

#47

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Sunday, October 02, 2022 7:10:55 AM
Last Modified: Sunday, October 02, 2022 7:49:23 AM
Time Spent: 00:38:28
IP Address: Privacy of natural persons

Page 3: Submitter information

Q1

Name

Sally

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:

Other (please specify):

Travelling kiwi

Q6

Yes

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:

I travel regularly in NZ, have a portapotti and hv never consider shittin in the woods. Your targeting the wrong people! Anyvtoilet on board is a good toilet.

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 law is fine as it is. Just a waste of money to change it

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:

Self containment is currently carried out by qualified people. No need to change it. Just a waste of money

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:

Again, the current standards work. No need for change

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:

And again, current stds are good

Page 6: Competency requirements for vehicle inspectors

Q18

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:

Current inspectors are already knowledgeable

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:

More red tape and waste of money

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:

If they werent fit an proper now, theyd b fired. Your makin a problem out of 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:

More bureaucratic rubbish. Gas/electrical gets signed off already.

Page 8: Chapter Three: Self-containment documentation

Q26

Neither agree nor 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:

Keep it simple

Q28

Strongly 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:

Keep it simple.

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:

Omg. What will changin the color actually achieve? Other than waste of money

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

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:

Already hv an identifier, both on the windscreen and a sticker for the rear of vehicle

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:

As above. Already have identifers currently. Dont need any more

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 dont need to fine people, just get them to move on. Just revenue gathering

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:

Again just revenue gathering. Fines shld be band as people have a right to park unless theyre disturbin or distructing the area. In which case move them on. More likely homeless cause issues as theyre the only ones ive seen droppin rubbish, shittin in bushes

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:

Its not practical for small vehicles. You can require they have some type of toilet but doesnt need to be fixed. Wich current law already does.

Q44

Strongly 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:

Just a requirement to have a toilet. A portapotti is a cassette toilet.

Q46

Neither agree nor 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

Respondent skipped this question

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

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?):

If you want tourists/new zealanders allow freedom camping. But how bout councils provide better/more toilet facilities and rubbish bins. I pay rates, where the council regulations to make sure theyre doing their job instead of dishin out fines to collect revenue.

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:

Just greed and more red tape. Nothin to do with freedom camping

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:

Again more money for a service thatll never achieve anything but red tape

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:

As above

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:

These changes are just about money grabbing nothin to do with makin it simpler to freedom camp in OUR country

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:

Again money grabbing

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

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

Doesnt even make sense! Use some common sense

Page 16: General comments

Q62

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

The rules now are ok. For self containment must have a toilet! You have no right to dictate what type of toilet. Councils need to clean up their act, provide more bins/better toilet facilities in general. We shld be promoting freedom camping not CRIMINALIZING it! If you want to get camper hire companies to improve the vehicles they hire go after them but leave the rest of us alone.

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.
