage by fire - the area of Morven Ferry rd is a tinder box in Summer with extreme high winds - as locals of this are always on</p>

						<p>high alert to the risk of fire - visitors from outside this area will not have the same appreciation of the risk - you only have to check the freedom camping areas around our district to see remnants of fires lit by campers who feel they are able to do so as they are in the outdoors. The fire would inherently blow down the valley and would be disastrous as we have a large number of residential dwellings close to this site and down through Gibston Valley.</p> <p>This is a Gold Mining Historic site and as such needs protection from Campers washing their clothes and selves in the easily accessible point of the Arrow River.</p> <p>This site has been used as the access point to the community swimming hole - my Wife grew up on the road using the swimming hole with her family and her nieces and nephews did the same and their children will hopefully do like wise - this is a very important local amenity for the community. Having random people camping at the access point will be a safety issue for young children walking to the swimming hole and enjoying what is their amenity. Campers in numbers will spoil the swimming hole and the access to it.</p> <p>This is a very beautiful area, there are 2 house sites that are within 50 meters of the proposed site and will be significantly impacted both audibly and visually with vans coming and going 24 hours a day. At night it is extremely quiet and noise travels significantly due to the acoustics of the surrounding hills. there are another 10 proposed house lots about to be built withing 200 meters and the area will see more residential growth. Visually these campsites are poor with washing lines and rubbish piling as well as the scattering feces and toilet paper (regardless of the blue sticker self containment) - people will not use the toilets in their vans even if they have them as it costs to be cleaned and the convenience of using a bush is too great and it's disgusting and a health risk)..(25 Mile rec is a classic example of this where as Kite and windsurfers we use this area to launch onto the lake for recreation - in recent years this has become untenable due to not just the shear numbers of camper-vans but the health risk from all the feces and toilet paper around the site it's disgusting.)</p> <p>Noise and Nuisance is also a concern with Alcohol easily accessible and many freedom campers of the age where they want to hang out to music and drink - this is not the place to do this and will be very annoying and intimidating in a close rural community.</p> <p>Privacy and safety issues are a concern as a rural community we have very close ties with our neighbors - random people camping at the recreational area will be a concern as we have farm equipment and animals that are easily accessible from this site - we have a good local bond of trust with neighbors and we don't want this threatened.</p> <p>I would like QLDC to look at Freedom Camping in the context of sustainable tourism. Tourists should be required to pay there own way - and the costs and negative impact not be funded by the local ratepayers.</p> <p>Why should our community have to pay the price of loss of Safety/Privacy/amenity so Freedom Campers can have a free place to camp. It will be very stressful to have to live with something that is forced on us and we will no doubt have to waste our time having to Police and report as rules are broken and live with the introduced safety noise and nuisance concerns. We want sustainable tourism not divisive freedom camping which will increase tension between local residents and tourist which no one wants.</p> <p>The recreational area is also a meeting point and parking area for bike trail and water hole users - this is sustainable tourism that we all can embrace as it's for locals and tourists alike, the recreational area is already being used in a sustainable way - please don't replace that with outdated and contentious practice of providing free camping when their are good DOC and private Campgrounds that have good facilities and are controlled with no affect on local or cost to the local residents..</p>
99	Joanne	Cunningham		No	Support	
100	Liesl	Kenrick		No	Oppose	The Whitechapel rd area is not a good spot for freedom campers - it would make the area very-busy as it's a dead end. And what is so nice about that area is the peaceful bridge and place to stop and listen to nature not a campground.
101	Kim	Fogelberg		No	Oppose	<p>Camphill Rd Bridge location is an important locals recreational hub used extensively by local bikers, walkers, kayakers and surfers. This area gets very busy at times especially in summer and is not big enough to accommodate both campers and general public who are increasingly utilising it.</p> <p>I have spent alot of time over the past 20yrs in the Morven Ferry Reserve area. Camping in this area would not protect amenity of the small rural properties in the immediate vicinity. These small cottages have already endured a big change since bike tracks were introduced (traffic, noise, safety) They deserve to have their historic settings protected.</p>
102	Liesl	Kenrick		No	Support	I have submitted again and am pro this bylaw. After rereading. I do not want the Whitechapel rd being used for freedom camping as explained before

103	Charles	Small		No	Support	<p>I believe Whitechapel road area is unsuitable for freedom camping because it's part of a dedicated cycle trail. The road is narrow and additional traffic from larger vans will create a traffic hazard for the many cyclists and pedestrians using this route. Suitable off road parking areas are limited.</p> <p>The intersection of Whitechapel road and the main road has limited visibility and slower campervans exiting would create a traffic hazard</p>
104	David	Gent		No	Oppose	As a ratepayer I do not want to contribute, there are camp grounds already available. Save the environment from freeliaders
105	Sarah	Burdon	Glen Dene Holdings Ltd - t/a The Camp - Lake Hawea	Yes	Support	<p>I am opposed to the proposed areas:  Proposed areas to allow restricted freedom camping in certified self-contained vehicles:  Gibbston Reserve carpark  Glenorchy Domain carpark  Camphill Road carpark  Morven Ferry Reserve  Luggate Red Bridge Reserve</p> <p>The proposed restricted sites will have a maximum number of carparks (except for Luggate Red Bridge Reserve) available for certified self-contained vehicles, along with a maximum stay of two nights at each site.</p> <p>We have adequate camping grounds and Holiday Parks in the area. Those that are not prepared to pay are not contributing. Many of the vehicles staying in these areas are not self-contained and the areas have not been managed appropriately. they should follow the camping ground regulations.</p> <p>I do not support the new freedom camping areas. I do not believe that freedom camping is sustainable in our area and it doesn't create a positive foot print. It is not in line with regenerative tourism and has a negative impact on the community and environment. We have enough camping grounds and holiday parks within the QLDC area and these should be supported rather than providing free sites for campers which a huge cost to the QLDC/ratepayers and taxpayers. QLDC needs to look at what is good for the district now and in the future. Is freedom camping sustainable - No!</p> <p>The freedom camping areas are not managed properly and are not regulated or licenced. They should be following the camping ground regulations and should be licensed accordingly to be allowed to operate. The local business can not compete with freedom camping and encouraging freedom camping in the areas is despondent to values of tourism in our area creating a bad feel and a bad name. The cost is far greater to our community than the benefits.</p>
106	Eric	Simpson		No	Oppose	<p>Changing Morven Ferry Reserve to allow freedom camping would not be an improvement because at the moment the Reserve serves as a quiet &amp; tranquil place for people to enjoy walking, biking, exercising their dogs &amp; swimming in the Arrow River.</p> <p>Development of infrastructure regarding water&amp; toilets, rubbish collection &amp; maintenance should not be a burden on the ratepayers. In closing I would like to say that the Mayor &amp; complete QLDC are a Local Body elected by local residents to serve on their behalf, not to be bullied or pressured by corporates or other outsiders.</p>
107	June	Simpson		No	Oppose	The Morven Ferry Reserve is well used & enjoyed as the Cycle Trail goes through it. There have been many instances of so called campervans (with only a bed in the back of a car & a recognised sticker on) staying in the car park & the people not taking any notice of the sign, if it is pointed out that they aren't allowed the verbal abuse is unable to be written down. There have been instances of these people lighting fires down by the river, washing clothes in it then hanging their things along the fence line. We are adjacent to the Reserve & Cycle Trail & enjoy chatting to people but still enjoy our privacy which I think allowing freedom camping would put a stop to.
108	Ben	Teele		No	Support	<p>I support the list of prohibited freedom camping sites.</p> <p>The list of prohibited freedom camping sites should be expanded to include Gibbston Reserve carpark. Previous freedom camping in the area near Rafters Road has led to extensive accumulation of waste, rubbish, and general disregard of the camping rules. The reserve is used by the community, and freedom camping if permitted will again perpetuate the problems seen previously. For those wishing to stay in campervans, there are sufficient facilities elsewhere in the basin.</p>
109	John	Langley		No	Support	

110	Dawn	Simpson		No	Oppose	<p>In regards to Freedom Campers to use the Morven Ferry Reserve, I object whole heartedly, as this area is Not suitable....It will totally disrupt the quiet rural neighbourhood.</p> <p>Not only traffic, negotiating the Parking area, which will cause problems with bikers using the trail, but also once they are parked up, it will limit the space there for families coming to enjoy the Reserve with young children and dogs, runners and walkers. Campers will force those bikers, joggers and dog walkers onto the road, which will be a major traffic and safety hazard.</p> <p>For those neighbours, such as us looking directly onto the Reserve, it will be unsightly, given that we have unrestricted views of the beautiful landscape....and speaking of beautiful landscape...who is going to make sure that that area is kept beautiful?? Certainly Not the so called Freedom Campers (of which some vans only have a bucket for ablutions!!)</p> <p>Most of the land owners around the Reserve have horses, so not only will it cause a problem for them with the Campervans coming and going (&amp; Who is there to police them for the 3day stay??)....other horse riders in the area will be affected as well, not to mention the deer farms in close proximity.</p> <p>It also Shouldn't be up to the Rate payers to subsidise their "freedom of choice" ....sure, have the Freedom to travel around the country, but stay in certified Camp Grounds, of which the owners will gladly have them stay there... Not in our back yard!!!</p>
111	John	Glover	Glenorchy Community Association	Yes	Oppose	<p>The Glenorchy Community Association is opposed to the proposal to allow freedom camping at the Glenorchy 'rec ground' domain reserve. Firstly, we believe there are no compelling reasons why freedom camping should be required to be provided for within the settlement of Glenorchy. A commercial camp site already exists and one local business has a large car park in which campers that support that business are welcome to stay.</p> <p>The proposed site does not have public toilets and will interfere with the enjoyment of the sporting facilities immediately adjoining it. Campers' vehicles would be immediately adjacent to a actively used golf course which presents risks of damage to vehicles and personal injuries from stray golf balls. The adjacent area is also used for cricket in the summer months.</p> <p>2. We submit that Council should provide for daily enforcement patrols, at an appropriate hour, along all public roads for which freedom camping is proposed to be permitted. The patrols should ensure the requirements for permitted freedom camping are implemented. There should also be nightly patrols around the Glenorchy waterfront reserves.</p> <p>3. We submit that beyond Glenorchy (towards the Rees, Paradise, Routeburn, Greenstone areas) freedom camping should not be permitted alongside QLDC roads as there are sufficient free (Glacier Burn, Diamond Creek, Rees River, Greenstone road end) and honesty box fee based (Lake Sylvan, Diamond Lake, Kinloch) DOC sites.</p> <p>4. Lastly we consider that the new car park facility at Bennett's Bluff is exceptionally well suited to be utilised for overnight freedom camping and we urge QLDC to do all it can to collaborate with DOC to achieve this. Overnight use of this area complements its' daytime use beautifully.</p>
112	Pete	Reid	Reid Earthworks	Yes	Oppose	<p>There should not be freedom camping in the Glenorchy township, specially not at our recreation reserve , the toilets at the rugby pavilion are not public toilets , local businesses should not have to compete against free areas to camp eg. Holiday park and hotel.</p> <p>If there had to be a spot in the township the only practical reserve is the one by the old tennis courts behind the hall it is plenty big enough has public toilets and is out of site of the main road and town centre</p>
113	Eunice	Borrie		No	Oppose	<p>I specifically oppose the Morven Ferry Carpark to be included in the Bylaw. The river spot that this provides access to is unique, and is one of the few places in the river that older families and teenage kids access as it has some special features. The spaces on the river banks where families can go and relax is not large, and the addition of freedom campers as we know will destroy this area. They will use the river to wash dishes, themselves, light fires, use the area as a toilet and generally be unfriendly to the local kids - exactly as we saw in Lake Hayes. Locals stopped going to Lake Hayes for all these reasons, and I see no reason to believe they will not do the same at Morven Ferry.</p> <p>How many of the people making this decision have actually been to this area of the river?? If you havent, then you need to go and see it. Certified self contained campervans can park anywhere - they do not need to be near our beautiful river.</p>
114	Peter	Cunningham		No	Support	
115	Colin & Bev	Robertson		No	Oppose	<p>The Queenstown area is promoted as the adventure capital of New Zealand. The draft bylaw does not provide sufficient freedom camping areas for the thousands of New Zealanders owning self contained motor homes and caravans who will readily spend money on local attractions if there is suitable overnight parking available. In addition QLDC ratepayers owning self contained vehicles are also prevented from staying overnight and enjoying their local area.</p>

						Dogs fouling walking/cycling tracks, e.g Lake Hayes, and boats discharging toilet waste directly into Lake Wakatipu are a major problem however there appear to be few restrictions/bylaws controlling these activities. N.B. we live in Invercargill and have a holiday home in Kingston.
116	Michelle	Jarvis		No	Support	No Freedom camping in Whitechapel and surrounding roads
117	Geoffrey	Thomson	Farmer	Yes	Oppose	Please remove "Lovers Leap carpark" from your list of suitable camping areas in the Glenorchy district. The carpark does not exist in it's current location, which is on private farm land. We are currently discussing with the Department of Conservation (DoC) where a suitable carpark (for people wishing to go out on the DoC track into the Earnslaw Burn) may be located, but it won't be where cars presently park. In the Glenorchy district DoC have provided camping areas at the NE corner of Diamond Lake, and also Lake Sylvan, both of which are attractive camping spots, and do not interfere with farming activities. Thank you.
118	Bryce	Smith		No	Oppose	Freedom camping in self contained vehicles should be allowed in more places. As the proposed stands we would not be able to visit our friends and stay the night outside there place. Also would love to be able to stay close to the ski fields for up to a week. Can you imagine how nice it would be to wake up on the crown range . Happy to pay for a spot to help cover costs.
119	Kenneth	Sommers		No	Oppose	In regards to the Gibbston Reserve proposal, there are several issues. First is that the area backs up onto two private properties and how Council could possibly justify sacrificing and disregarding the privacy that these residents/ratepayers enjoy and worked hard for to benefit transient campers? Just imagine that you live there and how that would make you feel. It is well known the amount of noise and behavior issues that go on in these spots, and given that Council does not have the funds and resources to monitor these spots effectively, should it be the local resident's job to monitor the reserve? If so, what you are encouraging then is local vigilantism to enforce what is believed to be acceptable standards of behavior, which is a poor policing outcome. So just given that, the proposal should be denied. Second to that, Coal Pit road is essentially a one land road, with no ability for two cars to pass without one being in a gully along the first 1/2km. Being relatively new to the area, I'm not even sure how this was allowed to happen to begin with on a Council Rd., but regardless, it is very dangerous and has one of the worst blind curves right near the location where the proposed reserve is. So local residents should expect that IF Council sees fit to move forward with such a proposal, that it will take into consideration the increased traffic and danger that reserve will pose, and will first look after the safety of locals by upgrading the road infrastructure back to the highway, and modifying the road so that the blind curve is taken care of. There would be a significant investment required to make that happen and I'm not sure the benefits outweigh the costs. The Gibbston Character Zone we assume was put in place to look after the entire area's residents and caretakers, and I do not see how any of this fits in with the overall safety and enjoyable environment the Council is looking to provide in this developing area. Thank you.
120	Alan	Hamilton		No	Oppose	I am 91 years old and have been farming on Morven Ferry rd for 80 plus years. My Wife and I brought raised four daughters here and they still live near me on the same stretch of road. My Father also farmed the same location. Morven Ferry rd is not a suitable site for a freedom camp ground. Both Junctions onto SH6 are very dangerous and visitors in large slow vans and without local knowledge of the road will put themselves and others in danger. Both Morven Ferry and Arrow Junction have no verge, myself and the neighbors walk on this road as well as many cyclists and horses, it will become dangerous to have campervans coming and going to the proposed site and having to negotiate people walking dogs, cyclists and horses on the road at the same time, I have seen these vans and they can be very large - the road will not be wide enough for two to pass each other safely especially if there is a cyclist, dog walker or horse on the road at the same time. My farm is very open as as a rural community we look out for each other, there will be random visitors coming and going 24hrs a day past my farm and i am worried about the security of my farm equipment and animals as well as my own privacy and security. My kids grew up playing at the swimming hole at the bottom of the proposed site and this important local cultural amenity will become over used as well as a potential unsightly mess for the local community to have to put up with. The Bike trail goes through the back of my farm and i don't see why the Morven Ferry site should be given over to free camping when it is already used for cyclists to park and access to the river for the local community. I do not want a freedom camping site on Morven Ferry road or in any other local community. It will bring tension and unpleasantness between visitors and locals which is not a good thing.

121	Chris	McLennan		No	Oppose	<p>I don't feel that freedom camping is appropriate in the Glenorchy domain. This area is a public facility and used regularly for local golf, cricket and tennis. Freedom camping would prove to interfere with this regular and well supported community use. There is also the ongoing problem of litter as well as noise in town. I personally live 30m from the domain and would not like to see this location littered by freedom campers. We already have to clean up after freedom campers. The allowance to freedom camp anywhere beyond Glenorchy should also be reconsidered. This is one of the most beautiful parts of New Zealand - it is regularly featured in tv series, movies and numerous other mediums for its natural beauty. I believe that freedom camping will take away from the reasons people wish to visit the area. As a local I regularly see and clean up trash left behind by freedom campers. Pre Covid there was always widespread littering of toilet paper :- ( Please protect this beautiful part of the world from further damage.</p> <p>I don't feel that freedom camping is appropriate in the Glenorchy domain. This area is a public facility and used regularly for local golf, cricket and tennis. Freedom camping would prove to interfere with this regular and well supported community use. There is also the ongoing problem of litter as well as noise in town. I personally live 30m from the domain and would not like to see this location littered by freedom campers. We already have to clean up after freedom campers. The allowance to freedom camp anywhere beyond Glenorchy should also be reconsidered. This is one of the most beautiful parts of New Zealand - it is regularly featured in tv series, movies and numerous other mediums for its natural beauty. I believe that freedom camping will take away from the reasons people wish to visit the area. As a local I regularly see and clean up trash left behind by freedom campers. Pre Covid there was always widespread littering of toilet paper :- ( Please protect this beautiful part of the world from further damage.</p>
122	Tracey	Kelly		Yes	Oppose	<p>I have an issue with Freedom Camping in general but more importantly with the the intention to have Freedom Camping at the Morven Ferry Reserve. The increased numbers created by the Queenstown Bike trail have already had an impact on the general area and that can only be exacerbated by additional numbers of freedom campers.</p> <p>The negative impact on the natural environment greatly outweighs the benefit of the campers. Additional rubbish, excessive use of the lone toilet facility in addition to the cyclists will detrimentally impact the local residents.</p> <p>There is no benefit to the local economy as where Morven Ferry Reserve is located is extremely isolated.</p> <p>The area has a lot of unmanaged cliffs and drops that could result in issues of health and safety with the campers if they are inebriated and decide to go for a moonlight walk not to mention the impact on the working deer farm adjoining the reserve especially during mating season.</p> <p>There are a large number of camping facilities available to campers in the region with some being redeveloped and upgraded at this very time but they often just choose to not pay for them. There seems to be a lot of tax payer money going into the freedom campers sites and facilities with very little return for the negative impact it has on the local residents and community.</p> <p>The Morven Ferry reserve is located near the end of Morven Ferry Road and as such is very quiet and isolated. Noise issues of regular freedom campers will negatively impact residents.</p> <p>Since the Queenstown Bike Trail commenced there has been an increase in rubbish left lying around and dogs off lead and being taken for a "walk" with a bike rider.</p> <p>Dog walkers also have increased and the majority seem to ignore the signs erected by the Bunn family requesting they respect that they are walking through a working deer farm. A large amount of dog faeces is also not being picked up. We can only expect these issues to increase ten fold with Freedom Campers added to the mix.</p> <p>I submit that QLDC should not allow Freedom Camping at the Morven Ferry Reserve.</p>
123	Michael	Hanna		Yes	Oppose	<p>20 August 2021 To: Queenstown Lakes District Council Response to Freedom Camping proposed changes to Bylaw</p> <p>I submit these comments with particular regard to your proposed freedom camping site located at Morven Ferry Reserve (No 89). I do however wish to clearly state that Freedom camping in most instances should be totally curtailed in all instances where the enjoyment of rate payers owned parks and reserves is affected by camping of non-residents, at no cost, to the detriment of local users and at a substantial cost to rate payers.</p> <p>You have arranged an independent review (by ex-council staff) of potential sites across the region, while some matters have been observed conveniently other potential issues which should also be considered are either glossed over or ignored. Additionally, the opportunity to support DOC upgrading existing camping grounds and your consultants failed to consider the already established commercial camping grounds throughout the area which need our support, not competition through your free camp sites.</p> <p>In short this was a very limited report restricted to simple analysis which is both subjective and flawed, as confirmed by removal of White Chapple as a no consideration was made in relation to traffic management.</p> <p>It should also be noted QLDC have been in the process of closing camp sites to the detriment of rate payers and campers, including the debacle we are witnessing with your questionable management of the Lakeview development.</p> <p>I wish to comment now on the results of your report with regard to (89) Morven Ferry Reserve and the three purposes of the act.</p> <p>1. Your own consultants do not recommend this site as being acceptable for freedom camping yet you override this recommendation – what is your basis for this and why bother with commissioning a report if this is then simply ignored?</p>

					<p>2. The assessment methodology is based on 3 criteria which as applies to Morven Ferry Reserve are inaccurate as follows:</p> <p>3. Protection of the area: (6.1 Purpose of protection)</p> <p>a. Little mention of historic site to include historic mining operations on the reserve</p> <p>b. Little mention of protection of amenity values of this area including views, noise and loss of privacy, neighbouring property owners have previously experienced harassment, noise and threatening behaviour from campers who have settled illegally on the site. Additionally, loss of privacy is a major concern as is the risk of safety and risk to owners and even animals (Horses, chooks, dog's cats and farmed stock)</p> <p>c. No mention of protection of water quality with several potable water rights located on the reserve including pumps and pipework. likely impact of physical damage and human waste.</p> <p>d. No mention of protection of water quality of the Arrow River which would be used for washing (soaps and detergents) plus the added risk of introduced human waste.</p> <p>e. No mention of protection of local amenities and recreational values to protect the local swimming hole for the continued enjoyment of the local community. During summer months this is an extremely popular and busy location which has been enjoyed for generations by families.</p> <p>f. No mention of protection of economic values of an area including residential properties, this location directly affects neighbouring properties, the owners will be seeking advice from property valuers to better understand the financial impact on property values should this site proceed.</p> <p>g. No mention of protection of recreational values of the area as per (Item e.) above but including the Queenstown trails trust bike track which passes through this reserve which is a valuable and well used recreational asset.</p> <p>4. Protection of Health and Safety of people who visit the area (Item 6.2)</p> <p>a. As stated neighbours to this proposed site have already experienced threatening behaviour from illegal campers on the site. Residents of all age groups are very concerned about the perceived threat of crime and antisocial behaviour as a direct result of encouraging freedom camping to this quiet pocket of Arrowtown.</p> <p>b. If your survey team had visited the location during weekends (especially summer months) they would have noted a large number of cyclists, walkers and runners sharing the road with traffic, this in itself under normal circumstances is a major safety issue, add to this mix horses, walkers with dogs and other activities associated with rural areas and you would better appreciate the safety issues associated with this site and additional vehicle activity camping will encourage.</p> <p>5. Protection of access to the area (Item 6.3)</p> <p>a. Additional campers manoeuvring, parking and camping around a constant flow of cyclists, walkers, joggers, swimmers, horses, dogs, farming activities and restrictive parking will not protect access to the area for residents.</p> <p>b. Given your report considers there are no significant issues for health and safety it would seem your team have not sufficiently studied this site, the correct score for this site should be a minimum 5, this is very apparent during summer months when the cycle way caters for thousands per day, the existing carpark is overflowing with families enjoying the river and roadside parking already proving to be a hazard for emergency services.</p> <p>Despite my own feelings about freedom camping in general, Movern Ferry Reserve is not a suitable site for this activity, your report clearly supports this claim and had your consultants undertaken a proper analysis the report would need to be revised to correctly recognise the additional issues raised above.</p> <p>The correct individual site assessment for Morven Ferry Reserve is not "No Health and Safety Concerns"</p> <p>Thank you</p> <p>Michael Hanna</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

124	Vivien	Eyers		No	Oppose	I am very strongly opposed to the inclusion of Camp hill road as a freedom camping site. This is a parking area for people accessing the wave and the cycle tracks. Allowing freedom camping at this site would severely and adversely affect those users and possibly cause crowding with insufficient space for those accessing the recreational opportunities. It would not be an acceptable option in my opinion to expand the space as it would be costly and unnecessary and have a negative impact on the local area. This area is not a camping ground. There is a camping ground at Hawea and anyone wishing to camp over should use the camping ground.
125	victoria	wills		No	Oppose	I strongly oppose the proposed bylaw to allow freedom camping in the CampHill road Carpark .This carpark is extensively used by local walkers and bikers .kayakers and other recreational users at "the wave' and would not support additional overuse by adding campers .Even if the number of campers is " restricted" I fear that it is impossible to control the numbers and this would create an overcrowding problem . The entrance to the carpark just above the one way bridge would be compromised by slow vehicles {campers}stopping and turning and create more danger on an already dangerous part of Camphill road .Heavy traffic coming from the East ,,and other traffic are often difficult to see in time as they come downhill very fast .if you are driving from the west[giveway}side of the bridge .I fear that the numbers of pedestrians would also increase around the bridge adding to the danger that already exists with distracted pedestrians watching the surfers on The Wave and crossing the road from the carpark and gathering over the bridge .  In general it seems almost impossible to control the numbers of campers who park at designated sites and overuse is inevitable along with overflowing rubbish bins pollution and human waste
126	Shaun	Gilbertson		Yes	Oppose	I think all freedom camping should be banned. If there is a demand for more camping grounds then someone will build them. Freedom camping is irresponsible tourism.  Freedom camping is irresponsible tourism.
127	Reginald	Hall		Yes	Oppose	Freedom Camping at Camphill Road one lane bridge. The QLDC plan to open the car park at the Camphill Road one lane bridge would be extremely irresponsible for traffic SAFETY reasons. The entrance to the car park is directly into a 100kph limit road, WITHIN METERS OF A ONE LANE BRIDGE. There is poor visibility in both directions from the car park entrance. Vehicles approaching the bridge from both east and west have limited vision of oncoming traffic due to bends ON BOTH approach roads. The bridge is prone to black ice in winter. There has been an increase in heavy traffic over the bridge from a large dairy farm and quarry just east of the bridge. There have been a large number of accidents and near misses at the bridge in past years. FOR HEALTH AND SAFETY REASONS THIS OPTION SHOULD NOT PROCEED.
128	Benjamin	Wallbank		No	Neutral	Placing a 'managed' location next to a public recreation walkway is terrible and I do not agree with this. As is prevalent with current freedom campers, the use of alcohol and drugs is easily observed, and this poses a safety risk to public using the walkway.  The way in which this submission is available to public is quite awful. I am FOR the prohibited sites, but against managed sites like Camphill Road, hence my submission being neutral. It is not clear to the general public what they are 'voting' for on these forms, and the structure should be refined to reflect that of simple for/against questions or scenarios. To reiterate. I am FOR the prohibited locations in this draft. I am AGAINST Camphill Road as a managed location.
129	Tanya	Bottomley		No	Neutral	I am in support of the new prohibited locations. In particular Hawea Flat Township. I do not support the new proposed areas for freedom camping - in particular the Camphill Road Car park. I am opposed to this site for a number of reasons. Concerns for the waterways that the site is beside, track user safety with the increase in people staying overnight at the site which is right beside the track, lack of parking for local track users and users of the river waves - a popular recreation area.

130	Susanne	McCutcheon	Privat	No	Oppose	<p>Freedom camping at the Camphill bridge should not be allowed.</p> <p>This is a very busy narrow corner with pedestrians carrying Kajaks and surf boards and bikers crossing the road and bridge and standing on the bridge watching the wave action .</p> <p>The turn off is sharp and short .</p> <p>As a local resident I consider this a very high risk accident waiting to happen spot.</p> <p>Adding a whole bunch of freedom campers to it will make this situation hugely worse.</p> <p>There is a campground (Albert Town)5 min down the road for \$7 a night and another one 10 min away in Luggate. So absolutely no need for campers to stay the night at Camphill bridge over night.</p> <p>I support the no freedom camping for Hawea Flat township .</p>
131	Christine	Byrch		Yes	Oppose	<p>My view is that all freedom camping should be prohibited. There is no good reason why campers should be allowed to stay for free. Freedom camping is not free, but is in fact a cost to the community - both environmental and social.</p> <p>In the past, with small numbers of freedom campers, this may not have been such an issue. But now, with the thousands of freedom campers, it is time to stop. As I am sure you are aware, freedom campers leave rubbish and toilet waste; throw out their washing water; wash themselves, their clothes and dishes in lakes and rivers; take over car parks and scenic spots; turn wherever they park into a camping ground by opening their vans and spreading tables and chairs and washing; drive onto private property looking for places to camp; fill our rubbish and recycling bins with their rubbish while they are out for collection; and so on.</p> <p>Further, by allowing them to camp for free, there is a lost potential source of revenue - and surely this is an important reason tourists are welcomed. As it is, with freedom camping allowed unless it is prohibited, it is very difficult to police. It would be much easier to control if everyone (freedom campers and community) was aware that all freedom camping is prohibited except in specific, well defined camping grounds where they pay to stay.</p> <p>If freedom camping is prohibited, then I am sure someone (eg businesses or community groups) will set up camping grounds. Camping grounds could be very simple, and therefore affordable, for self contained vehicles - essentially just a place to park. There are excellent examples of community run camping grounds that use existing facilities for example, the Duntroon domain. Rather, it would be far better to say all camping is prohibited except where it is expressly allowed. Freedom camping would be allowed at a limited number of well marked sites (and ideally as noted above, people would pay to stay here). This approach will be much easier to police, and campers would be directed to places approved by the community as appropriate, and not chosen by the freedom campers. Unlike the community, freedom campers have no stake in the District's environmental and social well being beyond their stay.</p> <p>6.3 - how exactly will this be policed? how will you know where and when campers are?</p> <p>6.4 - have numbers of vehicles been decided on yet?</p> <p>6.5 - seems logical to change the order of a and b</p> <p>- add conditions and enforcement as for section 8.3</p> <p>Section 8 Discretionary camping</p> <p>- mentions conditions for allowing camping, including leaving the area clean and tidy and no fires. Should there be conditions for restricted areas? Would this give more control over behaviour at these sites?</p> <p>8.4 - should this clause regarding enforcement officer or a similar clause be included for restricted camping areas?</p> <p>Schedule A - In addition to my comments above regarding maps ie that you must be clear whether or not maps include prohibited private property and DoC estate:- titled Prohibited and Restricted areas but only shows Prohibited areas</p> <p>2.1 Area in which Bylaw Applies</p> <p>The bylaw applies to Queenstown Lakes District - so this must mean both private and public areas. Part 2 refers to Local authority areas - does this also mean private and public land?</p> <p>The maps show as prohibited areas a mix of private and public land - eg the whole of Arrowtown which includes mostly private property. The Moke Lake / Glenorchy Road map shows the Closeburn area being prohibited, and this includes a large area of Doc estate, and private property. But the maps do not include all DoC estate land where freedom camping is prohibited, and they certainly do not include all private property where freedom camping is prohibited.</p> <p>This implies that the remainder allows 'restricted' freedom camping, and this is not correct.</p> <p>If you persist with showing prohibited areas, then it seems to me that you must include all prohibited areas including private property and DoC estate.</p> <p>How would the maps look if they only showed restricted areas? I think this would be interesting to see and may be more useful than trying to show prohibited areas.</p> <p>3 Purpose</p> <p>3.1 - include protecting social values. This is mentioned in the last phrase of 3.2, but should be in 3.1</p> <p>3.2 - take 'permitted' out of (a) and add a separate clause that says there are no areas where freedom camping is permitted</p> <p>4.1 - should freedom camping be defined?</p> <p>Part 2 - Restrictions on Freedom camping</p> <p>As mentioned above, I think that allowing freedom camping except where it is prohibited, is the wrong approach. This does not allow enough control of freedom camping - campers are always very quick to say "oh, I thought it was allowed here". It also requires prohibited signs to be</p>

						<p>placed at every possible camping site, and there are thousands of these. The signs are ugly and campers remove them. Many of the signs prohibiting camping placed along the Glenorchy Road two summers ago were pulled out and thrown into the bushes.</p> <p>- the entire road Kingston to Jacks Point should be prohibited</p> <p>Maps need to be very clear that all prohibited areas are covered. For example,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the orange lines along roads eg Glenorchy, Moke Lake, Crown Range, are very thin. They need to be much thicker to be clear that all pullouts and car parks (eg Bobs Cove, Bennett's Bluff and 12 Mile carparks, and the car park at top of Crown Range) are prohibited.</li> <li>- roads/tracks down to the lake from the Glenorchy Road should be orange eg Rat Point track, Pigeon Island track.</li> </ul>
132	Frances	Reid		No	Oppose	<p>I tried to give my detailed thoughts via the survey but encountered technical difficulties. Very briefly, as a car camper my observations has consistently been that people in self contained vehicles cause the most issues. Not always of course, but generally I've found the demographics of those with expensive campervans or rentals tend to either feel entitled (someone else will clean up after them), or disconnected from the environment (non-locals who are there for novelty or a cheap way to travel &amp; don't feel the same sense of responsibility towards the area, or haven't been brought up learning how to respect it), or simply don't fully know how or want to deal with the onboard waste systems and so they don't (but can say they have it so they can camp there). I've found that non-self contained campers tend to be doing it because they want a way to be able to engage with the area and environment, as a base for day walks or climbing etc, or a way to exploring as much as possible. They generally know how to interact with and care for environment and they're not there for long. They're more motivated to be responsible, and would face worse consequences if they're not (they don't just disappear back overseas soon, or have the ability to wave away or easily pay off any fines, for example). So I think having more areas, not less, is the way to go. Add facilities (toilets, decent rubbish facilities, maybe a coin operated hot gas shower?) and dedicated parking areas. Make these places big enough to accomodate a decent number of people and motivating to use. Because the main issues arise when people arrive tired after a long drive or day hiking, it's getting dark, they can't find a park and they end up resorting to the first flat spot they can find and hoping for the best. Containing it a few well maintained spots they know they're likely to find a place and is useful for them, will easier for everyone. For example, on my last trip to Motueka and Tasman Bay the two places I stayed overnight were completely bare except for toilets and rubbish facilities. Around 6-7pm it started filling up until there were between 6 and 20 vehicles (at each place respectively). There was low chatter but everyone was Friday, quiet &amp; respectful. By 7am the place had completely cleared out and you'd never know they'd been there. By contrast I've watched people in campervans drop rubbish, flood an area trying to fill the water tank and openly admit they don't use the onboard facilities because they don't know how or don't want to deal with or pay for changing the cartridges.</p> <p>More areas, more facilities and less restrictions will motivate users to take them up rather than trying to find workarounds, and help contain the issues. As a solo female camper less than 5 parks makes me nervous, but it also pushes people out to places with no facilities. Relying on self-contained campers to know &amp; follow the rules and punishing the rest won't solve the problem in my experience (&amp; makes camping prohibitive for people like me who are out there because we respect and want to engage with the environment). I've seen one of these people go to the toilet on the beach because they didn't want to walk to the toilets at the other end and someone else had to pick it up after them! Education on engaging with the environment (take all your rubbish, bury waste if you really have no other option, close gates behind you etc), and confirming they understand how to use onboard facilities should be mandatory for hiring a rental campervan.</p>
133	Karen	O'Donahoo	Wakatipu Reforestation Trust	No	Oppose	<p>Tourist numbers in NZ have grown exponentially. The goal of the by-law is to protect the environment, but time and again, freedom campers have shown their disregard for our local environment. Camping should be regulated within camping grounds, with toilet etc facilities. There are ample opportunities for tourists to get into nature through our extensive trail networks.</p>
134	Tim	Sikma	None	No	Oppose	<p>I do not agree with the commercial use of freedom camping areas by commercial rental vehicles with overseas clients. There are plenty of commercial and public campgrounds available for overseas visitors for use in the QLDC area. If the rental companies wish to purchase land and create free camping areas for their clients then I am happy for them to do so. However, they should not be using areas provided for domestic visitors.</p> <p>The main issue I have with the draft bylaw is the proposal to allow restricted camping at the Hawea Whitewater Park (HWP) which I use regularly. This area has been created for whitewater users as part of the Hawea dam consenting. It should not be used a freedom camping area. If used for freedom camping it will restrict the use for the original whitewater park users.</p> <p>Freedom camping will create heavy usage of the area and create significant traffic safety issues with the many blind spots on the parking area(s) driveways and increase traffic across the Camp Hill Rd bridge. Regular users of the area know of the traffics safety risks, having passing visitors using these driveways and bridge will create significant additional traffic risk they will have have prior knowledge of the traffic risks.</p> <p>Also directing campers with no whitewater knowledge to an area with easy access to significant whitewater safety risks will put peoples lives at risk.</p>

135	cath	Hanna		No	Oppose	It is unwanted as the campers already have private camp grounds who have gone to great expense to accomodate campers
136	Lisa	simmers	Shopping Cart Ltd	No	Oppose	<p>I am an opposer of freedom camping in our district and the effect this is having on both our landscapes, recreational areas and our local camping grounds. An example is the Luggate Campground run by the Albion Cricket Club who were required by QLDC to upgrade their facilities at a substantial cost. The opening of the Red Bridge Reserve Freedom camping site only months after this upgrade was completed and a five-minute drive away has had a detrimental effect on the campground with a major loss of campers and therefore revenue to support local cricket. Camphill Road Carpark was a carpark that was specifically created for recreational users of the Hawea Wave and River Track. At times it is at capacity with people enjoying the area and the proposal of this becoming a freedom camping site is nothing more than stupidity.</p> <p>We all know that restricted freedom camping with only 'certified self-contained vehicles' is a myth with many vehicles we see having a sticker but are in no way certified as self-contained. The proximity to the river means it will be used for washing of bodies, clothes, dishes etc. and the carpark will be full leaving no space for recreational users. The entrance to the carpark has visibility issues and with the increase in usage this will become a hazard.</p> <p>The proposal is completely irresponsible.</p>
137	Brent	Gilbert		No	Oppose	<p>I am opposed. Its clearly obvious to anyone driving around the South Island what happens when you designate an area as a freedom camping site. QLDC has said that they don't have the resources to monitor compliance given the location of the proposed site on Coal Pit Road. If there were issues with the Rafters Road site what is the point of shifting that problem to Coal Pit road where there will be a much higher number of impacted neighbours to the anti social activities that do happen at these camping areas! Why should the NZMCA think they have a right to camp at no cost in our neighborhood. If they are that keen to come to Queenstown they should go to a designated Camping ground run by a business owner who is contributing to the Queenstown economy through their rates and by living in this community with the associated costs that brings. We don't want or need Freedom camping in Queenstown.</p>
138	Luise	Lockwood		No	Oppose	<p>I do not believe Camper vans should be given the right to park up in our rural areas. These reserves should be retained as reserves; green spaces for the use of residents and ratepayers.</p> <p>Our local residents who have bought property in these areas, have done so for the peace and quiet and so they can have have animals. Large white vans full of people arriving at any time of the day or night, will create real distress for people and animals alike.</p> <p>Who will manage/check/enforce any requirements placed on this camping proposal ?????</p> <p>Our environment and our people need to be respected.</p> <p>I totally oppose the proposed use of these rural areas for freedom camping.</p>
139	Nicoll	Thomson		No	Oppose	<p>I do not believe Camper vans should be given the right to park up in our rural areas. These reserves should be retained as reserves; green spaces for the use of residents and ratepayers.</p> <p>Our local residents who have bought property in these areas, have done so for the peace and quiet and so they can have have animals. Large white vans full of people arriving at any time of the day or night, will create real distress for people and animals alike.</p> <p>Who will manage/check/enforce any requirements placed on this camping proposal ?????</p> <p>Our environment and our people need to be respected.</p> <p>I totally oppose the proposed use of these rural areas for freedom camping.</p>

140	Michael	Nieuwlands		No	Oppose	<p>The bylaw is unenforceable (quotes from NZStandards website):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. "Councils can not quote NZS5465:2001 and give it legal status - that simply is not what the Standard has been established to do."</li> <li>2. "A standard has to be incorporated by reference in an Act or delegated legislation in order to be mandatory."</li> </ol> <p>Council bylaws are neither an "Act" nor "designated legislation". A Standard with legal status must have a regulatory body overseeing it. There are many different levels of NZStandards some only being industry best practice with zero legal status, while others such as NZS5465 are intended only for use at 'club level', eg NZMCA which adopted CSC in the first place. Bylaws Act 1910: "Part of bylaw only may be deemed invalid If any bylaw contains any provisions which are invalid because they are ultra vires of the local authority, or repugnant to the laws of New Zealand, or unreasonable, or for any other cause whatever, the bylaw shall be invalid to the extent of those provisions and any others which cannot be severed therefrom." This would be a total defence to any issued infringements for failing to have Certified Self Containment when 'requested' by Council bylaws. The bylaw is not "fit for purpose": The bylaw abrogates the right of a driver to stop and rest to avoid crashing while driving when fatigued, under the influence of alcohol, or otherwise have diminished performance (eg due to sickness or excessive stress brought on by family mishaps, etc). Freedom Camping Act 2011 "11 (2) A local authority may make a bylaw under subsection (1) only if it is satisfied that— (a) the bylaw is necessary for 1 or more of the following purposes: (i) to protect the area: (ii) to protect the health and safety of people who may visit the area: (iii) to protect access to the area; and (b) the bylaw is the most appropriate and proportionate way of addressing the perceived problem in relation to that area; and (c) the bylaw is not inconsistent with the New Zealand Bill of Rights Act 1990." (a) The bylaw fails to justify how it is necessary for any of those purposes. On what solid evidence is its necessity based? (b) It is not appropriate and proportionate to deny NZ citizens the ability to legally and safely camp where they choose in their own country. (c) There are issues with NZ Bill Of Rights Act regarding proportionality (only applicable to RVs - a minority group as legally defined), and justification in a democratic, egalitarian society (no evidence that the behaviour of those with CSC is any better than those without etc). "12 Bylaws must not absolutely prohibit freedom camping (1) A local authority may not make bylaws under section 11 that have the effect of prohibiting freedom camping in all the local authority areas in its district." Yet the bylaw states "7.1 There are no permitted freedom camping areas."  QLDC is taking us down the path heading towards a Police State. :(</p>
141	Rob	Jewell		No	Oppose	<p>There should be no restricted freedom camping sites for certified self contained vehicles as there are an adequate number of commercial camping grounds available within the region. QLDC should not be allowing these free sites to compete with commercial camping grounds that offer all the necessary services for managing campers needs e.g. rubbish and toilet facilities. QLDC should not continue to waste ratepayers money and council time on this issue any longer.</p>
142	Hamish	Fraser		No	Oppose	<p>I do not support the proposed restricted freedom camping areas , particualy Camphill road. There is the DOC campground at Alberttown and the Lake Hawea Camp closeby. This reserve/ carpark is highly used and busy at all times of day. A "Camping area" gives some privacy and ownership to the areas campers use/park and will have a negative effect to local users. 'Selfcontained Freedom campers' do not always use their selfcontained or public facilitys( that will have to be invested in). Let them go to a camping ground or accomodation with the proper facilities.</p>
143	Fiona	Sussman		No	Oppose	<p>Gibbston Valley Reserve is a small area, which has been significantly beautified and tended to by the tightly-knit Gibbston community to afford local residents an area for walking pets, exercizing, and socialising. This feature of the valley, which was certainly an attraction when we purchased our home, lends Coalpit Rd and the surrounding vineyards, character and charm. This would be significantly impacted by allowing freedom camping in the carpark adjacent to the reserve. Previous experience with campers in this area has sometimes seen private property, noise regulations, toilet facilities, and the community-planted fruit trees not respected. As this site is quite remote from town, camping is unlikley to be adequately regulated. Government-subsidised, dedicated campsites which can be adequately maintained would be a far better solution in terms of both protecting and making available for everyone's enjoyment, NZ's natural beauty.</p>
144	Peter	Simpson	Peter simpson	No	Oppose	<p>I oppose freedom camping at the camp Hill bridge</p>

145	Susan	Rowley		No	Oppose	The Morven Ferry carpark is a favoured launching site for cyclists on the Arrowtown/Gibbston Valley trail. With Arrowtown expected to become even more popular for cycling this carpark will be in high demand. With this area being 'out of the way' it could also be difficult/expensive to supervise.
146	Simon	Melville	land owner at Arrow Junction Road	No	Oppose	I don't agree that as local rate payers we should be supporting Freedom Camping in this area. The mess/ disruption caused by freedom campers in habiting local idyllic/ iconic landscape settings does not weigh up against the small benefits they might bring in. Should they wish to stay in this area there are campground alternatives for them or a private/ council partnership could be established to create spaces for them which would be better controlled and policed. I feel this is a central government initiative being pushed upon the provinces such as QLDC. In the long run the costs of freedom camping are going to be borne by the local community here (eg provision of land/ toilets and facilities and the policing of this to ensure the campers are compliant). The beneficiaries of this will be the camper rental companies and the campers themselves, with very little benefit (in fact detriment) to the local residents having to accommodate these guests. From the small experiences we have seen on freedom camping in the area already (eg Lake Hayes in the earlier years) this has not gone well. I cannot imagine this would be better if rolled out on a wider scale such as what is proposed here. As a council this should be stopped in its tracks immediately!
147	Elaine	Kirkland		Yes	Oppose	I am opposed to the Bylaw as it relates to the Glenorchy Domain Car Park. The Glenorchy Domain is used by many people for a number of different sports including Glenorchy Race Day, golf, rugby, hockey, tennis, frisbee golf, cricket, netball, school cross country races, and other activities from time to time. The use of the car park area for freedom camping would seriously inhibit these activities. If local sports persons did choose to play sports while others are camping there this would put those present at serious risk of injury, particularly from flying golf balls. Visitors may not be aware of the dangers and some would consider their rights ahead of the locals rights. Regarding the proposed intention to prohibit freedom camping on the Precipice Creek Road Reserve, I can see no good reason for this. In fact I think it is a suitable place for freedom camping. There needs to be more provision for freedom camping, not less, and this should be open for further discussion.
148	Ian	Kirkland		Yes	Oppose	The Glenorchy Domain (Recreation Ground) is the headquarters for all sports in the Glenorchy area. These include: The Glenorchy Rugby Club which has occaissional games against Queenstown, Arrowtown, Dunedin and teams from the Southland area. It also runs the Glenorchy Races. The Rugby Club also holds the lease on part of the Recreation Ground. This includes the area that you intend to turn into a Freedom Camping Area. The Rugby Club also leaves one toilet open for the use of sports people and day walkers. The Glenorchy Golf Club also holds a lease on the remainder of the Recreation ground. From three of the holes on the golf course shots can end up on the area that you are proposing to use as a camping area. These are holes four, six and nine. Tennis is played all year round. Netball is played in the winter months. Women's hockey is also played there but there have not been many games lately. The Cricket club is run and sponsored by the Rugby Club and runs a summer competition with up to ten teams involved. The Rugby Club also installed a permanent all weather cricket pitch at a cost of approximately \$20,000.00. Rural Fire Brigade competitions are held at various times of the year. The parking area that you plan to use is 5 meters away from the Rugby and Hockey field and if there was room we would have enlarged it because at times there is not enough room for all vehicles to park. I would also like to point out in this submission that all tree and shrub planting around the recreation ground has been done and paid for by the Rugby Club or Golf Club, not QLDC. I think you should be able to see quite clearly that whoever came up with the idea of putting a freedom camping area there had no idea of the use this area gets. In closing I would like to say that the Rugby Club and Golf Club cannot have events on the same day but work together so they do not clash.  I will bring a detail plan to the hearing to illustrate my concerns.
149	Hayley	Jones		No	Neutral	I do NOT believe the Glenorchy Recreation ground is a suitable area for freedom campers. The Recreation ground is used all the time for sport. From golf all year round, to the weekly Cricket league that is held weekly over the summer months - the risk of damage to campervans etc caused by golf/cricket balls will be very high. I think the best place for freedom camping would be on the grass verge behind the Glenorchy Memorial Hall / Glenorchy Cafe, which also has public toilets available.
150	Jo	Goddard	Individual	No	Oppose	Freedom camping does not contribute to our community and is an unwanted cost to tax payers. It puts locals and visitors off using the beautiful public spaces where we want everyone to enjoy. Support our camping grounds and our townships instead.

151	Simon	Brackstone	Nevisrise consulting	No	Oppose	Specifically to the Gibbston proposal - I oppose any freedom camping on the following grounds 1) previous freedom camping within Gibbston has been a disaster form a management perspective 2) Its is clear the due to the distance form the CBD there will be little or no enforcement undertaken by QLDC as such how can freedom camping, if allowed be monitored or controlled. 3) There are private residences and business that operate next to the proposed location on coal pit road and freedom camping impinges on the rights of private landowners to enjoy the peace and tranquility of Gibbston 4) the reserve land is intended to be used by locals and residents. The facilities were-never intended to be used by transient campers. Freedom camping brings no economic benefit to the region and in fact only adds extra cost in cleaning up after the freedom campers soil the area. Specifically to all other areas proposed - In general freedom camping should be discouraged and campers directed to properly managed facilities like those at 5 Mile on the road towards Glenorchy.
152	Vicki	Robinson		No	Oppose	Absolutely do not want freedom camping at Gibbston Coalpit reserve
153	Callum	Grant		No	Oppose	
154	Kelly	Baker		No	Neutral	I support this only for self contained vehicles that have a permanent toilet on board (campervan or caravan but not wicked type van with a bucket style toilet). There are no toilets at the Hawea camp hill site, so if there is misuse of the area, it shouldn't continue. This carpark is small, so there would need to be provision for day users to park there as well. I would also like more information on how this would be managed and enforced.
155	Lynn	Horton		No	Oppose	The sites are too close in some cases to private dwellings. The infrastructure around the these areas are not up to standard to cope/ support freedom camping. I don't believe that there is the resources needed to ensure that the sites are being used properly and this will impact residents of the areas
156	Ashley	Hale	Plumber	No	Oppose	This area on Camphill road should not be used as a freedom camping area, the single lane bridge is dangerous enough as it is, with increased distractions from the wave and walkers, bikers crossing from the track. Why can't low spending tourists at least pay a small amount at one of our many camping grounds. Opening more freedom camping areas is a step backwards in preserving our already declining naturally beautiful surroundings
157	Michelle	Chambers		No	Oppose	After we observed the explosion in the numbers in Freedom camping at sites such as Lake Hayes in 2018 -2019 I think it is important for the environment and enjoyment of people using that we limit the locations and numbers of freedom campers
158	Meryn	Douglas		No	Oppose	I object to freedom camping at the Glenorchy recreation ground as we use it all year for sports etc.
159	Juliet	Mollan		No	Oppose	It is an area of natural beauty with fragile ecology that should be preserved, these areas should be kept as pristine as possible, allowing a freedom camping area would create waste and pollution and damage the environment
160	Kirsty	Rodgers-McPhee		No	Neutral	Camphill rd car park should NOT be used for freedom camping. With a number of activities accessed from this car park (river wave, biking and hiking tracks) having it full of freedom campers would be awful. And as proven elsewhere (red bridge) campers use the river for washing clothing with contaminants and they choose not to use their own toilet in their self contained vehicle they use the surrounding area and leave toilet paper and rubbish.
161	Jeannie	Crawford		No	Oppose	I don't agree with allowing freedom camping with-in our area, especially at sensitive spots like Morven Ferry rd and Glenorchy Domain car park. I feel we have ample camping grounds within our area for campers and don't agree with free camping. This applies to Wanaka as well. There are several good, affordable and well managed camping grounds in Wanaka. For me personally, I do not want to see Morven Ferry Reserve open to freedom camping. This is an area that is very popular with our locals as a swimming and recreation area, and is busy in the summer with often a full car park for cyclists and locals to use. Why should we be opening this up to freedom camping? Please send people in their vans and caravans to our great managed camping grounds.

162	Merle	Sea		No	Oppose	<p>I generally support the draft Freedom Camping Bylaw 2021, with one exception: The proposed freedom camping area at the Camphill Road carpark.</p> <p>My reasons are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- It is a busy place with local users and the carpark is often full with people enjoying the wave and going for walks along the river track. Having people use the carpark for overnight camping will change the feel of it and local users might start to feel like they are the ones encroaching on the visitor's backyard, when it is in fact the opposite.</li> <li>- As much as I can see the attraction for people to be freedom camping, it is time to embrace a new way of thinking about how visitors interact with the places they visit and the impact they are having on the local environment and communities. This is reflected in Wānaka Tourism's embrace of the idea of 'voluntourism' and other similar initiatives around the world. We have a large and beautiful DoC campground in Albert Town - 5 minutes from the Camphill Road carpark. It is not expensive and it gives the people using it the chance to - not only stay in a gorgeous spot by the river - but also give something back to Aotearoa's environment by paying a small fee to the Department of Conservation who are the guardians of the national parks and tracks most visitors come here to enjoy.</li> </ul> <p>My point is, that if there is a DoC campground with capacity (I have seen it busy, but never full!) within 10 minutes drive of the proposed freedom camping spot, it is wrong to encourage people to freedom camp when this is having a negative impact on the local community. Idealism aside, I am in support of the continued use of the Red Bridge carpark for overnight stays as it is not interfering with local users.</p>
163	Tiff	Campbell		No	Oppose	I do not agree to freedom campers by our rivers esp morven ferry which is a very special tranquil area for locals.
164	Eileen & Stuart	Law		No	Oppose	<p>Our objection mainly relates to the proposal to allow freedom camping at Gibbston Reserve, although we also believe that many of the same issues apply to other proposed sites. Our main concerns are outlined below.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. We don't believe this proposal is being considered within the spirit of the current Gibbston Character Zone rules outlined in the operative district plan (5.6 Objectives and Policies - Objective 1 "To protect the character and landscape value of Gibbston Valley (sic) by promoting sustainable management of natural and physical resources and the control of adverse effects caused through inappropriate activities"). This means that Gibbston residents have to follow strict rules regarding activities which must not impact the special character of the zone and adversely affect their fellow residents.</li> <li>2. Given the distance from Queenstown it will be difficult if not impossible to monitor.</li> <li>3. The small car park is uneven, designed only for cars and completely unsuitable for camper vans. At busy times it is likely that camper vans will overspill onto the road and park on what is already a narrow rural road and potentially dangerous junction with a busy state highway.</li> <li>4. The houses and businesses surrounding the reserve are already negatively impacted by illegal freedom campers in terms of mess, noise, theft and trespass. Whilst we cannot tar all freedom campers with the same brush, unfortunately we must be realistic and understand that if this proposal goes ahead the problem is only going to get worse.</li> <li>5. The local community and the Wakatipu Reforestation Trust have put considerable time, money and effort into planting and landscaping the reserve, which is likely to be adversely affected by additional large vehicles and overuse of the amenity.</li> <li>6. There has been a big national push to 'shop local' over the past 18 months as overseas travel has been severely limited. Whilst we are keen to see more kiwis enjoy our beautiful region, surely encouraging them to support local private and DOC campsites, which in turn supports local jobs and conservation is a better option than freeloading at the ratepayers expense.</li> </ol>
165	Krissy	Gullick		No	Oppose	
166	Kerry	Brackstone		No	Oppose	Freedom camping should not be allowed near private residences and businesses. Gibbston road side is especially NOT suitable due the above and many other factors including that it's parking for the ONLY community reserve area in Gibbston which allows for local families and friends to gather. We do not have other parks or recreational grounds to go to locally and don't agree that our ONLY local place should be spoiled by camping. These freedom camping areas are frequently poorly supervised and maintained by council. Road side parking is very limited and camping on the road side would cause dangers on what is close to a blind corner. I strongly oppose the Gibbston area being used for freedom camping.
167	Fiona	Garlick		No	Oppose	<p>I do not agree with the following areas being assigned for Freedom camping. In particular I do not want Morven Ferry Rd Reserve or Glenorchy Lakefront to be used for Freedom camping.</p> <p>Morven ferry rd reserve Whitechapel reserve Gibbston coal Pit rd Glenorchy Lakefront</p>
168	Ika	Willett		No	Oppose	Too close to residential properties, traffic hazard, and we need to set rules to limit tourists.

169	Ann	Patterson		No	Oppose	<p>1. In general I oppose Freedom Camping in the Wanaka Hawea area. We have beautiful camping grounds at Lake Hawea, Wanaka, Luggate and Glendhu Bay. Our overseas tourists should be encouraged to stay in these lovely camps instead of unsightly carparks around the district. Why should the ratepayers be expected to pay for these free camps when the alternative is to support the local camping grounds and the families who manage them them. In addition to this we have the DOC Albert Town Camp. Here the site is monitored and campers can stay in beautiful surroundings with toilets and fresh water, for a nominal fee.</p> <p>2. The proposed Camphill Road site is a carpark. This is used for walkers, bikers and users of the nearby water park. This can be quite congested especially during the summer months. Where are all these people going to go if the carpark is filled with Freedom campers.</p> <p>3. Many of these Freedom Campers use vans and vehicles which claim to be self contained. This is dubious. A lined plastic bucket is not a suitable toilet.</p> <p>4. No showers in the Camphill car park. Do we want to see campers washing their clothes and themselves in the river? I don't.</p> <p>5. I found the QLDC site difficult to navigate. Took a bit of searching to find the correct place to submit. Was reminded to submit by a neighbour. If not I wouldn't have known about the proposal to use the Camphill car park as a freedom camp. I do read the papers but nowhere have I seen anything asking for public comment about this. Could be that I have missed it somewhere along the line but was pleased to be reminded so that I have the opportunity to submit. Thank you. 5. Camphill Road is a very busy road with school traffic, trucks and commuters and is often used as an alternative route when the Luggate Bridge receives maintenance or when there are roadworks. The approaches to the bridge can be tricky for the unwary. When entering and exiting the car park the sight lines are inadequate and extra care is required. Freedom Campers who are not familiar with the road could be hazardous to the mix.</p> <p>6. May I suggest that we use the Albert Town camp as a future 'model' for campers who are on a budget. Provide an area with fresh water, toilets and rubbish bins, monitor it and charge a per person fee. Carparks would remain carparks, not camps. No drain on the ratepayers and some employment for the locals. And happy campers!</p> <p>Alternatively encourage our tourists to make use of the beautiful well equipped camping grounds in the district.</p>
170	Emily	Nelson		No	Oppose	<p>I do not agree with the areas proposed for freedom camping. Specifically, Morvern Ferry - this area is a place of local significance where our community go to enjoy the natural environment. It is already at capacity with visitors as it was put on trip advisor. Freedom camping will have a negative impact on the environment and the ability for local people to enjoy something we hold dearly</p> <p>Glenorchy Domain reserve - As above - there is already a lot of traffic and movement at this site with boats and daytrippers. A freedom camping site away from the lakefront should be found for overnight stays.</p>
171	Caroline	Abbiss		No	Oppose	<p>There are campsites all over New Zealand - why can these not be utilised by all.</p> <p>Secondly why is the community having to pay for this infrastructure when company's who rent out campervans are not obliged to contribute all or even part of any infrastructure.</p> <p>I am particularly opposed to the Morgan Ferry spot. This is a well known local swimming hole where the community has so much pleasure as families to enjoy and swim during summer. If this is to be open to freedom campers you are ruining part of the communities pleasures.</p>
172	Heather	Weber		No	Oppose	<p>I oppose any freedom camping under any terms at the location of morven ferry road or any other location in close proximity to private residential homes. The proposed site at morven ferry is offensive to the two private residences in close proximity. Arrow junction road is a busy road with dual usage - bikes and cars. The proposed area is already busy with bikers and people using the water hole.</p> <p>Allowing freedom campers permission to camp for 1 to 2 nights in a residential area is a terrible idea. Designated, purpose built facilities should be provided by council in areas away from residential areas.. at least hidden, causing no disturbance to private residence owners etc.</p> <p>Residences of road (arrow junction road) have already had issues with freedom campers since the zoning was changed. There have been noise disturbance issues, verbal altercations, campers hanging washing in hedges. We have had rubbish dumped. Had campers sitting under a tree at our driveway having a cup of tea, reading a book as our children went to catch the bus!</p>
173	Lisa	White	Resident	No	Oppose	<p>I do not feel that our countryside should have freedom campsites dotted around. This affects our beautiful landscape and they as in the past will not be monitored effectively. Camping is a great Kiwi tradition but Kiwis stay in campsites and travellers to our region should be able to choose what level of accommodation they want to stay - Hotel right through to campsite but a campsite with facilities. Everyone is fully aware that self contained vehicles do not leave the area clean.</p> <p>The Gibbston Reserve CARPARK is not a suitable place for a Freedom campsite - it is too small, not flat and will be completely ruined. The Gibbston Reserve is treasured by the Gibbston Community and to put a freedom campsite in the car park will ruin this beautiful asset that our community has created. Please don't allow it.</p>

174	Anisha	Capstick		No	Oppose	There is a beautiful local swimming hole near morven ferry road. Putting a freedom camping spot there will ruin the quite beautiful rural area. Lots of freedom campers won't understand farm life. This is a farm area which should stay that way
175	Anelise	Port		No	Neutral	I lived over 6 years in Arrowtown and I am very lucky to be able to extensively travel NZ. This year my partner and I bought our first caravan and it's been an awesome way of traveling. Me have a full self contained caravan but we always stay in places where we can have access to potable water, toilet and near dump stations. I would love to have more people traveling to see how beautiful Queenstown lakes area is, in my opinion it's necessary to have more designated places for freedom camping, my suggestion will be just to make sure it will have a decent structure with access to water and specially toilet facilities and it would be a plus to have a public dump station near by, so there is no excuse for any bad actions from pour minded freedom campers. Thank you
176	Rosemary	Chin		No	Oppose	Very difficult to make sure that they are self contained vehicles only and only stay for 2 nights.  Always lots of waste left behind. Also some with self contained vehicles do not use their own toilet.
177	Vera	Stewart		No	Oppose	I do not agree to the areas designated for the Freedom Camping areas, especially the one down Morven Ferry Road as we live across the river and would look directly at it.
178	Karen	Reid		No	Oppose	I'm a long term local who cares deeply about this area. I've already seen the damage that freedom campers have done to our unique local environment. As there are perfectly good, reasonably priced camping grounds close to the proposed 'freedom' camping areas, campers should be camping there, thus not only saving our environment from harm but also supporting the local economy. Why take our some of our most beautiful, locally beloved spots and offer them up free of charge to campers who have already proven that they neither care to treat them with respect or contribute financially to their upkeep! Yes people need somewhere reasonably priced to camp ... these places already exist they're called camping grounds! These are designated places where people camp! leaving the beautiful local surroundings unspoilt for everyone to enjoy. It's a total no brainer ... freedom camping? Why?
179	Lee	Thompson		No	Oppose	Oppose Morven Ferry Reserve because it is too small, has no facilities (one loo does not count) and will affect local bike/foot/horse traffic to our detriment. Sadly most freedom campers are feral litterbugs and contribute nothing to this area. Basically their shit and shitty vehicles will add nothing but crap and waste to what is a quiet and beautiful area for locals.
180	Terri	Anderson		No	Oppose	It's such a pleasure walking by the old Shotover Bridge nowadays without having to navigate partying campers, wads of toilet paper, and worse. We still have a problem with the adopted definition of self-contained in the bylaw: "Self-contained vehicle means a motor caravan, caravan, campervan, or any other vehicle designed and built for the purpose of camping for which a self-containment certificate has been issued under NZS 5465:2001." As there is no regulatory authority overseeing the issuing of these certifications, using them as the benchmark is fundamentally flawed. There is ample evidence of "valid" certificates being issued to vehicles that are not compliant with the new legal standard and the more appropriate standards (toilet that can be used when the bed is set up). This is the same as when NZTA wasn't managing WOFs correctly. We are enabling the unscrupulous to sell certification to the uncaring. So let's deal with the problem vans and stop pretending one size fits all. QLDC should redefine freedom camping according to a more stringent certification which we assess and enforce ourselves; a FIXED toilet that can be used at all time, with the door closed, and not cassette toilet. Big fines, taken immediately. That will get rid of most of the problem overnight without penalising the moms and pops who travel responsibly. Sadly from experience I don't support the provision of carparks at trailheads and near our rivers for campers; there are still more areas that need protecting and the whack-a-mole approach just shifts the problem around to other vulnerable areas (Earnslaw Burn and Diamond Lake for example). Taxpayers and ratepayers should not be subsidising business models with hundreds of thousands of dollars on camping hubs and ambassadors. Get FAI travellers back into camping grounds and DOC sites or they can share the love around the regions where they are needed.

181	Glenda	Duffell		No	Oppose	<p>Queenstown needs more Freedom camping areas not less. It is difficult for those of us travelling our beautiful country to visit Queenstown given the lack of space to park up and see the town.</p> <p>It would be great if Queenstown could provide a parking area walkable to town centre where those travelling in motor homes or towing caravans can park, visit restaurants, shopping etc without being ticketed. Many bypass Queenstown altogether as it has a name for being the most unfriendly town to motor home and caravan travellers in NZ.</p>
182	Tony	Carter		No	Oppose	<p>Oppose morven ferry reserve as a freedom camping site - going to impact a local beauty spot with their crappy half arsed honda odyssey campers which don't really cut the mustard so they dump their trash and poo in the bushes. Will completely ruin the area. They contribute nothing but cost tax payers dollars in clean up</p>
183	Alison	Beaumont		No	Oppose	<p>I do not support any of the Moven Ferry area being used by Freedom Campers</p>
184	Graeme	Jenkins	Freedom camping advice	No	Oppose	<p>You are taking away our birth given rights When the next natural disaster occurs you can keep your stupid town in poverty and your town can suffer the financial crisis of not having people spending their money there</p>
185	Valentina	Alessi		Yes	Oppose	<p>No freedom camping in general but paid organised carpark with rubbish collection and toilets facilities like in all European countries. Tourists from Europe know this very well and they will be happy to pay the organised car park per day which it will be cheaper than a campsite because it will not have all the facilities but just the basics one, like rubbish collection and a couple of public toilets. No Morven ferry road as free camping, it's a special place for the locals, the carpark is small and locals are keeping clean from rubbish.</p>
186	Lisa	Reid		Yes	Oppose	<p>I feel that the proposed freedom camping spot at the Glenorchy recreational reserve is not a viable option and am rather suprised in the council that they are even considering this as an option. This is a recreational reserve, for the community. It is NOT a camping spot. It is Glenorchy's only recreational reserve and is used by many community groups year round. Campervans parking here would negatively impact and effect the community and visitors to the area. It would DEVALUE glenorchy as a place to live and place to visit, and be detrimental to the wellbeing and quality of life of glenorchy residents. It is a COMMUNITY space used extensively year round for sports and recreation. The recreational ground is a GOLF COURSE maintained and played on year round by the local golf club, residents, visitors and other visiting golf clubs The tennis court are used extensively in summer by the residents and tennis club - most evenings there are people playing on the court. It is used for the community cricket club which runs spring / summer and has around 50 members from the community participating. It is used for the Glenorchy Netball Club during the winter for trainings and games.</p> <p>As a rate payer and resident of 20 years I am vehemently OPPOSED to any freedom camping at the glenorchy recreational reserve. This is community recreational area used extensively by the community and visitors alike and is not the place for freedom camping. We have one recreational reserve, don't ruin it. The recreation ground is in the TOWN centre - campervans do not need a space to freedom camp in the town centre. There are 2 x perfectly good DOC camping grounds at Lake Sylvan and Kinloch as well as a commercial camping ground around 300meteres down the road - why compete with a local business? The toilets here are NOT Owned by the council we don't want crappy portaloos sitting around at our lovely community recreational area.</p>
187	Anthony Marsh	Marsh	Private	No	Oppose	<p>I agree with the locations proposed to allow restricted freedom camping for certified self-contained vehicles. I agree that there should be no freedom camping in residential areas but I dis-agree with the proposal to prohibit freedom camping in some specific remote and rural areas with plenty of parking that affect no one , such as Crown Range Summit Carpark.</p> <p>QLDC needs to address the Definition of of What a Certified Self-Contained Vehicle is: Self-contained vehicles in Q L D need to have toilet definition that means it can be: 1) used at all times of say or night.... with ease! 2)multiple days capacity, 3)complete privacy for the person using the toilet. Unless the self contained toilet meets these standards, many freedom campers, even with the present certification sticker, are really just "Beds-on-wheels" with a porta-potty in the storage locker to meet compliance... that now one uses.</p>
188	Hannah	Dodd		No	Oppose	<p>The Arrow River is a national treasure and is loved for its prestige clear waters and natural surrounds. Freedom campers will ruin this!</p>

189	Jane	Hanna		Yes	Oppose	<p>As you can see I live at 154 Arrow Junction Road which is directly opposite the proposed Morven Ferry area. I have had bad experiences in the past, when people have "freedom camped" on this land. They have abused me and made me feel uncomfortable and scared. They have defecated, washed laundry in the Arrow River, hung clothing on the fence, been loud and been offensive to me. If "freedom camping" was allowed and in fact encouraged on this land my life would be negatively affected for ever.</p> <p>Freedom camping is not managed, and not policed. This means that any behavior can go undetected, and that would make me very uneasy as I live on my own. My house is literally 20m away from where people would camp. Not ideal!</p> <p>A lot of locals use the Morven Ferry area as the biking/walking trail goes through it. Plus there is a magnificent swimming area down in the Arrow River.....frequented and respected by many locals over the summer months. This would change!</p> <p>Arrow Junction Road is used by moterists, bikers, runners, walkers and dog walkers alike. This works at the moment because it has very little traffic. It needs to stay that way.</p> <p>The intersections at both Morven Ferry and Arrow Junction Roads onto the Highway are very dangerous and are the site of a number of crashes. We do not need to have more traffic also for this reason</p> <p>Please do not change my life and that of many others by allowing freedom camping so close to where we live and play!!</p>
190	Robin	Miller	None	No	Oppose	<p>Oppose in respect to the inclusion of the Gibbston community reserve as a place where freedom camping can take place. I do not consider that this community reserve is a suitable location for the following reasons:</p> <p>a. The road access is unsafe. Gibbston Highway is a 100 kph road and an increased number of camper vans, etc turning on and off this highway will be a significant hazard to road users, the local viticulture industry and the local community, which includes the local school bus users that have stops close to road junctions along the highway. The proposal is contrary to the aims and objectives of 3.2 of the draft bylaw with regard to safety.</p> <p>b. As the past situation with Rafters Road has proven, concealed rural back road locations in Gibbston are not suitable for freedom camping and cannot be appropriately managed. 6.3 of the draft bylaw will be unenforceable in this location.</p> <p>c. In a similar vein, the remote and concealed rural location of the community reserve will encourage freedom camping in the prohibited area of Coal Pit Road and, hence, it will be contrary to 5.1 of the proposed bylaw. People who arrive to find the spaces in the reserve already taken, or who have exceeded their permitted stay, will simply camp on prohibited Coal Pit Road or Back Road.</p> <p>d. The use of this reserve for freedom camping will be out of character with the Gibbston Character Zone and will remove the reserve from use by the Gibbston community. Accordingly, it will be contrary to the aims and objectives of 3.2 with regard to protection of this special area of the Wakatipu Basin.</p> <p>I believe that if freedom camping is permitted on the reserve, even in a restricted manner, there will be significant adverse environmental effects (noise, visual, safety, rubbish/pollution and their overspill into surrounding ares) on the Gibbston Character Zone and the local community itself.</p>
191	Kath	Melville		No	Oppose	<p>I oppose Morven Ferry Rd being a freedom camping spot. First concern is traffic on the road. We already have a high number of cars and more once the subdivided land has been built on. We have bikers with young kids and dogs and tourists who I have nearly crashed into coming around the first corner let alone over the hill and bend outside our place. It would be incredibly dangerous to add more traffic as we are already dreading a terrible accident with everyone sharing the road.</p> <p>The spot is a very beautiful spot, very peaceful and tranquil and loved by the locals. There are a huge number of kids and families that utilise the area. How are we sure that these people are not going to leave human waste and rubbish everywhere in the bushes. There is also residents who take water off the stream for their own water so there is a health and safety risk with a possibility of water contamination.</p> <p>If there is somebody manning these sites , who is paying for them? Who is paying for the toilets and facilities? Why should we as ratepayers be paying for all these services and what is the benefit to us as we don't use them. They can just go to the campgrounds and pay.</p> <p>The other concern is there are houses directly opposite the site. How is it fair to them to have parked campers outside their houses. They live in the area for peace and quiet, so the noise could have a huge impact day and night.</p> <p>I do believe campers in a lovely secluded spot with residents opposite will destroy the image of a peaceful , beautiful swimming spot and reserve for all families and locals to use . We do not need campers there.</p>
192	Suzy	Diamond	Pagan vines vineyard	No	Oppose	<p>I oppose freedom camping in the Gibbston reserve car park</p> <p>The car park has residences and business outside. Disruptive for those business/residents because traffic coming and going. Also freedom campers don't respect the area so rubbish etc will be left behind. This is a community area and freedom campers don't respect the area plus it is very small so there wouldn't be much room for many vehicles therefore they would overflow. This is also where the school buses pick up and drop off so the area would potentially be congested and dangerous for those children being picked up and dropped off</p>

193	Bob	Johnson		No	Oppose	<p>I have major concerns regarding the draft bylaw.</p> <p>Firstly there is the road safety issue. Coal Pit Road is fundamentally a single lane road and is used by residents, vineyard works and some heavy construction vehicles. At the reserve is a sharp 90 degree turn with limited visibility. An increase in road usage coupled with freedom campers who don't know the road or who are from overseas will greatly increase to the risk of accident and potential injury.</p> <p>Secondly we experience illegal freedom camping around the entrance to the Gibbston Tavern. The rubbish and waste left by these few campers is appalling. I see no reason why this would cease if the reserve was used as a camping site. In fact it would obviously increase with greater use.</p> <p>The council has sold of existing camping assets in order to "cash up" and are now trying to move their problems onto the rate payers. This reserve was left to the Gibbston community for community use, not as a get out of jail card for the council. There are plenty of other sites closer to Queenstown which can be used and don't impact on the citizens of this region.</p> <p>Freedom campers contribute very little to the local economy. Locals who pay rates, shop here, eat here contribute far more. Who are the council meant to be representing?</p>
194	Karen	O'Donahoo		No	Oppose	<p>I strongly believe that Freedom camping should no longer be allowed due to the high tourist numbers in the Queenstown Lakes District. All vehicles should stay at properly designated camping grounds that have all necessary facilities. As a private citizen who has had many woofers and helpx travellers stay in our home - these young people have supposedly "self-contained" vehicles - but the reality is they do not use the facilities because they don't like cleaning them. As a result, outdoor areas are often used in preference. Pre-covid I had several occasions where my dogs have rolled in human feces at places where freedom camping has been allowed or tolerated. It is completely unacceptable. As a community and country we are looking to transition to high quality visitors. As a young person I travelled extensively - which required saving enough money to be able to afford staying in youth hostels. New Zealand should not be seen as a place for free travel - free accomodation at the expense of our beautiful environment, as well as at the expense of the quality of life of local residents. We do not need to "give New Zealand" away. Freedom camping is not permitted in most other countries - it was a beautiful thing back in the day - but times have changed, and so should we. We all know freedom camping leads to rubbish being dumped, and our parks being used as outdoor toilets. We also know that vans being parked up in our beautiful places is a disincentive for other people who want to use the areas for day recreation. It's time to move on and just accept that travellers in vans and campers stay at campsites.</p>
195	Julie	Frazier		No	Oppose	<p>Whilst I do agree that in principal there should be sites available for freedom campers, I do not think that the Moven Ferry Reserve site is suitable - it is small, and always full with bikers using the trail. It also gets incredibly busy with locals in the summer using the swimming spot, to the point where cars are parked all down the road. I don't think adding freedom campers into that is a wise decision.</p>
196	Melissa	Hinves		No	Oppose	<p>I think freedom camping should only be permissible for nz residents, those who pay taxes to the country and therefor financial contribute to management if NZ locations as a whole... and even then the proposed list of locations should be minimised. Overseas tourists should pay for for formal camping, they shouldn't be allowed to have free access to a faculty that rate payers then have to financially service.</p>
197	Jess	Ruthe		No	Oppose	<p>I feel some of the allowed areas for freedom camping hardly have the facilities to support local use, let alone opening them up to freedom campers. We need better infrastructure to firstly support our local community, before opening these spaces up further. Places such as Morven Ferry can already be crowded at times and I have been many times in the last 5 years to take kids for a swim when the carpark is already full and cars are parked along the roadside. It does not have the capacity to encourage more people to use this area than the local community it already supports. Many swimming spots in our local area are already crowded at times, and we need to provide better facilities before allowing more use.</p>
198	Fiona	Wallen		No	Oppose	<p>Morven Ferry rd is a residential area of lifestyle blocks the small carpark is not a place for camping.</p>
199	Luigi	Sussman		No	Oppose	<p>Freedom camping should be restricted to organised campsites, which can be monitored daily, where bad behavior /noise control can be attended to immediately and rubbish left behind can be cleared by those who monitor and benefit financially or otherwise from the campers. Proposing freedom camping in a semi rural area in close proximity to existing residences where the campers will affect and impact on the enjoyment, peace and tranquility and value of our properties in an largely unregulated manner is not acceptable. I am confident that any councilors or people deciding on these submissions would not wish to have a freedom camping site on their doorstep and should not consider this as Nimbyism but consider better options for campers ie dedicated commercially funded campsites which dont impact local residents.</p> <p>The Gibbston reserve parking has limited space on a narrow road where 2 cars struggle to pass , bordered by very deep culverts and is not suitable for campervans. It is a community reserve and not a tourist "free campsite" for the benefit of local residents. My house looks directly down on this parking site. Having nomadic campervans and their occupants will increase the security risk, littering, noise and peace and tranquility we bought into - and unless the QLDC gaurantees they will be able to mitigate these risks effectively this proposal should not go ahead.</p>

200	Lisa	Guy		No	Oppose	No freedom camping in general but paid organised carpark with rubbish collection and toilets facilities like in all European countries. Tourists from Europe know this very well and they will be happy to pay the organised car park per day which it will be
201	Anna-Marie	Chin		Yes	Oppose	<p>I submit on two accounts. In general and also specific to the proposed Morven Ferry Rd Reserve option.</p> <p>Freedom Camping in general I am opposed to freedom camping in its entirety. In any area that is a recreation reserve and is used by members of the public and in close proximity to existing commercial camping grounds. These areas should be retained as open space for use by all public as a reserve, not for freedom camping. If you are going to spend money you should support existing facilities, to support DOC upgrading existing camping grounds. Existing commercial camping grounds throughout the area need our support, not competition through free camp sites. Freedom camping should be limited to either DOC camping sites or as an alternative, carparking areas that are not used at night such as QLDC carpark. They have the advantage of being close to town and services as promoted by Te Papa in Wellington. No one should not be allowed to freedom camp in some of the best areas undermining the quality of community recreation spaces for others, the community who are rate payers and are therefore stakeholders in these spaces and the tourists who come to these places to enjoy the beautiful open spaces. These sites in particular are Morven Ferry Reserve – cycle trails Camp Hill – parking for the water park used extensively by the community Gibbston Coal Pit Rd – winery tourist trail</p> <p>Morven Ferry Rd Reserve I am also vehemently opposed to the proposed freedom camping site at Morven Ferry Rd Reserve (No.89). I am a directly affected neighbour. I live directly across the road from this reserve at 180 Morven Ferry Road. I am very concerned and worried about my safety, the visual impact and the noise. I have found the suggestion of this proposal very stressful. No matter what you say about monitoring, you will never control the noise, partying at night, drinking, clothes hanging out on the reserve. You have no way to control or discriminate who uses it. You will not be able to monitor the time that freedom campers arrive and leave. A sign will not make them comply. I have lived/holidayed here since I was four years old and know the type of people who if given the chance would camp here. Young people who want to have a good time. Who do want to live on a dime, who do want to drink, party, have fun and wash clothes/bodies in the river. It might be seen to be biased but it is a reality that you will not control. And as I live here, I am the one that will have to live with it. I am also not the only one adjacent to this reserve, and we are really stressed and nervous about this. I have had direct experience with people illegally freedom camping both on the reserve, in the carpark and also along the road. None of them have been positive experiences, they all feel like they are entitled and do not respect the area and the privacy of the residents. In some instances, my 80yr old neighbour has come to me as he has felt threatened and worried, and he has been verbally abused. He walks his dog every day as do many people along this reserve. My potable water intake is below the carpark for Morven Ferry Reserve. This has been the water intake for my house since the property was built. The house was established here in the 1860s. This house has been in my family since 1973. This water intake is historic as it is with one of my neighbours Jane Hanna 154 Arrow Junction Rd. I am very concerned about the impact of the freedom camping on my water quality, any faeces and rubbish waste seeping into the ground could effect my water quality which I have enjoyed all my life. There are now 9 water intakes at this spring and they all could be affected by this. Also this activity will certainly devalue my property. I would like to know how you are to compensate me for this if you do allow freedom camping to go ahead. Both QLDC and Xyst that generated the QLDC Assessment of Sites for Freedom Camping July 2021 report report has shown no understanding of this reserve, its importance to the community, the enjoyment it holds for families, tourists, cyclists, dog walkers and horse riders often young. This shows a complete lack of understanding of this site and its use. Freedom camping will reduce the enjoyment immensely. No consideration has been taken into account that it is used as a part of the Queenstown Lakes Cycle Trail. It is a huge amenity to both the local community and to the enjoyment and attraction of tourists. Of which we are trying to encourage not discourage.</p> <p>You have not taken the road safety into account at all in the July 2021 report carried out by Xyst but dismissed it as of low importance. Obviously, there is no understanding from the company who wrote the report or QLDC of the impact this proposal will have on this reserve. Not only is the reserve part of the cycle trail but the whole length of Arrow Junction Road. This is a road that provides access to houses but is now also shared with cyclists, dogs, kids and horse riders. All have to respect each other and share the road. If the reserve is to be used as a freedom camping site, this would mean that a lot of people will not use the cycle trail on the reserve but continue along the road and exacerbate an existing traffic safety concern. This reserve is on an intersection where cars can travel up to 100kms and hour legally.</p> <p>Initially the establishment of the cycle trail did not include the carpark. This resulted in people parking on the road generating a real safety</p>

					<p>concern as people and dogs, kids would flow out of cars directly onto the road. This carpark was created by the ongoing concerns by the residents in the neighbourhood on the safety of the cyclists. Lots of lobbying and pushing to get this carpark established. Even so in busy times which is the weekends and in the summer cars still spill out onto the road.</p> <p>This reserve is a direct link to an amazing swimming hole. It is well known by the local community and used extensively in the summer by families, kids and dogs, it being a very safe and sheltered swimming area, safe and sheltered and widely used by the local community, families, I have been there when there have been up to 70 people, families and dogs. At these times the cars do spill onto the road. If there are freedom campers here there is a likely hood they may use the river to wash their clothes, have a bath and therefore undermine the water quality of the river and therefore have an impact on the reserve.</p> <p>The area shows hisitoric mining operations on the reserve and this needs to be considered and the concern nis this activity could undermine this.</p> <p>I am also an architect and I am aware of the requirements, under the Resource Management Act and the limitation imposed on building in this area when building houses. This activity needs to be considered in the same way, impact, visually, effect on neighbours.</p> <p>A suggestion by QLDC, as these reserves should be used as there is established parking spaces that the carparks should be used as spaces for freedom camping is not logical. These carparks were built for a reason to support the existing uses of these spaces. At Morven ferry rd reserve the trail can be used at any time of day and night and if it is filled with freedom Campers this will exclude others from being able to park here. The car park on this reserve was built to accommodate the users of the Queenstown Cycle Trail. As you will not be able to make sure that the carpark is free for the users of the cycle trail, there will only be the option that the overflow of users will again spill out onto the road and exacerbate an already existing safety concern. Or you will have to make the parking area larger which will only undermine the extent of the area that is open green space therefore undermining the quality of the reserves primary use open space.</p> <p>The report commissioned dated July 2021 QLDC Assessment of Sites for Freedom Camping assessed this site as “not acceptable” for Freedom Camping has completely been overridden by the fact that QLDC is still proposing Morven Ferry Rd Reserve be a freedom camping area. You have not seriously considered the Freedom Camping Bylaw 2021 which has 3 important fundamentals that need to be considered when deciding if areas are suitable. These are as follows;</p> <p>(a) the bylaw is necessary for one or more of the following purposes;</p> <p>(i) to protect the area:</p> <p>(ii) to protect the health and safety of people who may visit the area:</p> <p>(iii) to protect access to the area; and</p> <p>as noted above none of these have been considered appropriately.</p> <p>Following the August survey the status of Whitechapel Reserve was changed and the proposal is for it how to be “prohibited” from freedom camping. Morven Ferry Rd Reserve should have scored exactly the same. They both have the same protection issues noted above. Both are a reserve accessed off a state highway, a reserve over which the Queenstown Trust CycleTrail is located, directly beside residential properties and the Arrow River Therefore Morven Ferry Rd Reserve should also be classified as “prohibited” from freedom camping.</p>	
202	Julie	Jacques		No	Oppose	I oppose Freedom camping anywhere in the Wakatipu Basin. It creates an unnecessary financial burden on ratepayers, it diminishes the use and enjoyment of the area, and it undermines the legitimate, revenue and job-creating forms of accommodation.
203	Andrew	Green		No	Oppose	<p>1.) Glenorchy Recreation Ground - This is a community facility and is not suitable for use as a site for freedom camping. The car park is regularly used for sport - Cricket, Golf, Tennis, Netball and rugby. If the space is taken up by freedom campers there leaves no room for locals to park when using the recreation ground. When cricket is played cars do not park in the car park as the ball often lands in that area, damage to freedom camping vehicles will be unavoidable if they are parked there while cricket games are in progress.</p> <p>2.) Greenstone Road - We live at Greenstone Station and in the past have had trouble with freedom campers along the road leaving rubbish and human waste. Also having people camped on the side of the road creates a hazard when moving stock. I suggest that Greenstone Station Road be made a no freedom camping zone from the cattle stop south of Mill Creek to the Greenstone car park. Doc have provided for freedom camping in the car park with toilets and anyone wanting to camp along the road should be directed here.</p>

204	Scott	Murray		No	Oppose	<p>I don't believe there should be freedom camping in the Wakatipu basin because;</p> <p>It diminishes the intrinsic value of the Wakatipu basin</p> <p>It undermines local businesses accommodation. (Who pay council fees in order to operate said accommodation).</p> <p>It places an undue burden on ratepayers by having them pay to maintain the 'camp sites'.</p> <p>It creates low value, high volume tourism which in turn creates pressure on the environment and the ratepayer and residents quality of life.</p> <p>I fear for the quality of my water supply which is drawn from within 150 m of one of the suggested sites.</p> <p>I purchased my property in the belief that I would not have a council sponsored camping site with in 100 m of it. It will devalue the properties in the area.</p>
205	Simon	McGrath		No	Oppose	<p>In it's current form I strongly oppose freedom camping in the QLDC area. The obvious issue that nobody seems to be concerned about is how a large proportion of "self contained" vehicles visiting are in no way "self contained" they are the small vans with a mattress in the back and these are somehow deemed self contained. I regularly see these types of freedom campers, leaving their rubbish, washing dishes in the arrow river, relieving themselves in our parks. Until there is a reclassification of what a "self contained vehicle" is I am strongly against any freedom camping in the area.</p> <p>If there is no change in what defines a "self contained vehicle" freedom camping should not exist in it's current form. I have no problem with people camping responsibly but this is not the case for a large amount of these campers who ruin it for everyone else. The freedom campers I am talking about are welcome to Queenstown however they should have to stay at camp grounds that provide toilet and cooking facilities.</p> <p>If the council wants to have freedom campers at the proposed areas they need to provide toilets and kitchen facilities and I don't think it's fair for ratepayers to foot this bill so there should be a nightly charge.</p>
206	Ken and Trish	MacKenzie		Yes	Oppose	<p>1) To even consider a very small and inadequate car park as a site for Freedom Campers to utilize, is beyond belief. The Gibbston Reserve is for the community, and is used in a variety of ways by the people living in Gibbston (and beyond).</p> <p>To describe the proposed site as a car park is also incredulous. The designated car park area for the Gibbston Community Reserve is very small, rather unkempt and uneven, and is also the access point for people wanting to use the Reserve. It is very limiting in the number of spaces available to be utilized for casual visitors for recreation and community event purposes, let alone opening it up to Campers.</p> <p>2) In addition, adjacent to the Gibbston Reserve are numerous private residences and businesses. I do not believe that camping should be allowed in an area so close to private homes. It could possibly add security concerns and expenses to all those living nearby.</p> <p>I hope it is noted, that Freedom Camping has been an issue in Gibbston previously. Prior to the first COVID lock-down, Freedom Campers (many with incorrect vans) set up in Gibbston, and at no stage was there any overseeing, from either DOC or QLDC, as to the effect these campers had on the area. Rubbish, excrement, soiled nappies, and empty bottles are just part of the list of items that Community members had to deal with.</p> <p>3) Over the years, considerable time, man hours and money has been spent by Community Association and its members to develop the Gibbston Community Reserve as a destination for locals (and beyond) to enjoy. It's a destination which has evolved with much thought through planning and plantings and is now a site we, as a Community, are very proud of.</p> <p>4) We also have an amazing and renowned Cycle Trail winding its way through Gibbston which brings many tourists (and locals) into the region. The basis of this was through the efforts of the Community before what was initially a walking track, was transformed into the current cycle trail. This is a trail that has increased in popularity immensely, and to think that this fantastic destination which spans the length of Gibbston is potentially going to be 'littered' with campers and potentially their rubbish, and detracting from the enjoyment of this group, is concerning. Added to this are safety concerns at the intersection for the proposed site, with considerable traffic travelling along State Highway 6, and the dangers surrounding this very unsafe intersection, both accessing and departing.</p> <p>We live in Gibbston .....not Gibbston Valley! Please check the accuracy of your information before sharing it.....I believe that you have misnamed Coal Pit Road too!!!</p> <p>5) Freedom Camping has been allowed to 'grow' within our Community, without any efforts from the QLDC, except for some ineffective signage, to curb its growth or its impact. I personally have phoned in so many times to raise my concerns about the arrogance and amount of Freedom Campers, but to no avail. I have very little faith that this will improve going forward.</p> <p>6) To finish, i am perplexed to note that in various reports I have read, there is mention of how much these Freedom Campers contribute to the community financially. Perhaps it would be a good idea if they, the Freedom Campers, moving forward, utilized the businesses established for the purpose of camping, and spent their time in the Queenstown area at those places</p> <p>.</p>
207	Michelle	Green		No	Oppose	<p>1.) Glenorchy Recreation Ground - This is a community facility and is not suitable for use as a site for freedom camping. It is regularly used by myself and my family for sport - Cricket, Golf, Tennis, Netball and rugby.</p> <p>2.) Greenstone Road - We live at Greenstone Station and in the past have had trouble with freedom campers along the road leaving rubbish and human waste. I have rung and reported this to the council on numerous occasions. There is a Doc camping site at the Greenstone Track Carpark which provides freedom campers with toilets and bins. Anyone wanting to camp along the road should be directed here.</p> <p>I struggle to understand why we need to create freedom camping zones for campers when we have an abundance of holiday parks and doc campsites. We need to be making all forms of tourism beneficial for both the environment and economy.</p>

208	Michelle	Percy	Lakeside Netball Club Glenorchy	No	Oppose	<p>Glenorchy Recreation Ground - This is a community facility and is not suitable for use as a site for freedom camping. The ground is frequently used for sports and by local clubs. Many club have spent time bettering these facilities or fundraising for improvements to benefit their chosen Club. There are a limited number of parks already it would be a shame to lose these to freedom campers.</p> <p>The Bucklerburn would make an ideal site for a campsite- It is sheltered, out of view of locals and would only require toilets.</p>
209	Michelle	Green	Greenstone Homestead	No	Oppose	<p>1.) Glenorchy Recreation Ground - This is a community facility and is not suitable for use as a site for freedom camping. The car park is regularly used for sport - Cricket, Golf, Tennis, Netball and rugby. If the space is taken up by freedom campers there leaves no room for locals to park when using the recreation ground. When cricket is played cars do not park in the car park as the ball often lands in that area, damage to freedom camping vehicles will be unavoidable if they are parked there while cricket games are in progress.</p> <p>2.) Greenstone Road - We live at Greenstone Station and in the past have had trouble with freedom campers along the road leaving rubbish and human waste. Also having people camped on the side of the road creates a hazard when moving stock. I suggest that Greenstone Station Road be made a no freedom camping zone from the cattle stop south of Mill Creek to the Greenstone car park. Doc have provided for freedom camping in the car park with toilets and anyone wanting to camp along the road should be directed here.</p>
210	Paul	Jones		No	Oppose	<p>Firstly I would note that this consultation is incomplete as it provides no guidance as to why these specific freedom camping sites have been chosen and the modifications that are intended to accommodate the new use. My concern relates to the proposed Morven Ferry site although the points raised may be equally applicable to other sites.</p> <p>I am a frequent user of the Morven Ferry site and oppose the inclusion on the basis that:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Existing users will be unable to use the site and parking will at best be displaced to the potentially dangerous narrow access roads: Particularly in summer, it is well used by both cyclists and walkers to access the Queenstown Trail and nearby swimming hole. Indeed during summer, the car park is often already overflowing.</li> <li>- As the current parking arrangements could only cater for at most two or three large vehicles, I fear that the car parking area will be further extended onto the reserve, with all of the negative impacts to the environment and spoiling of views.</li> <li>- Your notes correctly mention that good behaviour of freedom campers cannot be relied upon. Consequently the impact on nearby homes is likely to be unacceptable. There are several homes within 50m of the reserve and if the car park is extended, at least one will be directly opposite the site. This is not acceptable for exactly the same reason that you are not placing these sites in more densely residential areas - it is not appropriate for ANY resident to be forced to live next to a freedom camping site. Furthermore, there is a high chance of noise disturbance to numerous homes within the area.</li> <li>- Access to the site from SH6 is dangerous and encouraging large, slow vehicles to turn across the highway at what are already accident blackspots is likely to result in a serious accident. One access road requires vehicles to turn across a sharp 100kmh bend with limited visibility whilst the other is on a blind brow immediately adjacent to the main Arrowtown turnoff. The road at this junction will need to be modified as it is impossible for large vehicles to access the single lane road without taking up both lanes. I speak from experience that, even in a car, accessing the roads can be extremely tricky and is not without danger. NZTA does not appear to have been involved in the process.</li> </ul> <p>Finally I would like to make a few broader points, although recognise that tackling these issues may be beyond the remit of QLDC:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Preferably freedom campers should be required to use existing camp sites, which would welcome their business.</li> <li>- A distinction needs to be made between those vehicles that are self-contained as opposed to those that are self-contained in name only. It is the latter where the main problem lies.</li> <li>- If you are legally required to find these sites, they should be on the absolute periphery of the area and nowhere near existing homes (at least 1km) or public utilities such as beaches, cycling trails or beauty spots.</li> <li>- As a general rule, we should not be encouraging freedom campers in the area - their needs have to be secondary to those who live here.</li> </ul>
211	Suzanna	Martin		No	Oppose	<p>Allowing freedom camping is an absolute shame . The mess and lack of council follow through last round means that there should be no repeat of the experience. Children swim at the Morven Ferry site , often young kids , regularly without adults . This is not appropriate when vans etc are parked within the area . It is dangerous, and ill advised .</p>

212	Stuart	Boyce		No	Oppose	<p>'Re Gibbston Freedom Camping proposed location.  I'm totally against this proposal for the Gibbston location for the reasons below :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Highly unlikely that the council will be able to monitor the site effectively, due to the location and the lack of funding.</li> <li>- The wide road sides up and down Coal Pit mean we will end up with campers parked up along the road.</li> <li>- Coal pit road is already getting busier, and with campers/van, on a narrow road, with cyclists, horse riders, motor bikers, walkers, runners, vineyard &amp; farm machinery vehicles also using this same road it will not be SAFE.</li> <li>- The main access point for coal pit road is also not easy to enter and exit safely due to the volume of traffic using this road.</li> <li>- There is also the visual and noise effects freedom campers would create on the reserve that would effect not only residents, but also visitors to the area.</li> <li>- Campers in the past vandalising trees, stealing fruit from our property, coming onto our property and causing distress to our animals, noise, litter, showering in the toilets and choosing not to use the toilets, even though they are available.</li> <li>- The final aspect is the carpark is a small area that is not flat, and the gateway needs to be kept clear so that emergency services and council staff can drive in when needed. This makes the actual useable flat area very small and not effective for the proposal.</li> </ul> <p>Kind Regards  Stuart Boyce</p>
213	Michelle	Boyce		No	Oppose	<p>Re Gibbston Freedom Camping proposed location.  I'm totally against this proposal for the Gibbston location for the reasons below :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Highly unlikely that the council will be able to monitor the site effectively, due to the location and the lack of funding.</li> <li>- The wide road sides up and down Coal Pit mean we will end up with campers parked up along the road.</li> <li>- Coal pit road is already getting busier, and with campers/van, on a narrow road, with cyclists, horse riders, motor bikers, walkers, runners, vineyard &amp; farm machinery vehicles also using this same road it will not be SAFE.</li> <li>- The main access point for coal pit road is also not easy to enter and exit safely due to the volume of traffic using this road.</li> <li>- There is also the visual and noise effects freedom campers would create on the reserve that would effect not only residents, but also visitors to the area.</li> <li>- Campers in the past vandalising trees, stealing fruit from our property, coming onto our property and causing distress to our animals, noise, litter, showering in the toilets and choosing not to use the toilets, even though they are available.</li> <li>- The final aspect is the carpark is a small area that is not flat, and the gateway needs to be kept clear so that emergency services and council staff can drive in when needed. This makes the actual useable flat area very small and not effective for the proposal.</li> </ul> <p>Kind Regards  Michelle Boyce</p>

214	Jennifer	Rogers		Yes	Oppose	<p>My submission primarily concerns is the proposal to use Morven Ferry Reserve for freedom camping.</p> <p>I have lived at our rural property on Morven Ferry Road for the past thirty five years, so I believe I am qualified to make an informed and meaningful submission. The Morven Ferry Reserve has been created with the assistance of our rates payments over the years. The majority of freedom campers have made no such contribution, but rather, if their current trends prevail would leave behind their rubbish and seriously diminish the enjoyment of the current users of this very popular reserve.</p> <p>The Proposal provided by Council lacks any meaningful statistical data as to the current use of this reserve. Similarly the XYST assessment did not take into account the current usage but rather focussed on the suitability of the site for freedom camping.</p> <p>The XYST assessment rated the Morven Ferry Reserve as having a total score of 67% and as such rated the site as unacceptable for freedom camping. Despite this finding Council has ignored this professional advice. The XYST assessment had significant concerns regarding the access to the area.</p> <p>I share these concerns, particularly for camper vans turning right on to SH6 from either Morven Ferry Road or Arrow Junction Road. The SH6 speed limit at the junction of Morven Ferry Road is 100kph and at Arrow Junction Road 80kph. At both intersections SH6 slopes downhill when travelling east.</p> <p>Turning right off Morven Ferry Road, a driver will have a six second window to view a vehicle travelling east until it is opposite Morven Ferry Road. A small camper van will just have made it over the centre line of SH6 in this time. For larger camper vans there is insufficient time to carry out this manoeuvre safely. Similarly, a vehicle turning right at Arrow Junction Road will have only seven seconds to carry out this manoeuvre. If NZTA found the exit from Whitechapel Road where the viewing distance is substantially improved over the above two intersections as unsatisfactory, then Council should not be considering the Morven Ferry Reserve on this basis alone.</p> <p>The Reserve is on a school bus run and is in very close proximity to existing houses. The area is used extensively for horse riding, mainly by the local residents and any increase in road traffic will be incompatible with the current use of the area. The Reserve is currently used extensively for cyclist, some very young, enjoying the cycling trails in the district. The Reserve car park, on occasions has quite a number of cars parked and allowing freedom campers to use this site would be to the detriment of the current users who include, not only the cyclists, but passive walkers, some with dogs.</p> <p>The individual site assessments from the XYST report were not included in the report available.</p>
215	Ruth	Harrison		No	Oppose	<p>Freedom camping is a particular NZ concept not found in any of the other many countries in which I have travelled. In all other situations you are required to camp in a park/reserve/campground and are charged for it.</p> <p>When NZ had a population of 3 million people freedom camping was possible without despoiling the environment to an obvious extent. Even if we are not considering the rise of overseas visitors this is no longer feasible without severe detriment to our environment.</p> <p>This brings us to self contained vehicles. Any vehicle that does not have fixed toilet facilities should not be considered as self contained. When a portable toilet is tucked under a seat or in a cupboard it is seldom if ever removed for the intended purpose. We need not only to be unambiguous about this but police it if freedom camping continues.</p> <p>Provision of toilet facilities at places like the Luggate Red bridge are a poor use of ratepayers money when we already support adequate camping grounds. While it improves the environmental impact if does nothing to support our campgrounds and they take a lot of time and money to service adequately.</p> <p>I would like to see any freedom camping removed or at least the definition of self contained vehicles changed and a charge applied for maintenance of any facilities. I support people having to use our campgrounds.</p>
216	Anne	Percy		No	Oppose	<p>My stance on the bylaw is that freedom camping should not be entertained in any form. Where they like to camp in reality is beside lakes and rivers etc. there are perfectly good camping grounds available and Doc has spent an awful lot of money creating beautiful and affordable camping areas that are very cheap . No need for any freedom camping since they continue to pollute pristine areas with the ridiculous 'self contained' vans .</p> <p>Camping in the Glenorchy recreation ground area not a good option as this is currently leased by the rugby club who own the toilets there . Also it is a sports area and campers would interfere with its current use which is high .</p>
217	Emma	Pullar	Roost	No	Oppose	Opposed to Morvan Ferry Rd freedom camping

218	Warrick	Weber	Gridline Limited	Yes	Oppose	<p>Gridline Limited is a Civil and Structural Engineering Consultancy. This submission is in relation to civil engineering concerns and in particular road safety issues.</p> <p>This submission is in relation to the Morven Ferry Reserve site which is been proposed as a restricted freedom camping area. The site may be accessed by either Morven Ferry Road or Arrow Junction Road.</p> <p>Arrow Junction Road is part of the 'Arrow River Bridges Ride' cycle trial. There only a small length of dedicated cycle trail at the north end of the road. For the majority of the road cyclists are forced to use the road. It is a popular cycle trail with many daily users. There are areas with limited or no verge and cyclists are forced onto the road. These areas also coincide with reduced sight lines and are of high risk.</p> <p>The introduction of additional vehicles, many of whom are unfamiliar with the road and user demographic, will significantly increase risk to cycle trail users.</p> <p>We do not support the proposal as it represents a life safety risk.</p>
219	Manu	Sinclair		No	Oppose	<p>I oppose the freedom camping by law I oppose freedom specifically, I oppose Freedom Camping being permitted on the Morven Carpark. This is a well utilized local space. There is limited parking which is constantly in demand by local people who wish to walk, cycle, the trails and swim, and recreate in the river at the swimming hole. this has become more so in the recent past summers when lake Hayes has become unswimable.</p> <p>We need to protect our family recreation spaces and associated parking areas from Freedom Camping.</p>
220	Jan	Scown		No	Oppose	<p>I believe the draft Freedom Camping Bylaw 2021 needs changes made and it needs rewriting by a Plain Language specialist to make it more easily understood by a wider group of people.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. All major tourist routes should be prohibited areas eg the Hawea-Makarora highway.</li> <li>2. Only those vehicles with a permanent toilet installed should be certified 'salt-contained'. Portable toilets in vehicles tend not to be used.</li> <li>3. With only 'self-contained' vehicles allowed to freedom camp (in specific circumstances) there should be no need for Council to provide toilets at designated camping areas. These encourage people to not use their own toilet facilities and their provision/ maintenance is an unnecessary cost on the ratepayer.</li> <li>4. If facilities are to be provided this should only be done so on a pay-for-use system.</li> <li>5. Campgrounds already provide such pay-for-use camping facilities and their use should be encouraged.</li> </ol>
221	Helen	McPhail	individual	No	Oppose	<p>The Gibbston recreation reserve is unsuitable for Freedom Camping. It is in an area being developed by the Gibbston Community Assn as a place for locals to gather, children to play field games, families to gather. The community has spent time money and energy beautifying the area with amenity planting for their future use.</p> <p>The parking space is limited and freedom camping will displace this area designed for local use.</p> <p>It is unsuitable as it is among isolated business and farming homes, and it will be intimidating for some to have unknown people camping "on the doorstep".</p> <p>The site is "out of sight" of the main road unlike other spots such as on the Kingston Road.</p> <p>The certification of self contained camper vans is an area that needs to be covered by a type of warrant of fitness and re issued every 6 months by accredited agents (NZTA?) - perhaps when getting a WOF.</p> <p>Camper vans should be able to be inspected for compliance by officers at Freedom Camping sites where there is reason to believe the vehicle is in fact not being used as a self contained unit. It is hard to imagine that some small 'wagons' with a mattress filling the whole back area can actually have a workable toilet in the night, have water containment etc.</p>
222	Danelle	Jones		Yes	Oppose	<p>I am opposed to the proposed areas to allow restricted freedom camping in certified self-contained vehicles, in particular the Glenorchy Domain carpark.</p> <p>We already have a number of campgrounds in the area where people can camp responsibly and have access to amenities for a very reasonable fee. The addition of a freedom camping area takes away from these businesses and encourages visitors with options to choose not to engage with local community. We should be encouraging people who want to contribute to our place, as custodians, not simply take the cheapest option or check-out from surrounding communities.</p>
223	Dale	Jefcoate		Yes	Oppose	<p>Camping should be in a camping ground we do not need</p> <p>To allow for somewhere else in</p> <p>The centre of town. We have numerous doc camp sites out of town for people to use as well.</p>
224	Shelley	Guy		No	Oppose	<p>I do not think Freedom Camping should be allowed on the roads north of Glenorchy. Most of the roads have very limited space to pull-off so would not be suitable for camper vans. This leaves areas such as the Rees bridge gravel area, the Diamond creek carpark, and other walking track carparks such as Glacier burn carpark. Do we really want these full of campervans all the time? There are 2 great Doc camping areas in the area - Lake Sylvan and Kinloch. Campervans should be restricted to these areas for overnight camping north of Glenorchy.</p>
225	Rachael	Anderson		No	Oppose	

226	Alister	Watson		No	Oppose	<p>I am against Freedom Camping in the Glenorchy Domain. The recreation ground was set aside by our forefathers many years ago to allow recreation activities near the centre of town. For many years this was used infrequently but over the years a golf club tennis court and cricket fields have been set up to go with the existing rugby ground and race track.</p> <p>Over the last few years the grounds have been enjoyed by local and visitors alike. In the summer time three cricket pitches are used every week for social cricket and the golf course attracts many visitors and locals alike.</p> <p>What great foresight our forefathers had setting this ground for recreational use when there were probably less than one hundred people living here. Now Glenorchy is a thriving community and if this freedom camping goes ahead what a short sighted bunch of bureaucrats will have made the decision.</p> <p>Surely we can keep this one small peace of land for recreation of the community and visitors alike.</p> <p>I am presuming, if this goes ahead the council will pay for the numerous broken windows etc from golf tennis and cricket balls.</p> <p>There are many more appropriate sights in the valley than this area.</p>
227	Randall	Aspinall	Mt Aspiring Station Ltd	No	Oppose	<p>I support the intent of managing freedom camping within the district however I cannot support an approach which is simply to prohibit freedom camping from more and more areas. This approach is not going to reduce the number of freedom campers in the district not is it providing them with more attractive, serviced camping options. All this approach will do is increase the intensity of freedom camping in the non prohibited / restricted areas - many of which are less likely to have public toilets &amp; rubbish bins than the areas they are prohibited from despite 64% of survey respondents saying that freedom camping should be limited (or at least encouraged) to areas with publicly accessible toilets.</p> <p>Those that benefit from having freedom campers in the district are tourism businesses, retail &amp; hospitality who tend to be concentrated in the urban areas. By progressively prohibiting freedom camping from these areas you are allowing those ratepayers to benefit without incurring any of the negatives or costs. At the same time you are pushing the freedom campers out into more rural areas whose ratepayers have to deal with the negative impacts &amp; costs of freedom camping without receiving any benefits.</p> <p>As I said above I do support the intent of managing freedom camping and I am aware there are limitations to what can be done due to legislation. However rather than progressively prohibiting it from the more public areas (out of sight out of mind) a bold approach has to be taken to positively manage freedom camping and its impacts to deliver a better experience for all. This approach needs to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- encouraging (or perhaps requiring) genuinely self contained campers (not accepting the fakes we often have at present)</li> <li>- education (&amp; where appropriate enforcement) to ensure that freedom campers respect our district and behave correctly</li> <li>- identify the economic benefits freedom camping brings to our district and ensure a significant amount of that is spent on providing the infrastructure required for zero impact camping (toilets, rubbish bins, waste water management etc)</li> <li>- have a coherent strategy that provides freedom campers with alternatives and encourages them towards a network of camping areas (with appropriate infrastructure) that spreads them and allows their impact on the environment to be effectively managed</li> <li>- for those that do want to travel our district on a low budget encourage a Workaway / WOOFA type scheme where they can access serviced camp sites (with local families or camping hubs) in return for some work or contribution to the environment, district etc</li> </ul>

228	Warrick	Weber		Yes	Oppose	<p>This submission is in relation to the Morven Ferry Reserve site which is been proposed as a restricted freedom camping area. Our family live at 26 Arrow Junction Road and are regular users of the reserve. We have a young family and use the reserve for swimming, walks, picnics and cycling. We oppose the proposed restricted freedom camping area for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Life safety to road users. The road is shared with many cyclist who use the road as part of the 'Arrow River Bridges Ride' cycle trial. The road is narrow with limited or no verge, poor sight lines in areas and is a high speed environment. The introduction of campervans and campers will increase life safety risk.</li> <li>2. We agree with Councils own assessment report 'QLDC Camping Site Assessment' dated 15th April 2021 (QLDC Assessment) which recommends that 'Camping is no longer considered appropriate on this site given need to protect access to the recreational areas which are under high demand'</li> <li>2. The site is in a rural setting with long established residents directly adjacent to the reserve. The proposal is not in keeping with the rural nature of the site and is highly detrimental to the surrounding residence. The proposal has created a highly stressful situation for those adjacent residents.</li> <li>3. The site contains an historical gold mine or historical significance. The proposal raises significant concerns around protection. This was also raised as a significant concern in the QLDC Assessment.</li> <li>4. The area is currently as safe area for children to explore and play. Many local families and children use the reserve. The proposal in our view would diminish children's safety. We have had first hand experience of verbal abuse from freedom campers overnighiting along our road boundary. When asking a camper not to toilet on our property we were told to 'f*** off'. This was really disturbing and we would not feel safe letting our children play in the reserve if it were a freedom camping area.</li> <li>5. The reserve and swimming hole is pristine and is well looked after and respected by the local community. Our experience with freedom campers is that they usually tend to be young, do not use self contained toilets and would wash/bath in the river/swimming hole. We have found toilet paper and toothpaste spit on our property and fences and I can not see that situation improving.</li> <li>6. I can not see how the Council would adequately monitor and enforce rules at the proposed site. Who would pay the costs for running the facility? If it is the ratepayers why should ratepayers be paying these costs?</li> <li>7. We note that Whitechapple reserve has been dropped from the list of proposed sites. In the QLDC assessment dated July 2021, Whitechapple scored a higher health and safety score of 5 compared to 1 for Morven Ferry. As mentioned above it is our opinion that the proposed Morven Ferry site has significant Health and Safety risk with respect to road access and cyclists. In all other respects the Council Assessment gave the Morven Ferry site the same or great concerns as Whitechapple. it is difficult to see how the Morven Ferry site has remained on the proposed list.</li> </ol> <p>New camping areas should be established as part of new higher density developments or in remote areas similar to current DOC campsites. The Morven Ferry Road site is highly in appropriate for the many reasons given above.</p>
229	Jen	Thomson		No	Oppose	<p>Our community reserve cannot accomodate freedom campers. It is too close residential and business owners that it would impose upon them and their daily activities. There is no way the council could enforce rules for freedoms campers</p>
230	Tony	Stratford		No	Oppose	<p>We do not want Freedom campers around the Arrow junction and Morven ferry area.</p>
231	Ana & Earl	Matheson		Yes	Oppose	<p>We are opposing the draft by law as it is proposing, sites, one of which is right next to our residential property as being a place for freedom camping to occur. The freedom camping act 2011 enables council to make bylaws to refualte freedom camping, unless it is restricted or prohibited in accordance with a bylaw or other acts, such as the Reserves Act.</p> <p>The reason the Gibbston Reserve was sub-divided from our property by the previous owner and sold to the QLDC was for the sole purpose of its use being for the Gibbston community. It was a place specifically set aside for the community to have a central point to gather, hold functions, and to ensure that land was set aside in perpetuity in this special character zone.</p> <p>The council need to ensure that before attempting to make any changes to this special community reserve, that the area is protected, the surrounding residents and business will not be affected, and that there is adequate safe access to the area, and protections are put in place. They also are obliged to take on board the opinions of residents and businesses who will be directly affected by the change, other residents and businesses located on Coal Pit Road, and the great Gibbston Community. These opinions for those directly affected by this proposed change have been already heard loud and clear in the first round of submissions, where the answer was no we do not want the use of our reserve changed and we do not want freedom camping in the Gibbston district. When we first purchased the property the reserve was under utilised and like an open paddock. The previous GCA members asked if we would be open to having trees planted, as previous requests to do so had been denied. We agreed to this under certain provisions. The previous GCA worked with us closely and the results from this have been fantastic. We worked actively with the GCA through years, to make the reserve a more welcoming area. We dug holes for trees, we hand watered these for the first year to ensure establishment and that roots were established that now don't require irrigation, we planted bulbs, and we encouraged people to go there. We are delighted to see the use of this area expand, with Coal Pit Road residents using the space on a daily occurrence, dog walkers, horse riders, cyclists, and commercial operators such as wine tour buses and adventure activity providers, along with tradies. We have had visitors to the reserve from as far away as Japan, and from as close as Arrowtown and Wanaka who made special</p>

					<p>trips to the reserve with their families. The reserve is not suitable for overnight camping or any form of camping due to it being in close proximity to our property. You can see the reserve from our drive, from our lounge window, bathroom window, kitchen window, dining room window, conservatory, outdoor seated area, and bedroom. One part of the reserve looks straight down on to our property and vineyard. Which means privacy is a huge consideration if its use was changed. The council state that camping should be prohibited in residential areas, this is not only a residential area, it is a special character zone, and a rural environment. It is clear from previous experiences that introducing freedom camping to such an area would have extremely negative effects.</p> <p>The previous assessment for freedom camping sites noted both the Gibbston Reserve &amp; the Coal Pit Road as both having significant concerns for the protection of the area, significant concerns for the protection of the area, and some health and safety concerns for vulnerable visitors, it rated 73% as not suitable. This combined with its close proximity to our residential property (note we also run our business from our property), and another residents property, and another business (that has visitors land on the reserve is helicopters) make it a wholly unsuitable area as a freedom camping location in any capacity.</p> <p>The area described as a carpark, is not flat nor is it large. The only gate to the reserve give us access to our water tank which is located on the reserve, and also is the only available access for emergency vehicles to get onto the reserve to access these. We regularly have campers camping in front of these gates that blocks this access.</p> <p>The Coal Pit road is a narrow road, with deep culverts that deal with the flood of rain that comes down from the top of Coal Pit Road, it is wholly unsuitable to encourage campers to be on this road as it is single lane. The only exit is on Gibbston Back Road, which is a narrow single lane windy gravel road, make the only suitable exit entry point being the T-Junction of Coal Pit Road &amp; the Gibbston Highway. Visibility is not the best on this junction, and turning from either direction onto Coal Pit road is generates significant hazards for vehicles such as vans and campers. Turning from Coal Pit Road onto the Gibbston Highway in either direction for vans or campers should not be encouraged, a van or camper needs to accelerate extremely quickly to get up to the 100km speed, and with visibility an issue it is not easy at the best of times.</p> <p>Coal Pit Road is a busy road, with large vehicles such as stock trucks, delivery trucks that service the needs of the wineries and vineyards further up, tractors and other associated farm vehicles, as well as residents go up and down the road on a regular basis.</p> <p>The other concern is the fire risk, in such a windy and dry area, by introducing freedom camping to this area, there is a higher risk of fires starting, especially at night, as they cook or light fires. The trees along the carpark also are a serious health concern, not so long ago a tree fell in the middle of the night, it crashed across the road and smashed and broke the fence in the neighbours vineyard and blocked the road off till it was able to be cleared. This is where a camper would have parked had it been permitted.</p> <p>There is also the issue of noise and visual pollution that this will have an huge adverse affect on our property. We have also had issues of people coming onto our property, stealing fruit, interfering with our sheep and blocking our drive that is needed for our farm vehicle access, and deliveries. Noise late at night of van doors slamming shut, toilets doors being slammed, music, noise and mess being left behind, and for some reason though a toilet is available the trees appear to be the preference.</p> <p>We have woken up to see people on the reserve in their pj's cleaning their teeth and looking at me directly from my kitchen window. Using the toilets as a shower. When the water in the toilets ran out we saw them looking in our water tanks. When wanting access on the reserve through the locked gate, they simply took the gate off the hinges, and drove over it.</p> <p>The impacts of this change would be significant for us being directly affected and the community.</p> <p>There are no controls that can be put into place to make this workable, as the council does not have the adequate funds to monitor this effectively.</p> <p>we do not approve of the change of use of our reserve, we will not welcome it, we do not want it. The Coal Pit Road Community have also spoken strongly that they do not want camping in the area, and the wider Gibbston community also do not want the use of our reserve after to much hard work to make it what it is today taken away from us.</p> <p>Regards, Ana &amp; Earl Coal Pit Road</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

232	Josh	Melville		No	Oppose	<p><b>PRESENT VIDEO</b></p> <p>These comments are from the Melville/Weber kids.</p> <p>James... I object to freedom campers because it's a local place for local people! People should pay and stay in camp grounds away from peoples homes and animals. They might disturb and scare the horses.</p> <p>Flynn... there will be too many cars and too much rubbish! The walks and bike rides will be crowded. The water hole won't be a secret anymore!</p> <p>Ruby... we live here! We don't want people camping, the rubbish and loud music.</p> <p>Thank you</p> <p>Josh: I like swimming there. It's a cool swimming spot. Don't make it a freedom camping spot as I don't want poo in the water or in the bushes.</p> <p>Also some tourists aren't the best drivers so they can hit people on their bikes on the biking trail as it is a road shared by both.</p> <p>Bede: there will be heaps of tourists there and it is busy enough as it is. There will be nowhere to sit and enjoy.</p> <p>They would like to have a video presented at the hearing</p>
233	duncan	forsyth	Mount Edward Wines	Yes	Oppose	<p><b>Refer separate detailed submission</b></p> <p>Mount Edward winery is situated at 34 Coalpit Rd Gibbston</p> <p>This is the same address as the Gibbston Reserve</p> <p>We immediately adjoin the reserve with no barriers between the reserve and ourselves.</p> <p>Conclusion:</p> <p>We contend that;</p> <p>Xyst and council officers were remiss in firstly assessing the Gibbston Reserve as a potential site, secondly in not applying criteria used to prohibit this as a site and thirdly in assessing further suitability as a restricted site</p> <p>For these reasons</p> <p>Gibbston Reserve should be excluded from being a potential restricted freedom Camping site</p>
234	Leigh	Dixon	N/a	No	Oppose	<p>I have been an avid camper for years, and not once have freedom camped.</p> <p>The locations stated above are lovely ideal places to camp yes, however do you not think that the residents who paid very good money to live where they do would like to see van after van of freedom campers. I think not. I don't want to be narrow minded when I say such a statement but conclusively talking to residents in the surrounding areas none of whom seemed to be happy with the locations nor the idea.</p> <p>There are many a camp sites near by said areas whom have plenty of space to accommodate the travellers. Not only this but after the recent effects of COVID 19 do you not think that these businesses need the custom, the answer to that is yes. All businesss big or small need any custom they can.</p> <p>The main area which struck me as a big no were the Glenorchy reserve! The American who has gifted the community with the beloved "Camp Glenorchy " has poured millions into this project, not for personal gain but to try something new (sustainability) which Glenorchy folk strongly uphold these principles.</p> <p>If campers want a nice reserve to camp on for a minimal fee then they have a number of DOC sites nearby. After seeing what has happened around the country with freedom camping (including lake Hayes!) people just don't seem to have the responsibility nor the respect to look after these places whilst on holiday.</p> <p>I hope you can appreciate what I have said and hope that there is other avenues we can go down, and ideally one which puts money back into our economy or DOC.</p>
235	Danny	Mollan	me	No	Oppose	<p>You're proposing new freedom camping slots in some very precious and beautiful places, such as the one on Camphill Road near the Wave. That's a bad idea, as this invites pollution of the river, which is almost certainly going to happen. People will wash in the river, clean their pots and pans, and likely worse. It's not appropriate.</p>
236	Toni	Glover	Kinloch Lodge Ltd	Yes	Oppose	<p>Whereas I haven't fully read the byelaw, I only support vans with a fully equipped toilet that is properly used and is certified by VTNZ or similar</p> <p>All campervans should be encouraged to use DOC or other bonafide sites and not to camp in the wild.</p>
237	Si	Fay		No	Neutral	<p>Morven Ferry needs to be removed for the this approved site. Accessibility to the river is too close and far too often we are seeing the Arrow River being used as a bath, a washing up sink and washing machine, we need to protect this delicate icon and do all we can to preserve it.</p>

238	Karen	Roberts		No	Oppose	<p>Kia ora,</p> <p>I do not understand why we support tourist to freedom camp when we have perfectly good locals running many camp grounds around the region. These are fully serviced with showers, toilets and rubbish bins and they are reasonably priced for people looking to sleep in their own vehicles.</p> <p>As a Hawea resident, my family and I adore the river track and spent many days walking and cycling to the wave and swimming in the river. We would be heart broken to see this spot in particular rammed full with cars and vans all summer while we cover the rates for the area and they contribute nothing towards their accommodation.</p> <p>I oppose freedom camping for tourists in general but if there is no other way, these spots should be in undesirable locations i.e on the side of busy main roads and not next to our lakes and rivers. If freedom campers want an idyllic spot, they can go to our beautiful Hawea campground and support our locals here.</p> <p>Nō reira, tēnā koutou katou</p>
239	George	Roberts	N/A	No	Oppose	<p>I oppose all freedom camping in self contained vehicles. The QLDC should not be accommodating freedom campers at the rate payers expense. If people are too tight to pay for accommodation when visiting our region then we don't want them here. They add very little value to this region whilst clogging up our roads and leaving behind their rubbish and shit. If tourists are driving around New Zealand why can they not pay to stay at the many DOC administered camp grounds?</p>
240	Alex	Roberts		No	Support	<p>No freedom camping in general but paid organised carpark with rubbish collection and toilets facilities like in all European countries. Tourists from Europe know this very well and they will be happy to pay the organised car park per day which it will be</p>
241	Nicolet	Simon		No	Oppose	<p>Freedom campers should stay in doc run camping spots so that they can use the income for conservation</p>
242	Roland	Lemaire-Sicre		No	Oppose	<p>freedom camping is a beautiful way to discover a country and to limit the areas where a freedom camper can overnight is to maximise and to had congestion on other allowed areas. I think the problem sit more in:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 the ability the local authority have to fine people doing the wrong thing (i.e.: leave a mess behind...)</li> <li>2 The amount of the fine (it should be in the vicinity of thousand not hundreds of \$; This would be a real deterrent and the news of someone been caught will spread in the freedom camper community like wild fire and therefore achieve its purpose.)</li> <li>3 The enforcement of that fine is really important as if someone get caught and fine but can get away with it when he or she fly home, the only thing achieved here is to expose the idiotic system. (fined campers should not be able to leave the country unpunished.)</li> </ol> <p>I travelled myself for many years and I have learned a great deal throughout my travels. It would have been a real pity to have been kept from been able to set up camp when I needed it (because I was too tide to carry on) or because the place was so nice I wanted to stay a few day there.</p> <p>In a place like Queenstown it is to often thought that freedom campers should be a direct source of income; but to allow them to save some money in some areas allow them to spend in others and also help to maximise the quality of their stay and then they can spread the word to others whom may prefer to stay in hotels.</p>
243	Garth	Swan		Yes	Oppose	<p>We look after the free paying travelers to well. Get me on the stand and and I'll tell you more.....</p> <p>Get me on the stand and and I'll tell you more.....</p>
244	Alastair and Chrissie	Thomas		No		<p>As a ratepayer to the QLDC my wife and myself are totally against any form of freedom camping on the Morven Ferry Reserve. The area is a very important Historical Site. The trail is unsuitable for large self contained trucks as the steepness of the grade and the stability of the track. We are positive that giving access to these campers would be a detriment to this important area. Only really access to the Reserve should be for emergency services and fisherman in four wheel drive vehicles.</p>
245	Alison and Neal	Brown		Yes	?	<p><b>Refer to detailed submission</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Include Hawea Flat as a residential area but extend the boundary to Camphill Road.</li> <li>• Negotiate with DoC to block off access through their land at Willow Bay/Camp Bay.</li> <li>• Enforce compliance.</li> <li>• Ensure the wording in the new bylaw is clear about intentions, definitions, and restrictions and that wording matches corresponding signs and maps.</li> <li>• Do not include car parks as areas for freedom camping even though it is intended that they be for self-contained vehicles only.</li> <li>• Lobby Government to repeal the existing 2011 Freedom Camping Act. Currently it does not meet the needs of this district with the very high numbers of visitors and large areas of land not under Council control, especially LINZ land around lake edges.</li> <li>• Educate New Zealanders about the rights and responsibilities of freedom camping.</li> <li>• Ensure that our environment is respected and cared for.</li> </ul>

246	Brylee	Percy	Lakeside Rugby Club Glenorchy	Yes	Oppose	<b>Refer to detailed submission.</b> Does not support freedom camping in Glenorchy Domain - is within Rugby Club Lease area, concerns around liability, H&S, protection of access
247	Thomas	Jenkins	Canterbury Whitewater	No	Oppose	<b>Refer to detailed submission.</b> Proforma submission. Does not support freedom camping at Camphill due to effects on Hawea Wave
248	Tim Dennison	Dennison	Canterbury Whitewater	No	Oppose	<b>Refer to detailed submission</b> Proforma submission. Does not support freedom camping at Camphill due to effects on Hawea Wave
249	Kevin	Gielink	Canterbury Whitewater	No	Oppose	<b>Refer to detailed submission</b> Proforma submission. Does not support freedom camping at Camphill due to effects on Hawea Wave
250	Matt	Hansen	Canterbury Whitewater	No	Oppose	<b>Refer to detailed submission</b> Proforma submission. Does not support freedom camping at Camphill due to effects on Hawea Wave
251	Emma	Scott	Canterbury Whitewater	No	Oppose	<b>Refer to detailed submission</b> Proforma submission. Does not support freedom camping at Camphill due to effects on Hawea Wave
252	Gordon	Rayner	Central Otago Whitewater Club	Yes	Oppose	Refer to detailed submission. Does not support freedom camping at Camphill due to effects on Hawea Wave. Risks relationship with adjoining private landowner, previous evidence of litter, fires etc
253	Elisabeth	Kleinjan		No	Support	<b>Refer to detailed submission</b> Costs for proper effective enforcement. How will these be recouped? More clarity published on website
254	Esther	Water		Yes	Oppose	<b>Refer to detailed submission</b> Does not support freedom camping at Camphill. EVIDENCE - sighted people washing in river. Loss of carparking. Questions enforcement
255	Fiona	James		No	Oppose	<b>Refer to detailed submission.</b> Campers should be in campgrounds. Does not support camping at Camphill
256	Geoff	Hatten		No	Oppose	<b>Refer to detailed submission.</b> Wanaka well served for camping. No freedom camping
257	Graham	Charles		No	Oppose	<b>Refer to detailed submission</b> Does not support freedom camping at Camphill due to effects on Hawea Wave
258	Helen	Brown	Guardians of Lake Hawea	Yes	Oppose	<b>Refer to detailed submission</b> Expand Hawea Flat Prohibition. Approve Camphill Road Carpark. Include Lake Hawea Holiday Park to The Neck (SH6), Restrict camping on LINZ land
259	Ian	Pentecost		No	Oppose	<b>Refer to detailed submission</b> No camping at Camphill.
260	Janet	Musker		No	Oppose	<b>Refer to detailed submission</b> Proforma submission. Does not support freedom camping at Camphill due to effects on Hawea Wave
261	Jo Haines	Alan Cutler		No	Oppose	<b>Refer to detailed submission</b> No camping at camphill. Detailed submission
262	Jo	Tilson		No	Oppose	<b>Refer to detailed submission</b> Proforma submission. Does not support freedom camping at Camphill due to effects on Hawea Wave
263	Jo	Williams		No	Oppose	<b>Refer to detailed submission</b> Expand prohibited area at Hawea Flat
264	Jonathon and Toni	Bird		Yes	Oppose	<b>Refer to detailed submission</b> from Anderson Lloyd (a) That freedom camping within Queenstown Lakes District be prohibited; (b) That freedom camping at Luggate Red Bridge Reserve be prohibited; (c) That the issues identified in this submission be resolved before freedom camping at Luggate Red Bridge Reserve can be allowed to continue; or (d) Any additional, further or consequential relief necessary to give effect to the matters raised in this submission.
265	Kellie Bailey	Bailey		No	Oppose	<b>Refer to detailed submission</b> Proforma submission. Does not support freedom camping at Camphill due to effects on Hawea Wave
266	Kerrin and Kirsty	Burnnand		?	Oppose	<b>Refer to detailed submission</b> Gibbston Reserve is unsafe and inappropriate for Freedom Camping
267	Lynne	Stewart		No	Oppose	<b>Refer to detailed submission</b> Proforma submission. Does not support freedom camping at Camphill due to effects on Hawea Wave

268	Madelyn	Zoi		No		<p>Thank you for this opportunity to share my thoughts on freedom camping in the QLDC region. I remain mindful of the recent history of freedom camping in our region and am aware that irresponsible campers brought damage, additional costs, and ill-will and discord among local residents. Responsible freedom campers as well as local residents paid a heavy price because of the bad behaviour of a few. So I am pleased to see that -- with consultation from the community -- the draft Freedom Camping By-Law 2021 does include areas where freedom camping will be allowed. My primary concern is that history not repeat itself —</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>. that freedom campers take responsibility and comply with the regulations</li> <li>. that QLDC is not saddled with an impossible task to enforce the irresponsible few with compliance and</li> <li>. that local rates payers are not burdened with additional costs.</li> </ul> <p>This is why I request that as you fine-tune freedom camping regulations that there is sufficient coordination and communication with all appropriate bodies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>. those who create and enforce federal freedom camping laws</li> <li>. those who coordinate federal and regional freedom camping laws</li> <li>. national freedom camping associations</li> <li>. local governing bodies including those in tourism who advise visitors/freedom campers</li> <li>. the freedom campers themselves through websites and signage on the allowed freedom camping areas</li> <li>. local rates payers.</li> </ul> <p>Communication, education and adequate monitoring will enable all responsible parties to all enjoy and benefit from having freedom campers in the community.</p>
269	Neil Sloan	Sloan		No	Oppose	<b>Refer to detailed submission</b> Proforma submission. Does not support freedom camping at Camphill due to effects on Hawea Wave
270	Ngaio	Hart		Yes	Oppose	<b>Refer to detailed submission</b> Detailed Submission. Does not support location of proposed sites where there are negative effects. Camphill
271	James	Imlach	NZMCA	Yes	Oppose	<b>Refer to detailed submission</b> Detailed submission. Bylaw is unlawful. Expand areas to allow freedom camping. Reserves Act delegation
272	Peter	Mitchell		No	Oppose	<b>Refer to detailed submission</b> Proforma submission. Does not support freedom camping at Camphill due to effects on Hawea Wave
273	Peter	Speight		No	?	<p>Congratulations on taking heed of submissions made on a proposal to have a freedom camping site on the foreshore near the Glenorchy marina!</p> <p>Following over 820 public responses already received on a freedom camping survey in July, a number of locations are proposed to allow restricted freedom camping, allowing only certified self-contained vehicles.* These locations are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gibbston Reserve carpark</li> <li>• Glenorchy Domain carpark</li> <li>• Camphill Road carpark</li> <li>• Morven Ferry Reserve</li> <li>• Luggate Red Bridge Reserve</li> </ul> <p>Rather than the Glenorchy Domain carpark as a freedom camping site may I suggest that the newly created carpark and viewing area at Bennetts Bluff would be a far more suitable location. The QLDC having already gone to the expense of carparking and installing toilets should make use of this newly created asset. This would incur minimal additional expenses and there is already signage which caters for campers' needs.</p> <p>Further I believe that freedom camping should not be encouraged within the Glenorchy village area, and we should maintain the current prohibition on such activity. We already have sustainable camp facilities within the village and visitors to our pristine environment should be encouraged to make the most of these facilities!</p> <p>*Further the certification of many supposedly self-contained vehicles should be immediately addressed. I suspect that many vehicles which display the blue sticker do not have a flush toilet and neither do they contain hand washing facilities. They may be reliant on a porta-potty cassette which is not adequate in today's environment, particularly when people choose to not use the potty and go behind the nearest bush to relieve themselves. Therefore I believe we as a community have a great opportunity to raise the standards and encourage campers to be responsible and not abuse our environment!</p>
274	Robin	Rutter-Baumann	Whitewater NZ and Canterbury Whitewater	No	Oppose	<b>Refer to detailed submission</b> Proforma submission. Does not support freedom camping at Camphill due to effects on Hawea Wave

275	Rachel	Brown		Yes		<p>Please accept my late submission.</p> <p>This morning I found the latest edition of Scuttlebutt tucked inside the Wānaka Sun which had only found its way to my letter box late Friday evening. Within the front cover I read that submissions to the Freedom Camping Bylaw were overdue.</p> <p>I have a long and deep history of engagement in this focus area, and would like to make a few salient and helpful points concerning the proposals made.</p> <p>Firstly I fully understand the need for QLDC to provide some freedom camping sites for self-contained vehicles; it cannot under present law forbid camping everywhere.</p> <p>In my local area I can see the balance you are trying to create: ban camping altogether from Hāwea Flat township but provide a site at Camphill Bridge.</p> <p>Please accept the following comments regarding this proposal, based on solid local knowledge.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Any freedom camping prohibition for Hāwea Flat 'township' needs to include all residential property in Hāwea Flat, not just south of Newcastle Road.</li> <li>2. Camphill Bridge car park was partially 'gifted' to be used as a carpark by the former owner of Gimmermore Farm, now part of Devon Dairy. I suggest title is checked.</li> <li>3. Camphill Bridge car park is very heavily used at many times of the day by walkers, dogs, cyclists, fisherfolk, surfers and sight seers. The numbers of camping sites would need to be restricted. I suggest six.</li> <li>4. There is currently no public toilet at the Camphill Bridge car park. I can't think of any other official public camp sites, even for certified self contained vehicles that don't have a toilet. The number of day users at this site should warrant a toilet now; if freedom camping triggers installation of a toilet then the community could be more accepting and understanding of the situation.</li> <li>5. I imagine campers regularly using the Hāwea River for washing. As part of our environmental responsibility I would expect signage requesting no use of soaps etc in the river.</li> <li>6. A large amount of local volunteer labour has gone into planting and trying to beautify the Camphill Bridge car park. If freedom camping is to become part of the picture here, I would ask the council contribute significantly to these efforts to create a space desirable and functional for all.</li> <li>7. I suggest talking to the kayak community who established this area as a destination. They have there own car park and toilet on private land, but working together rather than separately or against, will achieve better results.</li> </ol> <p>Thank you for taking these points into consideration. And let's not lose the term 'responsible camping' which is really what it is all about.</p>
276	Rik	Deaton	LandEscape Wanaka			<p><b>Refer to detailed submission</b> Allow private freedom camping site at LandEscape, conditional on QLDC providing consents, commercial licence on Wanaka Lakefront, QLDC building active travel trail to site.</p> <p>Campers can camp for free if they purchase a 'product' from the landowner and QLDC delivering infrastructure and consents</p>
277	Russell	Godfrey	Otago Canoe and Kayak Club	No	Oppose	<p><b>Refer to detailed submission</b> Proforma submission. Does not support freedom camping at Camphill due to effects on Hawea Wave</p>
278	Sarah	Manning			Support	<p>Supports no camping at Whitechapel The Whitechapel Reserve is wholly unsuitable for freedom camping for a number of reasons, all of which have been extensively set out prior to this, including but not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extremely unsafe access off the main road</li> <li>• Fire risks</li> <li>• Existing cycle trail</li> <li>• Risks to the state of the river</li> <li>• Public health risks</li> <li>• Risk to an area of outstanding natural beauty</li> <li>• Historic places nature of area (historic building in Whitechapel Lane)</li> <li>• Lack of policing (refer to previous issues elsewhere with freedom camping).</li> </ul>
279	Emma	Turner	Sunnyheights and Dublin Bay	Yes	Support with changes	<p><b>Refer to detailed submission</b> Include Dublin Bay Recreation Reserve as prohibited</p>
280	Tony	Ward-Holmes		Yes	Oppose	<p><b>Refer to detailed submission</b> Author of Proforma submission. Does not support freedom camping at Camphill due to effects on Hawea Wave. Consultation process flawed</p>
281	Wayne	Hudson				<p><b>Refer to detailed submission</b> Extend prohibited areas. No camping in urban areas. Issues with NZ standards. Drafting suggestions</p>
282	Hamish	Darling	Whitewater NZ	Yes	Oppose	<p><b>Refer to detailed submission.</b> Rafters Road questioned. No camping at Camphill</p>
283	Margrethre	Helles		No	Oppose	<p><b>Refer to detailed submission</b> Proforma submission. Does not support freedom camping at Camphill due to effects on Hawea Wave</p>

284	Grant	Norbury		No	Oppose	<b>Refer to detailed submission</b> Proforma submission. Does not support freedom camping at Camphill due to effects on Hawea Wave