

#77

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Tuesday, October 04, 2022 2:15:38 PM
Last Modified: Tuesday, October 04, 2022 3:27:04 PM
Time Spent: 01:11:26
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

Agree

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

Q9

Respondent skipped this question

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

Q10

Neither agree nor disagree

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

Q11

Respondent skipped this question

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

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

Q12

Don't know

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:

I dont have the time or motivation to understand what is going on here.

Q14

Don't know

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:

Again, too complicated.

Q16

Don't know

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:

Again too complicated.

Page 6: Competency requirements for vehicle inspectors

Q18

Strongly agree

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:

Suits volunteer people who do it for love not money.

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:

Cost will be high, unlike with volunteers.

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:

Will be cost involved and maybe a govt department.

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:

Plumbers charge lots, level of expertise easily met by volunteers.

Page 8: Chapter Three: Self-containment documentation

Q26

Agree

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:

Current situation does not cost and works fine. If it aint broke dont fix it. Need to upgrade toilet issue though.

Q28

Agree

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:

simplification is fine, no need for unnecessary duplication.

Page 9: Self-containment warrant

Q30

Agree

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:

sounds no more than a colour change so fast identification of an up to date warrant can be done.

Q32

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

Toilet type, eg fixed Thetford cassette.

Q33

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

present requirements are fine once toilet approved.

Page 10: Generic Identifiers

Q34

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:

cheats exist.

Q36

Agree

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:

window sticker exists now.

Page 11: Chapter Four: Infringement fees

Q38

Agree

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:

self contained vehicles have nothing to worry about, but if certification has recently lapsed then only a warning NOT a fine is appropriate. Should NOT be used for revenue gathering.

Q40

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:

Token fines for first offenders is one thing, but revenue gathering is another.

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:

We are all one people, no exceptions. "Motor homes" should be fully self contained to freedom camp, no budget ones allowed to pollute the environment. However small motorhomes could have a private COMPARTMENT with a bolted in porta potty. Penalties for misuse or no use should be ENFORCED.

Q44

Agree

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:

I have no problem with a porta potty in its own private compartment, as long as it can and is being used.

Q46

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:

They can upgrade or go to a motor camp.

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?):

Motorcycles with a tent for sleeping cannot possibly have their own toilet. They can use one elsewhere though, but if cars cant stay at a freedom camp site, same applies to motorcycles and bikes.

Page 13: Chapter Six: Fees and levies

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:

Dead against willing compliers paying anything.

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:

Dead against willing compliers paying anything. Regulatory body operating costs should and must come from OFFENDERS, not compliers.

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:

OFFENDERS should be paying for administration, not compliers.

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:

Volunteer workers do this at present for club members. Huge fees like this are OFFENSIVE and UNNECESSARY. As I keep saying, willing compliers should not get fleeced like this. Go catch the offenders and FINE them.

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 for 58.

Page 15: Waivers and refunds

Q60

Agree

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:

I dont like where this is all heading. Its top heavy beauracracy paid for by motor home owners WHO COMPLY WITH THE LAW ANYWAY. I will vote against change, but somehow I dont think I will get to have any vote.

Page 16: General comments

Q62

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

I dont have a problem with the system AS IT CURRENTLY IS, except that non compliers give a bad reputation to the majority of us. I do OBJECT to treated as a source of revenue for what looks like a top heavy beaurocratic and needless body that should be drawing revenue from offenders and not compliers. We dont need well paid state servants tripping over themselves to extract money from us. Extract it from non compliers.

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

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.

Just withhold my name.
