

#125

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Thursday, September 15, 2022 10:46:08 PM
Last Modified: Monday, October 31, 2022 11:12:29 AM
Time Spent: Over a month
IP Address: Privacy of natural persons

Page 3: Submitter information

Q1

Name

Linton Winder

Q2

Email address

Privacy of natural persons

Q3

Yes

Are you happy for MBIE to contact you if we have questions about your submission?

Q4

No

Are you making this submission on behalf of a business or organisation?

Q5

The best way/s to describe your role is:

Other (please specify):

Person who chose to live in NZ after a camper van holiday with my family.

Q6

No

Do you own a vehicle that you use for camping? (Either for freedom camping or other sorts of vehicle-based camping)

Q7

Respondent skipped this question

Privacy information

Page 4: Chapter One: Self-containment technical requirements

Q8

Strongly disagree

To what extent do you agree with Option 1: 'light-touch' performance-based requirements?

Q9

If you would like to say something more about your answer to Question 8, please do so here:

The vilification of a group of tourists who have contributed so much to the economic development of NZ is ridiculous. The whole notion of this proposal is utter nonsense.

Q10

Strongly disagree

To what extent do you agree with Option 2: prescriptive approach to setting technical requirements?

Q11

If you would like to say something more about your answer to Question 10, please do so here:

The vilification of a group of tourists who have contributed so much to the economic development of NZ is ridiculous. The whole notion of this proposal is utter nonsense.

Page 5: Chapter Two: Certification authority criteria and competency requirements for vehicle inspectors

Q12

Strongly disagree

To what extent do you agree with Option 1: Multiple-pathway approval criteria and competency requirements?

Q13

If you would like to say something more about your answer to Question 12, please do so here:

This is bureaucracy gone mad.

Q14

Strongly disagree

To what extent do you agree with Option 2: more rigorous and prescriptive certification approval criteria?

Q15

If you would like to say something more about your answer to Question 14, please do so here:

This is bureaucracy gone mad.

Q16

Strongly disagree

To what extent do you agree with Option 3: Third-party review of certification authority systems?

Q17

If you would like to say something more about your answer to Question 16, please do so here:

This is bureaucracy gone mad.

Page 6: Competency requirements for vehicle inspectors

Q18

Strongly disagree

To what extent do you agree with Option 1: requiring vehicle inspectors to be knowledgeable?

Q19

If you would like to say something more about your answer to Question 18, please do so here:

These inspections will achieve nothing.

Q20

Strongly disagree

To what extent do you agree with Option 2: requiring vehicle inspectors to have a relevant trade qualification?

Q21

If you would like to say something more about your answer to Question 20, please do so here:

These inspections will achieve nothing.

Q22

Strongly disagree

To what extent do you agree with Option 3: requiring vehicle inspectors to be assessed as “fit and proper”?

Q23

If you would like to say something more about your answer to Question 22, please do so here:

These inspections will achieve nothing.

Page 7: Deeming plumbers as certification authorities and vehicle inspectors

Q24

Strongly disagree

To what extent do you agree that certifying plumbers should be deemed as certification authorities and vehicle inspectors under the new regulations?

Q25

If you would like to say something more about your answer to Question 24, please do so here:

These inspections are ludicrous and will achieve nothing.

Page 8: Chapter Three: Self-containment documentation

Q26

Strongly disagree

To what extent do you agree with Option 1: continue to record the details of a vehicle's self-containment facilities the on the self-containment certificate?

Q27

If you would like to say something more about your answer to Question 26, please do so here:

Totally unnecessary.

Q28

Strongly disagree

To what extent do you agree with Option 2: a simplified self-containment certificate?

Q29

If you would like to say something more about your answer to Question 28, please do so here:

Totally unnecessary.

Page 9: Self-containment warrant

Q30

Strongly disagree

To what extent do you agree with the option for the self-containment warrant?

Q31

If you would like to say something more about your answer to Question 30, please do so here:

Why are you consulting on the colour of something? This is ridiculous.

Q32

Respondent skipped this question

Please list any additional information that you think should be collected on the warrant.

Q33

Respondent skipped this question

Please list any information you think is proposed to be collected on the warrant that does not need to be.

Page 10: Generic Identifiers

Q34

Strongly disagree

To what extent do you agree with Option 1: not having a generic identifier?

Q35

If you would like to say something more about your answer to Question 34, please do so here:

Pointless.

Q36

Strongly disagree

To what extent do you agree with Option 2: having another generic identifier?

Q37

If you would like to say something more about your answer to Question 36, please do so here:

Pointless.

Page 11: Chapter Four: Infringement fees

Q38

Strongly disagree

To what extent do you agree with Option 1: a tiered approach infringement fee to a maximum of \$800?

Q39

If you would like to say something more about your answer to Question 38, please do so here:

You want to fine people who have chosen to visit New Zealand and spend money here? These fines are draconian and utterly ridiculous.

Q40

Strongly disagree

To what extent do you agree with Option 2: a tiered approach infringement fee to a maximum of \$1000?

Q41

If you would like to say something more about your answer to Question 40, please do so here:

You want to fine people who have chosen to visit New Zealand and spend money here? These fines are draconian and utterly ridiculous.

Page 12: Chapter Five: Exclusions from regulatory requirements

Q42

Strongly disagree

To what extent do you agree with Option 1: no exclusions from regulatory requirements?

Q43

If you would like to say something more about your answer to Question 42, please do so here:

Over-complicated nonsense.

Q44

Strongly disagree

To what extent do you agree with Option 2: excluding smaller freedom-camping vehicles from the requirement to have a fixed toilet?

Q45

If you would like to say something more about your answer to Question 44, please do so here:

Over-complicated nonsense.

Q46

Strongly disagree

To what extent do you agree with Option 3: excluding vintage vehicles from the requirement to be certified as self-contained?(A vintage vehicle is one that is at least 40 years old)

Q47

If you would like to say something more about your answer to Question 46, please do so here:

Over-complicated nonsense.

Q48

Don't know

Are there other types of vehicles that should be excluded?

Q49

Please explain your answer to Question 48: (for example, what other types of vehicles? What regulatory requirements do you suggest the vehicles be excluded from? Why should these vehicles be excluded from the identified regulatory requirements?):

Over-complicated nonsense.

Q50

Strongly disagree

To what extent do you agree with Option 1: levy of \$91.40?

Q51

If you would like to say something more about your answer to Question 50, please do so here:

Why create a system where costs are added that are not necessary?

Q52

Strongly disagree

To what extent do you agree with Option 2: levy of \$101?

Q53

If you would like to say something more about your answer to Question 52, please do so here:

Why create a system where costs are added that are not necessary?

Q54

Strongly disagree

To what extent do you agree with Option 3: levy of \$120?

Q55

If you would like to say something more about your answer to Question 54, please do so here:

Why create a system where costs are added that are not necessary?

Page 14: Certification Authority Application Fee

Q56

Strongly disagree

To what extent do you agree with Option 1: a set fee of \$431.25?

Q57

If you would like to say something more about your answer to Question 56, please do so here:

\$431.25 to work out if there is a toilet in a van? You must be joking.

Q58

Strongly disagree

To what extent do you agree with Option 2: a scalable fee?

Q59

If you would like to say something more about your answer to Question 58, please do so here:

\$75 per hour to work out if there is a toilet in a van? You must be joking.

Page 15: Waivers and refunds

Q60

Strongly disagree

To what extent do you agree with the proposal for granting waivers and refunds?

Q61

If you would like to say something more about your answer to Question 60, please do so here:

Ridiculous.

Page 16: General comments

Q62

Are there any other comments you would like to make about the proposed freedom camping regulations?

This has to be one of the most ridiculous proposals this government has ever put forward. What I have just read sounds like a script from a Monty Python episode.

About 15 years ago me and my family visited NZ. We hired an old VW camper as it was the only way we could afford to visit. It didn't have a toilet, so funnily enough we decided to use toilets made of porcelain in campsites rather than use the great outdoors.

We liked NZ so much we decided to move here. We are now citizens; we run a successful small business in a provincial town after careers in higher education (I am a retired professor) and primary teaching (my wife was an outstanding teacher). One of our daughter's is a civil engineer and the other just gained a first class honours for her masters. But I guess we aren't the kind of people that this government want in NZ any more.

You should be encouraging young people to visit and fall in love with this country. These ludicrous proposals vilify a crucially important group of tourists who visit provincial NZ, spend money there and often then choose to settle in this country. The government's focus on "rich" tourists who have a huge environmental impact by jetting in and out for a few days makes no sense.

Do you really think that just because a van has a toilet then it will be used? Of course not. The answer is for each district to welcome freedom campers and ensure that there are sufficient sites with good facilities. This would encourage people to stay longer in NZ, feel welcome, and they would be more likely to stay.

This utterly crass proposal makes no sense whatsoever and will do nothing but harm to the tourism industry. especially in provincial NZ which really needs visitors.

If this government is really interested in reducing the s**t in our rivers then I suggest they focus on the dairy industry.

Page 17: Confidential information

Q63

Respondent skipped this question

Please tick the box below if you would like any of your answers to be kept confidential

Q64

Respondent skipped this question

If you have ticked yes to Question 63, please tell us which specific questions are to be kept confidential. Please clearly indicate which questions you consider should be withheld, together with the reasons for withholding the information and the grounds under the Official Information Act 1982 you believe apply. We will take such objections into account and will consult with submitters when responding to requests under the Official Information Act 1982.
