

## Organisations

Submission ID	Tell us what you think about the new proposed changes to the bylaw	Name	Name of organisation	Your role within organisation
40283	There was only 1 public dump site at Templeton and that was closed because of heavy usage. There are now NO public dump sites in Chch and the only dump sites are at a few service stations. None of the so called public parking buildings will fit a motorhome. Other parking to spend some dollars None. Get a bus or just miss Chch as we do for Queenstown. Well done city council.	Mike Clark	Area 76 NZMCA	member with other duties
40378	<p>The Diamond Harbour Community Association (DHCA) supports the proposed changes and the status quo for the Diamond Harbour area provided the recently installed signage to reserve Park-and-Ride parking places at the Stoddart Point Domain parking place work as intended.</p> <p>Background: In the summers before the COVID 19 pandemic the parking places in the domain were increasingly used by freedom campers, which caused problems for commuters using public transport i.e. ferry and bus. The DHCA approached CCC traffic engineer Andrew Hensley and it was agreed that additional parking places would be created within the space available and that some parking places would be reserved for commuters by erecting Park-and-Ride signage. The signage has been put in place recently, but in the absence of overseas tourists it is not possible to establish if the intended purpose of the signage is achieved. DHCA would like to see around 50% of the existing parking places to be available for commuters as and when needed. If this is best achieved by changing the current bylaw status of part of the Domain parking place from the current "2 Nights" to "No Camping" then we would support such a change of the bylaw. Please note that the parking place in the Stoddart Point Domain and the connecting footpath to the wharf were upgraded and enlarged by Council in 2006 specifically to allow more Park-and-Ride places for commuters using the Diamond Harbour ferry.</p>	Thomas Kulpe	Diamond Harbour Community Association	Committee Member / Treasurer
40393	The Duvauchelle Reserve Management Committee submits that there be no freedom camping permitted in Hayward's Lane, seafield Road or Onawe Flat Road in Duvauchelle	Ian Whenmouth	Duvauchelle Reserve Management Committee	Secretary
40231	<p>As part of the review I think it is important for your staff to speak with stakeholders to get more of an understanding of the issues and possible solutions. I am curious to know who makes the recommendations to the committee? Do they have on the ground experience of issues caused to business and the environment by freedom camping? As a stake holder and an independent campground owner I would like to opportunity to be involved or at least asked how things can be improved, as none of your staff have a good understanding of the issues from a private campground perspective. How do they come up with the changes? I have valid concerns, which the community board have agreed with, but have never actually had these issues addressed.</p> <p>I think it is vital to have a range of views and suggestions, and not just from council staff that think they know the solutions. That may sound harsh but the need to keep changing the bylaw is evidence of a flawed process.</p> <p>Thanks for your time in considering this.</p>	Marcus Puentener	Little River Campground	Holiday Facilitator
40164	I agree with the decision to make the ban in north Beach car park permanent	Anna Barlow-Smith	North beach coffee shed	Owner
40287	I support the proposed changes.	Charles Duke	NZMCA	Member
40346	The New proposed Bylaw is a start but there needs to be a larger NO Camping Zone within an area that has an established Camping Ground Eg: NO Freedom Camping within 5km of an Established and operating Camping Ground or holiday park, Allowing Freedom camping within rage of a Established and operating Camping Ground or holiday park causes a loos of bushiness and also promotes Theft of Facilities and unpaid for uses of Facilities	Sam Hawkins	South Brighton Holiday Park	Director
40288	As Motorhome owners and frequent users we support all the changes proposed, especially tightening up on the definition of self-containment. Thank you	Allan Simpson	Southern Eye Specialists	Southern Eye Specialists

Submission ID	Tell us what you think about the new proposed changes to the bylaw	Name	Name of organisation	Your role within organisation
40383	<p>Proposed Freedom Camping Bylaw 2021 – Submission</p> <p>Over recent years, members of our local community have expressed concern over freedom camping in our area. This led to our discussion with different staff members of the City Council, who advised that changes were unlikely to occur given the restrictive provisions of the Freedom Camping Act and the existing Council bylaws.</p> <p>We are pleased to see that changes are proposed and we trust that our submission will be given due consideration.</p> <p>Firstly, we are grateful that the Council’s existing bylaw protects the Takamatua Bay Road and foreshore. However, we submit that this protection needs to be extended to include all of the area currently allowing 2 nights self-contained camping.</p> <p>In the area of housing incorporating Old French Road, campers regularly ignore the camping disallowed signage and camp along the foreshore area that is protected. Protection of that whole area would make it much clearer that camping along the foreshore was prohibited.</p> <p>Protection needs to be extended to include the tightly populated bay area that incorporates Quail Crescent, Bellbird Lane, McRae’s Road, Fantail Lane, Kingfisher Road, Kotare Lane and Lushingtons Bay Road, which is particularly unsuitable for freedom camping.</p> <p>All of that area involves roads that are very narrow and, in the past, campers on the verges have created unnecessary dangers to the safety of both passing vehicles and the campers themselves. In addition, there have been a number of occasions over the years when local residents have assisted campers to move their vehicles from difficult situations. This includes the use of local tractors to pull these vehicles out of roadside ditches and drains. Fortunately, to date there has been no personal harm that we are aware of, but vehicle damage has certainly occurred.</p> <p>Furthermore, there are no exits or turning bays available for campers entering the aforementioned streets/roads, and campers are often reliant on turning into private driveways to turn around and exit. The steep nature of many roadways can make that hazardous for campers, as well as residents. We often see campers travel into this area only to find that it is unsuitable and immediately depart.</p> <p>We note that the narrow streets of Akaroa are duly protected from this danger, as is the residential area of Birdlings Flat, and we are strongly of the view that camping access on the aforementioned streets/road in our area is similarly dangerous and should be protected.</p> <p>It should also be noted that for several years there has been ongoing housing construction in the area (currently 4 in progress and 3 more planned), and the entry and exit of related large service vehicles on these roads has created, and will continue to create, potentially dangerous situations for freedom campers.</p> <p>We look forward to your consideration of our submission, and would be happy to respond to any queries that might arise.</p>	Garth Tiffen	Takamatua Ratepayers Association Incorporated	Treasurer and committee member
40242	<p>Thank you for engaging us as this is very relevant to our community. We think the proposals are ok but are concerned about who will enforce them. We noticed that many campervans currently do not abide by the current rules and get away with this because enforce rules are not instant or followed up. More people need to be employed to do this and definitely a full time person for Marine Parade and the East of Christchurch. Yours Waimairi Beach Residents.</p>	Waimairi Beach Residents Association Jo Emson	Waimairi Beach Residents Association	Secretary

## Individuals

Submission ID	Tell us what you think about the new proposed changes to the bylaw	Name
40256	<p>Updating Self containment regulations agree.</p> <p>Restricting access to non self contained vehicles agree.</p> <p>Limiting stays to 2 nights minimum agree.</p> <p>Closing freedom camping areas for self contained vehicles strongly disagree.</p> <p>These towns will be boycotted by travelers and locals will not get the business. We will see them as non friendly Motorhome cities log that info into travel maps and apps and drive right past them.</p>	Doug Meyer
40219	definitely no freedom camping in South shore the area is too small	noelene nunnink
40402	<p>CCC Freedom Camping submission 2021</p> <p>Freedom camping is an important part of New Zealand culture. It allows New Zealanders whether rich or poor to use their right to explore their own country. And, assists keeping many Kiwi's taking their holidays in New Zealand rather than the overseas. This helps the local economy and also our overseas exchange balance. A win-win for the country. Freedom camping is an important part of this.</p> <p>Christchurch is a popular destination for motor homes from the South Island and beyond. This brings a range of visitors to enjoy the cities attractions and in doing so has economic benefits for the city. Additionally, the Christchurch Council area with 1/3 of the population of the South Island presumably means 1/3 of South Island motor homes reside here.</p> <p>Local motor homers also travel within Christchurch. For example, elderly and others use their motor homes to visit the beach and other areas as it provides home comforts and at times makes it easier for their health issues. This adds to the perception that there are 'too many' motor homes. Some are just using a larger vehicle than their car. Similarly some local residents also use their motor homes for night away change of scenery. This includes Naval point and beyond.</p> <p>One way to increase number of motor home sites at Naval point to above 18 would be to allow extra spaces/area during weekdays so as to allow better utilisation during the lower use non-weekend periods.</p> <p>It is a pity that an area of the Red zone can not be utilised for freedom camping as a way of assisting moving vehicles away from the beach. For example, the Red zone area between Union street and the Avon River north of Admirals Way is within walking distance of the beach 2 blocks away. Having Motor homes close to New Brighton should also help boost local shopping.</p> <p>Council should consider using the term Responsible camping in the place of Freedom camping as it alters the perception to a more positive mind frame of both those undertaking the activity and community members.</p>	Don Lovett
40401	<p>While I appreciate that CCC is doing its best to please everyone, i do not believe that there is a place for freedom camping in Christchurch, or anywhere else in New Zealand for that matter. We saw the havoc that was created by freedom campers prior to the Covid-19 lockdown and we should not allow our country to return to that situation:- rubbish strewn around the landscape - dumping of toilet waste on our roadsides and in our rivers and streams- abusive behaviour- partying until early in the morning with no respect for nearby residents These are just a few examples of what allowing freedom camping can lead to. New Zealand is endowed with many designated camping sites including very reasonably priced sites managed by DOC - these are specially designed for camping so there is no need to allow freedom camping. If people can afford to hire/buy a camper van then they can afford to pay for the use of designated camping sites. Christchurch City Council should ban all freedom camping within its boundaries!</p>	Mike Currie

Submission ID	Tell us what you think about the new proposed changes to the bylaw	Name
40388	<p>Proposed Freedom Camping Bylaw 2021 – Submission</p> <p>Over recent years, many of us in the community have expressed concern over freedom camping in our area. A representative of our ratepayers' association raised the issue with City Council staff and reported back that under present legislation there were limited grounds to address our concerns and make changes under the existing Council bylaws.</p> <p>Although the Council's existing bylaw protects the Takamatua Bay Road and foreshore, we submit that this protection needs to be extended to include all of the area currently allowing 2 nights self-contained camping. In the area of housing incorporating Old French Road, campers regularly ignore the camping disallowed signage and camp along the foreshore area that is protected. Protection of the whole area would make it clearer that camping along the foreshore was prohibited.</p> <p>The bay area that incorporates Quail Crescent, Bellbird Lane, McRae's Road, Fantail Lane, Kingfisher Road, Kotare Lane and Lushingtons Bay Road is particularly unsuitable for freedom camping and should be included in the 2021 bylaw protection. All of that area involves roads that are very narrow and, in the past, campers on the very limited verges have created unnecessary dangers to the safety of both passing vehicles and the campers themselves. There have been a number of occasions over the years when local residents have assisted campers to move their vehicles from difficult situations. This includes the use of local tractors to pull these vehicles out of roadside ditches/drains on several occasions. Fortunately, to date there has been no personal harm that we are aware of, but vehicle damage has certainly occurred.</p> <p>It should be noted that there are no exits or turning bays available for campers entering the aforementioned streets/roads, and campers are often reliant on turning into private driveways to turn around and exit. The steep nature of many roadways can make that hazardous for campers, and residents. We often see campers travel into this area only to find that it is unsuitable and leave immediately.</p> <p>We note that the narrow streets of Akaroa are duly protected from this danger, as is the residential area of Birdlings Flat, and we are strongly of the view that camping access on the aforementioned streets/road in our area is similarly dangerous and should be prohibited.</p> <p>It should also be noted that for several years there has been ongoing housing construction in the area (currently 3 in progress), and the entry and exit of related large service vehicles has created, and will continue to create, dangerous situations for freedom campers.</p> <p>We look forward to your favourable consideration.</p>	Darryl and Martine Swann
40387	<p>Over recent years, many of us in the community have expressed concern over freedom camping in our area. A representative of our ratepayers' association raised the issue with City Council staff and reported back that under present legislation there were limited grounds to address our concerns and make changes under the existing Council bylaws.</p> <p>Although the Council's existing bylaw protects the Takamatua Bay Road and foreshore, we submit that this protection needs to be extended to include all of the area currently allowing 2 nights self-contained camping. In the area of housing incorporating Old French Road, campers regularly ignore the camping disallowed signage and camp along the foreshore area that is protected. Protection of the whole area would make it clearer that camping along the foreshore was prohibited.</p> <p>The bay area that incorporates Quail Crescent, Bellbird Lane, McRae's Road, Fantail Lane, Kingfisher Road, Kotare Lane and Lushingtons Bay Road is particularly unsuitable for freedom camping and should be included in the 2021 bylaw protection. As a resident in Lushingtons Bay Road, it is not acceptable that freedom campers could park anywhere on my private property as the current maps indicate. This is a residential area and should be treated in the same way as Akaroa, i.e. Freedom Camping prohibited.</p> <p>We have seen evidence (multiple instances) of freedom campers parked nearby where the camper waste was dumped on the street and run down to the storm water drain. Even in self contained campers, there is no guarantee that this will not happen again.</p>	Graeme Bryant

Submission ID	Tell us what you think about the new proposed changes to the bylaw	Name
40385	<p>Over recent years, many of us in the community have expressed concern over freedom camping in our area. A representative of our ratepayers' association raised the issue with City Council staff and reported back that under present legislation there were limited grounds to address our concerns and make changes under the existing Council bylaws.</p> <p>Although the Council's existing bylaw protects the Takamatua Bay Road and foreshore, I submit that this protection needs to be extended to include all of the area currently allowing 2 nights self-contained camping. In the area of housing incorporating Old French Road, campers regularly ignore the camping disallowed signage and camp along the foreshore area that is protected. Protection of the whole area would make it clearer that camping along the foreshore was prohibited.</p> <p>The bay area that incorporates Quail Crescent, Bellbird Lane, McRae's Road, Fantail Lane, Kingfisher Road, Kotare Lane and Lushingtons Bay Road is particularly unsuitable for freedom camping and should be included in the 2021 bylaw protection. All of that area involves roads that are very narrow and, in the past, campers on the very limited verges have created unnecessary dangers to the safety of both passing vehicles and the campers themselves. There have been a number of occasions over the years when local residents have assisted campers to move their vehicles from difficult situations. This includes the use of local tractors to pull these vehicles out of roadside ditches/drains on several occasions. Fortunately, to date there has been no personal harm that we are aware of, but vehicle damage has certainly occurred.</p> <p>It should be noted that there are no exits or turning bays available for campers entering the aforementioned streets/roads, and campers are often reliant on turning into private driveways to turn around and exit. The steep nature of many roadways can make that hazardous for campers, and residents. We often see campers travel into this area only to find that it is unsuitable and leave immediately.</p> <p>I note that the narrow streets of Akaroa are duly protected from this danger, as is the residential area of Birdlings Flat, and we are strongly of the view that camping access on the aforementioned streets/road in our area is similarly dangerous and should be prohibited.</p> <p>It should also be noted that for several years there has been ongoing housing construction in the area (currently 4 in progress with 3 more planned), and the entry and exit of related large service vehicles has created, and will continue to create, dangerous situations for freedom campers.</p> <p>I look forward to your favourable consideration.</p>	Robin Tiffen
40384	<p>Over recent years, many of us in the community have expressed concern over freedom camping in our area. A representative of our ratepayers' association raised the issue with City Council staff and reported back that under present legislation there were limited grounds to address our concerns and make changes under the existing Council bylaws. Although the Council's existing bylaw protects the Takamatua Bay Road and foreshore, I submit that this protection needs to be extended to include all of the area currently allowing 2 nights self-contained camping. In the area of housing incorporating Old French Road, campers regularly ignore the camping disallowed signage and camp along the foreshore area that is protected. Protection of the whole area would make it clearer that camping along the foreshore was prohibited. The bay area that incorporates Quail Crescent, Bellbird Lane, McRae's Road, Fantail Lane, Kingfisher Road, Kotare Lane and Lushingtons Bay Road is particularly unsuitable for freedom camping and should be included in the 2021 bylaw protection. All of that area involves roads that are very narrow and, in the past, campers on the very limited verges have created unnecessary dangers to the safety of both passing vehicles and the campers themselves. There have been a number of occasions over the years when local residents have assisted campers to move their vehicles from difficult situations. This includes the use of local tractors to pull these vehicles out of roadside ditches/drains on several occasions. Fortunately, to date there has been no personal harm that we are aware of, but vehicle damage has certainly occurred. It should be noted that there are no exits or turning bays available for campers entering the aforementioned streets/roads, and campers are often reliant on turning into private driveways to turn around and exit. The steep nature of many roadways can make that hazardous for campers, and residents. We often see campers travel into this area only to find that it is unsuitable and leave immediately. I note that the narrow streets of Akaroa are duly protected from this danger, as is the residential area of Birdlings Flat, and we are strongly of the view that camping access on the aforementioned streets/road in our area is similarly dangerous and should be prohibited. It should also be noted that for several years there has been ongoing housing construction in the area (currently 4 in progress with 3 more planned), and the entry and exit of related large service vehicles has created, and will continue to create, dangerous situations for freedom campers. I look forward to your favourable consideration.</p>	Garth Tiffen
40382	Generally supportive	Anne Schlumpf

Submission ID	Tell us what you think about the new proposed changes to the bylaw	Name
40381	Generally supportive	Michael Schlumpf
40376	I totally agree with the proposals. They are fair to all.	Mandy Holdstock
40374	I agree with the proposed submissions regarding the freedom camping. The rental companies/ and private owners with vehicles with just the "blue sticker"NZS5465 should be stopped from freedom camping. My husband and I along with thousands of other kiwis are members of the NZMCA and have done the right thing enabling us the privilege of being able to freedom camping.	Sue McNish
40370	<p>I strongly support the updating of the definition of “certified self-contained vehicle” to reflect an amendment to the Standard (NZS 5465:2001 A2).</p> <p>We are caravan owners although we do not freedom camp - we tend to use camping grounds and the NZMCA owned parks. We have a proper toilet in our ensuite and therefore do not have to rely on public toilets.</p> <p>We have seen many small vans and companies such as Jucy in our travels and there is no way these vans can facilitate the use of a toilet while the bed is down - they would have to be contortionists to achieve this. We are also aware that the van companies charge the renters extra for cleaning their onboard toilets so they avoid using them as another way of saving money.</p> <p>Ideally I would like to see these small vans banned as self-contained options and the 2017 changes are a move in the right direction. The 2017 regulations need to be monitored and those looking for a cheap holiday and pooing in our public areas need to pay the true cost of their travel as we do.</p>	Debbie Dawson
40358	I have been a couch surfing host for many years and have found my guests to be responsible and respectful 95% of the time. I feel like NZ is moving towards a more and more restrictive approach towards activities that used to be part of the Kiwi experience including freedom camping. Young people need to experience times of freedom during their lives for healthy development and we have the opportunity to provide this in a gesture of good will, friendliness and public health / mental wellbeing at very little public expensed or inconvenience. Further restricting freedom camping (which is already managed in a way that minimizes public disturbance) is therefore unnecessary and creates difficulties for people who wish to experience this freedom and the social fiber and international friendships that grow with it. In particular I object to the limiting and impractical for people wishing to sell-on their campervan for instance, or while seeking employment if fund have dried up. Impoverished members of the community could be forced from their vehicles on to the streets through this, as a Lyttelton resident am also against reducing Naval Point capacity (which is working well currently)	Benjamin Wolpert
40348	We need more understanding and support for honest camping, families need to stay together these days and are socially so important for ALL	Murray Kirk
40347	<p>We don't agree that Southshore should have freedom campers at all and it should be prohibited from Caspian St to the Southshore Spit. We have enough issues down here if we have to evacuate at any time without adding extra caravans, buses, campervans etc.</p> <p>The safety and wellbeing of the Southshore Community should have been taken into account before any thought was given to the proposed changes for freedom campers.</p> <p>We also have a huge fire risk in the dunes during the summer months. Most residents are aware of this and are careful but that doesn't mean that all freedom campers will do the same.</p> <p>The only available space for freedom campers at Southshore is in the side streets so they have to park up outside</p> <p>Resident's homes. This is highly unsatisfactory as not all freedom campers cook in their vans or stay inside them all day/night so where do they cook and set up to eat, we assume on the road or footpath, where do they hang their washing, from cabbage tree to cabbage tree along the berm.</p> <p>How many freedom campers will be allowed to park in a side street at any one time, where will the parking be for resident's that don't have room inside their property to park their vehicles?</p> <p>There is enough broken bottles, rubbish, condoms etc dumped in our side streets now from cars that have people sleeping in them or using the side streets for their night time activities.</p> <p>Who will patrol Southshore and check that freedom campers are moving on and who will be available for complaints?</p> <p>Who is going to patrol how long they stay for and who will be available for complaints?</p>	Gaye Meffan

## **Proposed Freedom Camping Bylaw 2021 – Submission**

Over recent years, I have often been concerned over freedom camping in our area. I am aware that there are limited grounds to address concerns and make changes under the existing Council bylaws.

Although the Council's existing bylaw protects the Takamatua Bay Road and foreshore, I submit that this protection needs to be extended to include all of the area currently allowing 2 nights self-contained camping. In the area of housing incorporating Old French Road, campers regularly ignore the camping disallowed signage and camp along the foreshore area that is protected. Protection of the whole area would make it clearer that camping along the foreshore was prohibited.

The bay area that incorporates Quail Crescent, Bellbird Lane, McRae's Road, Fantail Lane, Kingfisher Road, Kotare Lane and Lushingtons Bay Road is particularly unsuitable for freedom camping and should be included in the 2021 bylaw protection. All of that area involves roads that are very narrow and, in the past, campers on the very limited verges have created unnecessary dangers to the safety of both passing vehicles and the campers themselves. There have been a number of occasions over the years when local residents have assisted campers to move their vehicles from difficult situations. This includes the use of local tractors to pull these vehicles out of roadside ditches/drains on several occasions. Fortunately, to date there has been no personal harm that we are aware of, but vehicle damage has certainly occurred.

It should be noted that there are no exits or turning bays available for campers entering the aforementioned streets/roads, and campers are often reliant on turning into private driveways to turn around and exit. The steep nature of many roadways can make that hazardous for campers, and residents. We often see campers travel into this area only to find that it is unsuitable and leave immediately.

We note that the narrow streets of Akaroa are duly protected from this danger, as is the residential area of Birdlings Flat, and we are strongly of the view that camping access on the aforementioned streets/roads in our area is similarly dangerous and should be prohibited.

It should also be noted that for several years there has been ongoing housing construction in the area (currently 3 in progress), and the entry and exit of related large service vehicles has created, and will continue to create, dangerous situations for freedom campers.

We look forward to your favourable consideration.

## **Proposed Freedom Camping Bylaw 2021 – Submission**

Over recent years, I have often been concerned over freedom camping in our area. I am aware that there are limited grounds to address concerns and make changes under the existing Council bylaws.

Although the Council's existing bylaw protects the Takamatua Bay Road and foreshore, I submit that this protection needs to be extended to include all of the area currently allowing 2 nights self-contained camping. In the area of housing incorporating Old French Road, campers regularly ignore the camping disallowed signage and camp along the foreshore area that is protected. Protection of the whole area would make it clearer that camping along the foreshore was prohibited.

The bay area that incorporates Quail Crescent, Bellbird Lane, McRae's Road, Fantail Lane, Kingfisher Road, Kotare Lane and Lushingtons Bay Road is particularly unsuitable for freedom camping and should be included in the 2021 bylaw protection. All of that area involves roads that are very narrow and, in the past, campers on the very limited verges have created unnecessary dangers to the safety of both passing vehicles and the campers themselves. There have been a number of occasions over the years when local residents have assisted campers to move their vehicles from difficult situations. This includes the use of local tractors to pull these vehicles out of roadside ditches/drains on several occasions. Fortunately, to date there has been no personal harm that we are aware of, but vehicle damage has certainly occurred.

It should be noted that there are no exits or turning bays available for campers entering the aforementioned streets/roads, and campers are often reliant on turning into private driveways to turn around and exit. The steep nature of many roadways can make that hazardous for campers, and residents. We often see campers travel into this area only to find that it is unsuitable and leave immediately.

We note that the narrow streets of Akaroa are duly protected from this danger, as is the residential area of Birdlings Flat, and we are strongly of the view that camping access on the aforementioned streets/roads in our area is similarly dangerous and should be prohibited.

It should also be noted that for several years there has been ongoing housing construction in the area (currently 3 in progress), and the entry and exit of related large service vehicles has created, and will continue to create, dangerous situations for freedom campers.

We look forward to your favourable consideration.



Submission ID	Tell us what you think about the new proposed changes to the bylaw	Name
	<p>Southshore is certainly NOT a suitable area for freedom campers.</p>	
40312	<p>To whom it may concern..</p> <p>re :: Lack of Dump Stations in and around Christchurch</p> <p>According to the Christchurch City Council website (<a href="https://ccc.govt.nz/rec-and-sport/camping">https://ccc.govt.nz/rec-and-sport/camping</a>), there are no publicly provided dump stations in the area. There are a small number of such facilities shown that have been provided by local businesses, such as Service stations and Camping Grounds. Only a few of these facilities are available 'free of charge', most have a charge for use.</p> <p>This is unlike neighboring district councils who provide numerous 'free of charge' public Dump Station facilities. There are at least seven 'free' dump stations in the Selwyn District and several in both in the Ashburton and Hurunui Districts.</p> <p>For a city, and district the size of Christchurch, this lack of dump station facilities is, I consider shameful.</p> <p>I have been in numerous conversations with visiting fellow Motor-homer's and Caravaner's, many from the North Island, who all state that the lack of these facilities deters them from stopping in the area.</p> <p>I would suggest that if the Christchurch City Council wishes to encourage responsible 'freedom camping' in the district, it seriously consider providing additional public dump station facilities. Not just to overcome the issue of irresponsible, and illegal dumping of waste, but encouraging responsible Motor Homer's and Caravaner's to stay and spend their money in the City.</p>	John McIntosh
40311	<p>The Act and By-law does not go far enough to prevent vehicles without a dedicated enclosed toilet and bathroom area from parking in freedom camping areas where there are no toilet or other hygiene facilities. We have had properly self contained certified since 1985, and have witnessed so many instances of people camping in poorly equipped vehicles in DOC camp sites and in parking areas around the South Island and seen many many instances of the occupants walking into the bush and defecating rather than using a portapotti in front of the other vehicle occupants. I have seen this happening even when there is a long drop toilet provided nearby, but these are usually pretty basic and not up to the standard a foreign traveler would expect, so they do not use them and mess up our countryside. Does there need to be some sort of WOF check of these types of freedom "crapper" (my grandchildren's definition of these vehicles) with shonky self containment stickers and inadequate facilities that clearly identifies that they can only be used in a camping ground with appropriate facilities, and with appropriate penalties if found staying overnight in areas without such facilities. A much higher overseas visitor entry fee into our country would provide money for more toilet facilities at popular beaches and lakes and rest areas on our main tourist routes, and pay for daily maintenance of them so that they are clean and visitors will use them.</p>	Bruce Glennie
40303	<p>These are logical proposals for the right reasons, but we do need to not exclude too many visitors to the city who may be legitimate freedom campers who visit the city and its events, places of interest etc. Why can overnight camping not be permitted in the CAPA grounds - there are power points already installed for instance - perhaps a donation/or honesty box with maximum 2 nights stay etc. Is so close to city, close to arterial roads - bare land sitting empty 99% of the year.</p>	Christine Rodda
40301	<p>I thinks the proposals are fair and reasonable to all. one of the most important points is the certification by approved persons and that would include certified NZMCA people.</p>	Paul Stevens

Submission ID	Tell us what you think about the new proposed changes to the bylaw	Name
40296	I support the council in all its actions to manage freedom camping. Vehicles without a proper waste system must use campgrounds or areas with proper toilet facilities.	Wendy Biggs
40294	<p>I OPPOSE some sections in the council's proposal to amend the Freedom Camping Bylaw. PROPOSAL 1 - of 'updating the definition of “certified self-contained vehicle” to reflect an amendment to the Standard (NZS 5465:2001 A2).' I do not oppose this proposal, since most New Zealanders already infer that 'certified' self contained is referring to vehicles certified to the NZS 5465:2001 A2. PROPOSAL 2 - on 'adding a clause to prevent campers from setting-up in a way that blocks thoroughfares'. I do not oppose this proposal since it is common decency not to block the public's access to public spaces. PROPOSAL 3 - on 'improving the process to temporarily waive or modify parts of the bylaw to enable camping for organised events.' I do not oppose this proposal, with the caveat that the change does not unilaterally empower council to prevent organised events without just cause. PROPOSAL 4 - on 'proposing a new prohibited freedom camping area at North Beach Car Park, New Brighton, to enable better public access. This would replace the current temporary ban with a permanent ban'. I DO NOT support giving the council unilateral powers to permanently ban freedom camping in an area that has fewer campers now than at the time when the temporary ban was imposed. More over, a large portion of the campers using the area at the time of the temporary ban's implementation was foreign travelers. Those same foreign travelers have now been replaced with New Zealanders exploring their country. Limitations to their freedom to do so should not be imposed without further consultation of a wider group of stakeholders from around New Zealand who travel through the area as part of a greater trip. PROPOSAL 5 - on 'creating a new zone, the City Coastal Restricted Zone, where camping in self-contained vehicles would be allowed for up to four nights in any 30-day period, with no more than two nights in any location'. I OPPOSE this proposal. By the figures stipulated in point 25 of council's meeting on the subject, held Wednesday 28 April 2021, there are fewer complaints regarding freedom campers in the are, and fewer fines issued. There are also fewer campers in the area post Covid. I drive past the Marine Parade freedom camping area every single day. The number of campers have dropped significantly. On many mornings, there are only a handful of campers dispersed throughout the spots available on the road. The council's proposal to change the 2 days - 500m rule is ridiculous, considering the amount of campers in the area. Furthermore, tightening the rule for a larger area than where the actual (and past) hotspot is (Marine Parade) feels more ambitious land grabbing on the part of the council. Do not limit the few freedoms that New Zealanders have available to them. Kiwi's (historically a traveling, exploring nation) no longer have access to international travel and are forced to explore their own back yard. That means slow travel, and exploring local areas in more depth than before. The council plans to limit this by shewing them off public land under the rather weak pretense of getting rid of a few overstayers. PROPOSAL 6 - on 'how we manage freedom camping at Te Nukutai o Tapoa Naval Point marine and recreation area in Lyttelton'. I DO NOT support this proposal. To my points above, there are now fewer campers post Covid than in the early years of the Freedom Camping Act 2015. This is particularly so in Lyttelton. Any person who has spent time in Lyttelton over the last year or so can attest to the REAL issue at Naval Point - boy racers. Frankly, the few freedom campers who dare to park at Naval Point are frequently harassed by boy racers spinning, polluting and hurling abuse at them late at night. I have frequently picked up after them the next morning when I take my dog for a walk and talk to the handful of campers who withstood the abuse. The council states that there are currently 'no limits for how many freedom campers may use the area'. I sincerely doubt that the council encountered masses of unruly freedom campers in the area, since parking anywhere but behind the small barrier as you enter on the left will leave you directly in the path of boy racers coming through. PROPOSAL 7 - on 'improving the description and map of the prohibited area at Windsport Park, near the Avon-Heathcote Estuary / Te Ihutai' I do not oppose this proposal.</p>	Edna Lottering
40291	<p>Like many “campers” we own a certified self contained vehicle which easily met the NZ Standard,so my concern is not for these type of vehicles which we and others have chosen to do our camping in, including freedom camping.I am concerned that the use of the ‘certified’ concept will exclude those campers who have chosen a vehicle which does not meet the strict words of the standard ,or do not have the resources to do so,but who can satisfactorily meet the requirements of waste retention by other means.This could include smaller van campers.Freedom camping is a Nzer’s right ,in my opinion ,and it is unfair to arbitrarily deny us this.I ask that the standard is dropped from the new policy UNLESS the council is prepared to introduce a further classification which allows non-certified but responsible camping close to public toilet facilities for those who do not meet the Standard exactly in regard to toileting but who can contain waste in other ways.Access to public toilets 24/7 could provide a belts and braces solution.Other districts have gone further providing toilets and basic rubbish and wash up facilities .(eg Dunedin CC at Brighton)</p> <p>This would require a different approach from the council ...more inclusive ,less accepting of NIMBY reactions.Perhaps inevitably there would be a need to provide toilet facilities and ,in the Christchurch context, open up sites within prohibited or restricted areas.As campers both in NZ and in Australia we note that comparatively CCC does little to accommodate camping especially in regard to dump stations ,available toilet facilities or whatever.</p> <p>The preamble to the ‘new’ regulations states that the council must every 5 years consult even if no changes are proposed.It would seem to follow then that it should also be prepared to discuss existing policy in a more open way, allowing for reconsideration of already established policy.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment</p>	Wayne Thomas

Submission ID	Tell us what you think about the new proposed changes to the bylaw	Name
40290	I think that there should be a designated area within the Central City for self contained vehicles to stay for one or two nights in the CBD. This works well in Wellington and other towns and allows people to explore and spend within the central city area. I suggest the carpark opposite the Old Government Buildings as an ideal location -0 say 6 or 8 parks only. Fee paid on parking machine. No prebooking needed. Arrival required between 3 and 6 pm. Thankyou for your attention.	jeremy evison
40286	I would like visitors with a campervan or caravan who are staying with friends in a residential area be able to park on the road outside the house if they are unable to park in the driveway, without fear of being moved on in the middle of the night. Both self contained or unself contained, as homes provided the toilet facilities.	Sue ALDERMAN
40285	The windsport park should be made much larger, with toilets and proper facilities. Hard standing would be appreciated for campervans. Please plant some shelter from the easterly wind. This is a lovely location, and you should encourage active participants as well as less active people to stay a few days and enjoy watching the sports.	Bonnie Miller Perry
40281	I feel that the proposed changes, while addressing concerns as indicated fail to recognise that as numbers of restricted campers increase, places need to be provided for these people to stay overnight. It is simply putting your head in the sand to continually restrict without recognizing the need to provide additional suitable sites and services.  Consider for a moment that you are traveling around New Zealand as a responsible camper and arrive in Christchurch in the early evening. Your budget does not extend to staying in a motor camp which may be full anyway, so you try the identified locations without any way of knowing whether they have space available. If they have no space then you are effectively forced to camp in a prohibited location and hope that you are not caught.  Ensuring that there are plenty of available spaces in reasonably desirable areas and providing some way such as using the internet, to establish if these have vacancies is essential, if not immediately , then within a reasonable future time frame and therefore should be framed in these regulations.  IMHO, As an example of an inadequate option, the Akaroa freedom limited camping spot on the north end of the town near the jetty and reserve fails to provide for people arriving and seeking to stay in the area when numbers get higher. This just forces them to go to unsuitable locations.	George Elder
40273	The inclusion of the SouthShore spit within the City Coastal Restricted Zone will result in an increase of freedom campers in a residential area. There are no appropriate off street vehicle parking / camping spaces anywhere on Rocking Horse Rd, or its side streets. As a result anyone freedom camping in the SouthShore are will do so within meters of a private (and often family) home. This is not appropriate, and is not commensurate with other Restricted Freedom Camping Areas - which are often many meters away from private housing.  There is also a lack of public toilets and rubbish facilities south of the South Brighton Surf Club - which also makes this area unsuitable for freedom camping.  I suggest that the City Coastal Restricted Zone should be limited to between North New Brighton and New Brighton Surf Clubs - well away from any residential housing.  Alternately, a City Central Restricted Zone could be developed using the car parks by the Botanic Gardens - which would also be away from residential housing.	Mark Smith
40271	I don't want to have freedom camping along Marine Parade, Estuary Road or Southshore area as there is a camping ground available in the area.  Unfortunately most of these campers impact the area with their rubbish and behaviour.They don't pay any rates and impact the residents negatively.	Kate Latimer
40270	I disagree with the inclusion of Rockinghorse Rd in the freedom camping coastal zone. This area is a residential area with very few areas that could accommodate freedom campers, the side streets are often used for residents parking and we currently have enough issues with increased crime recently and visitors leaving rubbish behind etc. I believe it would be hard for the council to enforce the rules and the community will end up suffering the consequences.	Julie Cullen
40268	Why Southshore - there are no public parks only street side where will they park, where will they put their rubbish (possibly use our red bins) let alone go to the toilet.  Freedom camping is great where it is in an appropriate area but Southshore surely isn't the right place to allow freedom camping.  Campers from North Beach and New Brighton are prohibited from Oct-May over the weekends but opening up Southshore as an alternative for them? Definitely not happy about it.  Brighton has a nice campground - maybe it needs to be arranged/discussed with them if they can offer any cheap solutions for freedom campers.	Nicole Ritchie
40267	I think that they are excellent as especially in the North Beach areas these campers dominate all of the parking spaces and it often looks like a camping ground as they spread out tables and chairs.	Meredyth Anderson

Submission ID	Tell us what you think about the new proposed changes to the bylaw	Name
40266	Sounds good and will improve the situation in Brighton.	Doris Peleikis
40255	I think they sound like a sensible balance of community needs vs allowing some freedom camping. I support the changes.	Alison Middelkoop
40253	As a South New Brighton resident, I have seen the negative impact of freedom camping. This is usually in the form of urine & faeces around our beautiful paths in the dunes & near where vehicles can park. No more. I do not want freedom camping to be anywhere in our community. We are seeing lots of anti social behaviour with the freedom campers & little police presence in the area at night. This unruly behaviour is unsafe for our community.	Tayanita Scott
40252	Absolutely not! that's what camping grounds are for.	Brett and Wendy Pope
40250	I would prefer much stricter rules re Freedom Camping than what is proposed. We have some very well-designed, well-managed campgrounds, most of which have reasonable charges and are located in convenient, popular locations. Allowing freedom camping is putting many of these campgrounds at risk financially, which makes it more difficult for all of us. I would like to see restrictions on freedom camping within a specified distance from such campgrounds. Spending public / regional authority funds to set up what are 'de facto' campgrounds (e.g. places with public toilets and other facilities specifically for freedom campers) makes no sense to me. Even campervans that are fully serviced are better off in campgrounds, rather than congregating elsewhere. Examples: I have seen campers (i) washing their clothes in public parks, rather than using their own water supply; (ii) erecting clotheslines for drying; (iii) having noisy parties near to where people live--including a few kms from a crib my family & friends often use--and (iv) leaving rubbish in overfilled bins rather than taking it away with them.	Marjorie Manthei
40249	I am against the bylaw allowing freedom camping at Southshore. Freedom camping should not be allowed in a residential area, where children live, commute and play. We used to find food packaging, used toilet paper and rubbish left by campers on our property. I find it inappropriate to look out the windows of our home and see people camped out right in front of our home. It is really odd. There is a camping ground in South Brighton that is available to campers. Camping ought to be done in wide open spaces! Not right in front of someone's house.	Janet Macdonald
40247	My only real concern is as to who will be policing the bylaw and what that will cost. The fine for breaching the bylaw is absurdly low. It should certainly be high enough to cover the cost of enforcement. If the fine is set by government I'd like the council to submit that it should be much higher if it is to act as a real discouragement.	Jean Flannery
40246	I don't support Freedom camping as a homeowner in Southshore. There is a great camping ground here that should be supported.	Shelley Wright
40244	Absolutely frustrating! Why the hell do we want complete strangers camping outside our houses. We do not want all our neighbourhood children playing around strangers from all walks of life. This is a safety issue for us all. We are sick of these people shitting in our walk ways and leaving their toilet paper where we walk to the beach, hanging up a clothes line for us to look at day after day outside our house. If we wanted to live amongst travelling strangers then we would live in a camping ground. If we wanted to live with a view of vehicles/campervans instead of the beach we would go and live on Moorhouse Ave. We choose to live in a clean, safe, beautiful area. It WILL stay that way! Stop being muppets and grow some sense, let them park up your drive way and see how you feel. Freedom campers do not spend money in our city...they are FREEDOM campers doing it cheaply, on a budget without a care in the world. Why would anyone in their right mind try and make it easier for them to do this. Put the scabby freedom campers away from housing then it maybe ok and we all might not hate freedom campers so much. If this goes ahead there will be a shit fight for sure.	K McLean
40243	There will be a lot of rubbish left behind by these people where bins are not provided.  We have lived on marine parade for 20 years and have always had this with these people the ones that don't have proper toilets just go in the sand dunes. It will just be another job for the CCC to do cleaning up after them. This is a safety thing with our children playing on the beach with strangers camping outside our house. I think this is a stupid idea even considering changing this.	Kere McLean
40240	Again you are targeting Southshore. Why? What have we done to have such treatment? Why is it acceptable to offer freedom camping in an area full of families who just want a quiet, peaceful life. Freedom camping brings with it anti social behaviour. This is not what our area wants nor deserves. Freedom camping is not suitable for areas that are heavily residential. So why are you again targeting Southshore? Please think of the children, think of the residents. This is not suited for our area!	Tania Evamy
40239	I don't have an issue with the proposed changes but I do strongly believe that the red zone in the area around Fleet St/McBratneys Rd should be a designated freedom camping area for CSC vehicles i.e. Motorhome/Caravans etc. Yes the council may have to install toilets and perhaps even a dump station but what a fantastic area well away from any potential residents. I'm sure it could even be managed by the NZMCA if they were given the chance.	Neville Carter

Submission ID	Tell us what you think about the new proposed changes to the bylaw	Name
40236	<p>Hi</p> <p>I am a Christchurch resident. I have recently converted a van to a campervan, this was lovingly done to a high standard. We have an onboard toilet and are certified self contained. When we travel we use a mix of camping grounds (75%) and freedom camping (25%)</p> <p>I don't camp locally so don't know the specific areas, my comments are more general in nature. I appreciate the towns and councils that permit me to camp responsibly in their regions and I hope that CCC extends this same opportunity to visitors to Christchurch. I urge the council to remain broadly supportive of responsible camping.</p> <p>There has been some problems in some areas with the quantity and quality of freedom campers. I am hopeful the national review will address to some degree the quality of small vehicles that have been poorly converted.</p> <p>In terms of quantity, I agree that the council should limit camping in a small number of areas to ensure the impact of freedom camping does not overwhelm local residents enjoying the same area. Hopefully this can be kept to a minimum.</p>	Andrew Panckhurst
40235	<p>I am pleased to see that freedom campers are not banned in the New Brighton area. Rubbish bins need to be empty/checked more regularly. Four nights in one area - I believe that 5 nights allows for a good amount of time for people to explore Christchurch or rest while enjoying the beach and Brighton areas</p>	Robyn Ramirez
40234	<p>As a picture paints a thousand words I have attached one</p> <p>At the Estuary end of one of our currently No Camping signaged/designated South shore Streets here is a photo of what we deal with a Pepsi bottle with the Pepsi consumed and refilled with "urine" left for residents to find in the morning. Mostly Weekends but can be a weeknight and is not a one off event, we know its urine because we empty them before disposing. Also broken glass from Wine bottles smashed against a tree or hidden in the grass verge gardens put in by SSRA and empty alcopop type cans.</p> <p>As we have many walkers with small children and dogs we really don't want injuries from the cast offs of a cheap nights entertainment.</p> <p>For a while in this Summer we had a couple of semi permanent holes dug behind some bushes for a pit toilet for bedtime toileting the male and female had different sides of the street in the "red Zone land". This I can attest to because one was right beside my fence shared with the red zone and it was necessary to fill that one in for obvious reasons.</p> <p>This had probably become more prevalent because of the loss of The Bach Bar in Caspian Str due to the earthquakes and decisions around not being able to replace a Business in Southshore in the RUO being deemed noncomplying activity I think.</p> <p>If the proposal weakens our abilities to have reasonable enjoyment of our streets then you can be confident count us out (we try and take turns as some folk find this more objectionable and get a bit cross) from keeping up with cleaning after the poorly behaved and it will be a send snap &amp; solve sent for CCC to pick up the tab nobody would want those urine y bottles heading into the Estuary &amp; out to sea, I suspect.</p> <p>We used to have a Rubbish bin Beach end of the Street (Heron) but that was removed and the preference is not to have to but what we collect in our wheelie bins we walk over to the bin actually on the beach to complete our tidy up. I think it was 3/4 Summers ago (before LINZ kindly put up No Camping signs for us when we asked) a young lady parked in the end of our street overnight in a quite smart hired small RV, she was on her own and that was another reason for getting the CCC no camping Signs "Thank You Jo Zervos "you cant help but keep an eye out for their safety in that circumstance, that kind of responsibility added to our Community is not really on.</p> <p>Personally I don't think in our current times with the Meth, crime etc problems in our society that we should even be encouraging Freedom Campers.</p> <p>Any laws have to be fit for the purpose of the problems we are currently facing, I sincerely hope all has been taken into consideration and one more suggestion :</p> <p>With a really picturesque Camping ground in South Brighton <a href="https://southbrightonholidaypark.co.nz/">https://southbrightonholidaypark.co.nz/</a> Council could look at or come to an arrangement for a subsidized camp fee price to make it attractive for the "freedom Campers". Suggest having a very reasonable rate perhaps an area set aside so if you are fully a contained Camper so not using the facilities of the Campground apart from dumping fee of course which the Camp ground already has. Can an obligation be added that Camping should be undertaken for folks own protection in a safe Campground with a lot more</p>	Carol Scott

Submission ID	Tell us what you think about the new proposed changes to the bylaw	Name
	<p>support than a street with in a certain closeness of proximity to the Campground. Keep Southshore streets No Camping it does improve the amount of rubbish etc residents are forced to deal with its just not suitable to let that back in if that is being even remotely contemplated.</p> <p>I imagine that some of these insights have not got to you in full before no one wants to stop good folks from enjoying our natural environment and it is often hard to create a balanced approach so please consider what is placed on our shoulders to deal with. We converse with some folk and hear talk that nights at the Windsport park is where the really young congregate so wont go there and we have been known to inform folks where the one toilet facility is in Southshore.</p> <p>Thank you for your time.</p>	
40230	I support the new proposal to limit camping at the North beach surf club to memorial hall site during the times stipulated in the plan . The campers reduce the ability of locals to park anywhere near the beach access and make surf club patron parking nearly impossible , leading to children having to cross Marine Parade to and from the surf club .	Lindy McGillivray
40229	I do not have a problem with freedom camping but I live in Purau 8972 and would like to understand how the council plans to eliminate, mitigate or control : noise, light, litter waste, public toilets (that currently do not operate - (since 2011 earthquakes) but when they were working - sewage was disposed of into the river - or so I am lead to believe). Surely the Water Reform has to be involved regarding theses toilets also. I am keen to understand the proposed changes to the Freedom Camping Bylaw and how they will affect our community. Many thanks Jill [REDACTED]	Jill Haley
40227	<p>I think we need to pair this with offering some better camping spots with free toilets and pay per use showers.</p> <p>The point of this shouldnt just be to ensure no-one enjoys freedom camping. We dont want to block kiwis on an average income from seeing the country.</p> <p>There should also be specific allowance made for motorcycle and bicycle touring - you cant self contain a bicycle very easily, and you cant always ride the distances between caping areas in one go.</p> <p>I'd support the idea of having a few specific no camping zones in addition to "no freedom camping on public land within 50m of a house" - rather than a complicated system with varied rules. We also need more public toilets for everyone to use if we dont want anyone pooping on public land (more of the little steel toilet pods).</p>	Mark Penrice
40224	I support the restriction on freedom camping in the windsurf/kiteboard rigging and parking areas around Naval Point and on the estuary. At times the Naval Point area in particular is very crowded, and it would be good to extend the restricted area further east to allow for overflow parking. Note please ensure that both the area on the west of the estuary and on the south side near the yacht club need to be restricted. These areas are also very busy at peak wind and tide times.	Simon Harris
40223	I broadly agree with the proposed changes, but I request that Southshore be included in the prohibited freedom camping zone (i.e. ban freedom camping) including all Rocking Horse Road, and all side streets off Rocking Horse Road. I believe Southshore is proposed to be in the 'restricted zone' but I request it to be 'prohibited'. The side streets that end at the estuary off Rocking Horse Road are inappropriate for freedom camping. They are too close to residential homes. Freedom campers would block residential parking and cause unwanted noise and potential rubbish. There is the South Brighton Camp Ground close by and I would prefer that campers support this camp ground to enjoy our natural environment.	Megan Roulston
40222	I think it's great that you are making changes to make sure that environment is protected. I have noticed that there are free campers that do not have a self-contained vehicle, and as a result relieve themselves in the nature, or in the rivers, which is really bad for the environment. Sometimes they clean their clothe or dishes in the river with some cleaning product that again are not good for the environment. I don't know how this certification process works, but I've noticed that many vehicles have the sticker "self-contained" that have no toilet. So, who checks the vehicle and grants the stickers? That's my thoughts on the subject.	Eleonore Dumaine

Submission# 40234







Submission# 40234



Submission ID	Tell us what you think about the new proposed changes to the bylaw	Name
40218	As a Southshore resident I do not consider there is any satisfactory location in the area for freedom camping. Freedom campers should be directed to the South Brighton Motorcamp. I would hope there would be an area there with basic amenities for a low charge. Areas in the red zone could be adapted in a similar way to provide basic amenities and a suitable place to park.	Kathy Morris
40217	Can we please see some more rubbish bins installed at the Naval point sight close to the camping areas as this is one thing that is severely lacking with the increase in freedom campers and leads to rubbish spilling over and littering the area.	Mark Fisher
40162	<p>Personally, I object to all "Freedom Camping". However, if the Council wishes to accept these travellers, there should be designated areas, within a park where there is, at least, one toilet, one shower, one facility to washing of clothes, dishes, etc. Having vehicles with toilets included does not work. And, having to prepare meals from the back of vans is not only, unsightly, it is really unhygienic.</p> <p>I find it rather incongruous, the Council is willing to "look after" these people, but is very slow in assisting our own citizens with shelter. Living near the RRZ there are many times people are seen in cars, vans preparing to sleep overnight.</p> <p>As I say, I object to "Freedom camping "... they should be directed to camping grounds, even if to save legal, honest owners their businesses, after a couple of torrid years.</p> <p>Thank you for allowing me a voice.</p>	Julie Tavendale
40152	I love my freedom camping opportunity.. I would like to see more toilet areas as it is not just the freedom campers but day trippers an local population. That Do pollute as well so it really needs to be a happy medium.	Evana Elvy
40147	<p>I am the owner of an RV, a member of the NZMCA, and enjoy freedom camping.</p> <p>I am fully supportive of the proposed changes, including those to the definition of Self Containment.</p> <p>Whatever is decided, I think it important that areas NOT defined as prohibited or restricted are available for Self Contained freedom campers.</p>	John Simpson
40146	It's not free we the rate payers paying. So no to any free camping	Corinna Cornelius
40144	One thing to introduce is validation of the blue Self Contained Sticker seen on a lot of vans at North Beach. A lot of these are fake. The copy of the sticker can be found easily on the internet. A lot of vans parked up at North Beach are not compliant.	Jim Richardson
40132	Yes limit the time of year is a good idea.i myself gave a large self contained camper, I am in the wings club and only stay there, I feel unless these small Van's can prove they are fully self contained and also join the wings club , if they dont then they should be made to use paid camping grounds and holiday parks to keep these businesses going....many I'd the small cans were travellers from overseas who make s mess and put very little money into the NZ economy when they come here to travel about...if they cant afford to pay a camp fee or be a member of the club they should not be able to stay on 5he side if the road....we are making it to eady by supplying toilets ....hmmm there's my moan ...I pay fees and I use camp grounds ..	Glenda hayward
40131	I think that freedom camping other than large obvious self contained rvs should be banned all along Marine Parade. I have seen vans that do not have a toilet or gray water tank but showing a Nz motorhome association blue sticker parked along there I saw the same sticker on the back of a Toyota station wagon. In the summer walking along the track beside the park it smells like a sewer so it is obvious that the occupants of these vans just use the undergrowth as a toilet. I also note that there is no freedom camping allowed along the beachfront in Sumner	terry MOYSE
40130	Excellent.	Carol Groves

Submission ID	Tell us what you think about the new proposed changes to the bylaw	Name
40128	<p>I think we should be encouraging freedom camping, it brings money to the area and also is part of being a kiwi being able to visit our own country. I don't actually think the official 'self-contained rules' make any difference it is about making sure there are good facilities instead, people in fancy motorhomes still make messes, it is about education and facilities.</p> <p>I live in North New Brighton right by the war memorial and walk my dog daily at the beach I have never had any issues with the campers there. Sometimes it does get busy but banning it sucks, some places around NZ I have seen say that you can camp overnight but have to be left by 7am or something on weekends, so that could be a good idea! I see the local freedom campers at the coffee shops and supermarket and I think they add to our local businesses.</p> <p>I think Chch should encourage freedom campers but like I said focus on education and good facilities, I like the idea of people being able to use the rezoned area. I have traveled NZ in a van for months at a time and 90% of people are awesome and it is also such a cool way to see NZ, people stay longer and so do end up spending money. I think that only valuing high-value tourism is such a negative precedent to set. I hope Chch council can make Chch an accessible place for freedom camping.</p>	Lydia Newlands
40125	<p>Your proposals are good but do not go far enough.</p> <p>Where is the proposal to prohibit freedom camping along the sea front in Sumner?</p> <p>Does the by-law prohibit freedom camping on suburban roads?</p> <p>The government should accept that "freedom camping" in ANY STREETS outside people's houses must be forbidden.</p> <p>Furthermore, there is no mention of any policing of the restrictions.</p> <p>Camping grounds used to be the place for camping. Campers paid for a space and the owner of the camping ground provided the facilities and earned an income. Now the only people who benefit are the free-loaders, and the ordinary residents and ratepayers have to bear the cost.</p> <p>I do not accept that ANYBODY has the right to live in a vehicle or caravan on a street in a built up area.</p> <p>The number of camper vans in any area at the same time should be restricted. Last year I encountered a large number all parked in the car park south of the pier in New Brighton.</p> <p>You have a duty of care to your residents and ratepayers. Why would we want this sort of thing occurring in our neighbourhoods?</p> <p>Please make sure that the by-law has some teeth, and protects the people who live here.</p> <p>Thank you</p>	Beverley Nelson
40124	<p>Agree only certified vehicles are allowed to freedom camp. Standard vans, cars &amp; station wagons are NOT allowed to freedom camp for the obvious toileting reasons and should be compelled to stay at commercial camping grounds. Yes while they may carry a porta potty do you seriously think they would use it inside the above, car, station wagon or small van especially if they have a partner sleeping with them.</p>	Blair Corkran
40123	<p>I agree with all the changes but think there should be an additional sentence in the part about not restricting thoroughfares and only 1 vehicle per park. No chairs, tables or any equipment can be in an adjacent park space. We have significant parking issues at Diamond Harbour Domain car park where vans use 2 parks for all their gear and this is a busy carpark with commuters and other locals trying to use it to catch the ferry. It is often overcrowded. There should also be a restriction on the number of vehicles that can stay and clear signs to say where they may park as we find in other areas when we freedom camp. e.g. Whakatane, Kaikoura, Whangarei. In the summer there are sometimes 10 or more campers in this small carpark.</p>	Pat Pritchett
40122	<p>I support the changes to the Beachside camping. I don't believe the clause allowing a vehicle to move 500 metres works. I drive down Marine Parade every day, and there are several vehicles that are there more or less permanently.</p> <p>I believe restricting the months of the year that people can park there is also helpful, although I would like to see some area with decent facilities made available for visitors</p>	Kim Button
40121	<p>I believe we need to invite responsible self containment freedom campers to our city. Look at how the Gisborne council manage it. Also what about a freedom camping area or new DOC campground in the redzone.</p>	Shannon Radcliffe

Submission ID	Tell us what you think about the new proposed changes to the bylaw	Name
40120	I live in Wainui, Banks Peninsula. I'd like it if people could freedom camp in the reserve near the toilets by the beach. I sure this was originally set up as a camping area... Thanks	Richard Smale
40119	Keep the freedom camping areas as they are . Areas that have a problem with access need to have freedom camping areas in these areas clearly marked off . Toilets should also be considered . As overseas tourist numbers are going to be low for some years yet freedom campers will and can be a very good source of income locally were ever they stay .	Peter Corboy
40118	There is no mention of Sumner esplanade. I think that there should be no freedom camping on the esplanade at Sumner as it is a residential area and sometimes all the carparks between Marriner and Stoke streets are taken by freedom campers. They also quite often take up two parks , one for the van and one for tables and chairs.	Steve Andrews
40117	I support the proposed changes	Ross Campbell
40114	I cant think of any other country where you can camp for free. Make them pay!	Jan Edwards