

#39

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Saturday, September 24, 2022 11:22:56 AM
Last Modified: Saturday, September 24, 2022 12:18:25 PM
Time Spent: 00:55:28
IP Address: Privacy of natural persons

Page 3: Submitter information

Q1

Name

Withheld at request of submitter

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

Individual

The best way/s to describe your role is:

Q6

Yes

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

Q7

Privacy information

The Privacy Act 2020 applies to submissions. Please tick this box if you do not wish your name or other personal details to be included in any information about submissions that MBIE may publish.

Page 4: Chapter One: Self-containment technical requirements

Q8

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:

There is nothing wrong with the current rules ... having fixed toilets is not going to make this problem go away ... because many will not use them correctly or dispose of the waste in correct areas.
ANY toilet is better than the roadside.

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 CSC register is a good idea ... but mandatory fixed toilets are not the answer and is an erosion of our rights as citizens of NZ. All it does is transfer "our rights " to an elitist monied few.
Also 5 of the 10 organisations on your review panel have a vested interest in the outcome of this bill and stand to profit largely from it.
Where was the general publics representation on this panel??

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:

Apart from the national register for CSC the status quo works well

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:

Stays quo works

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:

Status quo works

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

Respondent skipped this question

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

Q20

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:

No need .. the system works

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:

The register takes care of this .. a dodgy inspector can be dismissed

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:

No

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:

All CSC vehicles need to be registered

Q28

Strongly disagree

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

Q29

Respondent skipped this question

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

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 change the colour ... put a serial number on the sticker and register it to the vehicle rego

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

Respondent skipped this question

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

Q36

Agree

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

Q37

Respondent skipped this question

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

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:

Unless actually being caught in the act ... just how will your inspectors identify who's turd it is ??? Freedom camper, cyclist, truckie, walker, general public ??

Will the have to have a degree in " Turdology "

The wrong people could be wrongfully accused of something they didn't do.

This law has dangerous implications

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:

As above ... where does the burden of proof stand here ???

Wrongful accusations will happen here

Page 12: Chapter Five: Exclusions from regulatory requirements

Q42

Strongly agree

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:

As long as there is a toilet ... preferably a portapotti type for hygienic reasons ... small vans etc must be exempt.

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:

This is discriminatory and panders to the so call " elite monied " motorhomers who think they have more rights than the general public and get sole access to prime spots.

Thea individuals and also Councils have a vested monetary int the outcome of these proposals.

Councils own most of the camping grounds ... leading them out to private operators

Q46

Strongly agree

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:

Same as small camper cans EXCLUDED

Q48

No

Are there other types of vehicles that should be excluded?

Q49

Respondent skipped this question

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?):

Q50

Agree

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:

This cost should be built into the CSC inspection fee

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:

No

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:

No

Page 14: Certification Authority Application Fee

Q56

Agree

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:

Certification courses for inspectors at reasonable cost to the provider

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:

As above

Page 15: Waivers and refunds

Q60

Neither agree nor disagree

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

Q61

Respondent skipped this question

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

Page 16: General comments

Q62

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

At 71 I have been freedom camping responsibly for years and this bill will erode my natural right ... and future generations of campers civil rights.

I note 50% of the organisation's on your panel have a direct vested interest in the outcome of this bill for their own financial gain.

Also Councils have a vested interest to force people into campgrounds ... as they own them.

This is a direct CONFLICT OF INTEREST,

How many non CSC sites are Councils expected to make available ... should be equal in quality of location and number as certified sites.

For CSC fixed toilets to work ... people have to use them and dispose of waste correctly ... I have seen many sites over the years where waste from these fixed systems dumped on roadsides.

Also from a legal point of view ... just how can a turd on the roadside be identified ????

Could be anyone ... so wrongful accusations would be rife.

Just how could an innocent person prove it wasn't them ???

Stop pandering to the self considered privileged few and look after ALL campers and treating them with the same rights.

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.
