

Comments from people who did NOT support the KRRA in trying to find a suitable alternative parking space for self-contained campervans, motorhomes and caravans

we have plenty of places for camper vans etc to stay. campgrounds/Airbnb/private options and 20mins more to over a dozen options.

1-we have NO social or legal obligations to supply any space for free for tourist to stay. i have checked the Freedom camping law (from which TCDC gets their by-law) and we dont have to.

2- NZTA has sensible guidelines as to rest for tourist and driver fatigue. this has been tested in Court and the tourists lost.

but most importantly HOW does doing this fit in the mission for KUAOTUNU RESIDENTS?!

HOW does it sit with the mission statement of KRRA? tourists dont pay our rates or reside here and KRRA is here to forward and enhance those that do, not those that pass through.

thank you for your inclusion of the community for their thoughts and your good work.

I think self contained campervans should park at designated NZMCA sites OR at our local campground. This keeps our beaches and reserves clean and provides income for a local business. I'd like Kuaotunu to be a place where stopping is encouraged but only at these designated areas.

I don't consider any of the 3 choices to be suitable as they all have negative impacts on Kuaotunu.

Site 1 is a community space with tennis, pentaque, soccer, the proposed new library and is the designated emergency helicopter landing area.

Site 2 is too close to the beach and an extremely busy community space

Site 3 would end up looking like a shanty town of campervans on our main highway

We have thought long and hard about this, especially as we are campervanners and NZMCA members ourselves. Our conclusion is that KRRA should OPPOSE any attempt to establish space for these vehicles to overnight in the Kuaotunu area. We didn't come to this conclusion lightly, but having experienced and observed the negative impact of so-called "freedom campers" in the South Island have reluctantly concluded the downside for Kuaotunu residents and the environment is too great, particularly as, at this stage, many vehicles display the "self-contained" sticker that are plainly nowhere near capable of deserving that status.

Some key reasons for not allowing overnight stays include:

- * Hygiene [people do not use toilets even when they are provided]
- * Impact on the enjoyment of other reserve users, especially the freedom of children to play safely
- * Litter - unfortunately many tourists have no concept of using rubbish tins either!
- * Need for ongoing management/policing, that then becomes a charge on ratepayers.
- * Visual impacts
- * Traffic hazard in places that have limited parking at peak times already

Sites 1 and 2 in particular are completely unsuitable because of the high level of community use. Conceptually, at a pinch site 3 could be developed but this will limit the options for future use by the community. If this site were to be chosen there should be a charge placed on its use to recover development and management costs, and numbers/behaviour monitored.

However there will be very little advantage to the community, economic or otherwise, in providing a parking facility and the negative impact on residents will be significant. In the past when this topic has come up it has been suggested that farmers in the district make space available [e.g.like the Simpsons at Wharekaho] and it would be more appropriate for TCDC to work with private land owners if indeed there is a burning need for such a facility in this district. However we believe it is not KRRA's role to enable any de facto sequestration of public land and that KRRA should vigorously oppose any use of reserve land for this purpose.

<p>Although I would prefer ultimately to have no ugly campervans causing visual pollution along our beaches, I understand that trying to stop them completely is a little like King Canute and the tide (didn't end well for him); also there is something very unwelcoming and inhospitable about a community that says "No! Go away!" to visitors. So I think that the area west of the boat ramp, which used to have signs, and the boat ramp, are appropriate areas and together could cater for 6 or 7 vehicles. The boat ramp could have 3 or 4 dedicated spaces, in the same way the Lee Street car park and Buffalo Beach by the toilets do.</p> <p>Congestion at the boat ramp over the very busy periods will not be hugely affected by this: 4 fewer spaces for trailers won't make a dent if there are 30-odd trailers parked along the road-side; boat-ramp usage and congestion is a separate issue. Having said all that, if I had to choose one of the possible sites, it would be site 3, and ideally the Motor-caravan Association or similar would be responsible for preparing and administering it.</p>
<p>Too impactful on the environment & public amenity Reserves created for green / open space so inconsistent use They require onerous policing (extra cost) and are lacking in respect and care for our backyard. Irrespective of any economic benefit (which will be over stated) they can stay in designated DOC or Commercial camping grounds</p>
<p>please dont even THINK of putting a campground at site 2 kuaotunu reef! we spend alot of time there all year round for surfing ,sun set brews and general fun times! youll piss off all the surfers and they will take matters into there own hands !! i dont think u want that! site 1 also out of the question! you have already built a long sand pitt that has weeds growing all around it! is it a litter box??</p>
<p>Hi, personally I feel that Kuaotunu does not want/ need a designated camper van area, They can go to Whitianga. What about an area in Matarangi?</p> <p>We need to keep our environmental reserves for our own community. No campervan, caravan or motorhome overnight parking anywhere in Kuaotunu.</p>
<p>Would rather that the campervans stuck to Wharekaho & Whitianga motorhome association locations, or paid for a space at the Kuaotunu campground.</p> <p>The reserves are better kept clear for families and holiday makers to enjoy open spaces for picnics and activities.</p>
<p>I would not want to see a large group of campervans parked up/washing drying/all other sundries in sight in Kuaotunu. We already have a small area for about 3 vans between the boat ramp and Bluff Road which is sufficient.</p>
<p>You are putting out false info. There is no self-contained site at the boat Ramp it is up further along SH25 and perfectly adequate. You provide no evidence with numbers that there is an issue with congestion and campervan at the boat Ramp. Alternative not at the tennis court reserve as that is for recreation and sport with young children playing there. Why not the council reserve over the bridge from the store.</p>
<p>It is not clear how many sites KRRRA are proposing. There is no information about whether these sites will be powered or how they will be maintained. More information is required before i would make a firm decision.</p>
<p>To be in running with other coromandel Motorhomer friendly towns shouldn't Kuaotunu also be one. And not we are here and ban all motor homes.</p>

We would like to register our objection to 2 of the proposed sites to provide camper van parking, in our sport grounds and the Black Jack reserve. Both of those spaces are highly prized and used by the families and the resident and rate payers and of this community.

We feel it would be a grave injustice to have them cluttered with camper vans from travelers passing through that are not contributing to our infrastructure maintenance. To propose to allow them to park on our prime sites it simply wrong. We have a camping ground that has this facility provided. Our public space is limited here in Kuaotunu and it must be reserved for the rights and privileges of those who firstly live here and second those who pay to visit and contribute.

Thank you for the opportunity to have our say and our objection registered.

The real issue is that the boat ramp is unsuitable for a very short window - maybe 3 weeks in the year. The 3 or was it 4 spaces in the secluded layby next to the ramp are perfect for campervans. And possibly a sign telling them about the camping ground and dedicated campervan sites in Wharekaho and Whitianga.

I know that it is a bit rich coming from me, essentially an outsider still, but I do not want any development further in Kuaotunu. I thought that the freedom camping site formerly was unsuitable. Although they are supposed to have toilet facilities in the campervans or caravans, most seem not to have, judging from the 'deposits' I found occasionally on the beach, actually more the grass nearby. So for me the only possible sites that have toilet facilities are by the tennis courts or on the road leading from Lukes to the old disused boat ramp. For the former there is a lot of things happening, namely the skateboard rink and the new library and for the latter, it is already fairly crowded in the summer months. So my vote is for NO freedom camping site.

I think our wee town is congested enough in peak periods and I wouldn't like to see a campervan park in Kuaotunu. They can book into the Kuaotunu Camp ground if they wish to visit our beautiful spot.

No I do not support allocation of space for self contained campervans, motorhomes and caravans on any of OUR community reserves. Set aside five or six spaces at the boat ramp with a 9pm to 7am time slot or get council to negotiate with a willing land owner to provide space on their land. This could bring money into our community by way of a small fee to park

I think that Site 3 is the most appropriate as the Black Jack Reserve does not need any more pressure put on it as is busy enough as it is. The site next to the playground is not suitable as it is being established as a community area with library, playground sports area garden etc, therefore in my opinion not suitable for campers as well.

No....I believe the campground is the place for campervans, motorhomes and caravans. If we were to provide a free alternative space, aren't we taking possible business return from the campground. We also would lack the control (that exists (within campgrounds) regarding unruly or unacceptable behaviour. I would support helping the campground extend their current parking provision for these vehicles firstly.

we would only support a maximum of 3 spaces at site number 2

We travel NZ extensively in a caravan and over the past few years have witnessed firsthand, the filth and destruction caused by freedom camping to our once pristine park environments. We know that not all freedom campers are guilty and that it is only a minority travelling on the cheap that are the cause. Nevertheless, the problem certainly exists in most popular tourist spots in NZ to the extent that many councils are now reviewing their policies on freedom camping.

With regards to the three options, clearly we support none of them but in particular would strongly object to site 1 agreeing with the disadvantages you list but also this area is now largely residential and it is inappropriate to mix freedom camping with a residential family environment. There are perfectly good camping grounds at Kuaotunu west and just down the road in Whitianga.

I believe that we do not need campervan parking anywhere in and around our village as it is already inundated with plenty of tourists / visitors over the summer months. A designated campervan parking area would add to the amount of people and increase congestion and pressure on our infrastructure.. We have a nice campground with good facilities and should direct campers there.

If you were to change from the current site I would prefer site 3 as this site does not impede on all the local community activities and services.

My preference is not to promote alternative parking spaces for self-contained campervans, motorhomes and caravans. Legal rights notwithstanding I do not want to see this encouraged in our community. As pointed out in the newsletter, each of the sites is unsuitable for this purpose. I would have preferred to see no additional signage as an option in the newsletter. This was raised by Mel at the public meeting in January and I would like to know this was not suggested.