

## Attachment C – Options analysis for site specific restrictions and general rules

### Analysis of proposed site specific restrictions

Proposed rules
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Whether restricted sites to have a limit on numbers of freedom campers on the site</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Whether restricted sites should identify a designated area on a site for freedom camping</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Whether restricted sites with high day use should be limited to overnight only</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Whether overnight only restricted sites require a consistent time for when freedom campers must leave the site</li></ul>

Assessment Criteria:

**Meets legislative criteria** means:

- section 11 evidential criteria met
- option is a proportionate response to the perceived problem

**Effectiveness** means the option achieves the purpose of effectively managing freedom camping by:

- increasing supply
- minimising conflict with other users of the site
- minimising environmental impact
- encouraging responsible camping

**Ease of implementation** means:

- easy for campers to understand
- easy for enforcement to enforce
- easy to communicate
- implementation costs minimised

<b>Whether restricted sites to have a limit on numbers of freedom campers on the site</b>		
<b>Criteria</b>	<b>No restriction on numbers on a restricted site</b>	<b>Restriction on numbers of campers on a restricted site</b>
<b>Meets legislative criteria</b>	✓✓ The Act is permissive by default of all freedom camping and does not specify limits on numbers.	✓✓ The Act enables the council to restrict freedom camping to protect access, the area and health and safety. Staff have assessed that a site by site restriction on numbers is a proportionate response.
<b>Effectiveness</b>	✗ <u>Advantages:</u> Increase supply of freedom camping sites - more opportunities for freedom camping  <u>Disadvantages:</u> Negative environmental impact - creates risk of damage to a site and overloading of infrastructure due to overcrowding of popular areas Does not encourage responsible camping - popular areas are likely to become overcrowded with freedom campers not being required to move to another site Cause conflict with other users - likely to cause disruption and conflict with other users of a site - creates a risk to health and safety of other users due to overcrowding - creates privatisation issues with locals potentially being pushed out of sites	✓✓ <u>Advantages:</u> Minimise environmental impact - limiting numbers on a site would reduce risk of damage to a site - create less pressure on existing infrastructure Minimise conflict with other users - balances use of a site for freedom camping with use of a site for other existing activities and other users - less numbers of campers on a site would reduce impression of privatisation of a site by freedom camper Encourage responsible camping - reduces overcrowding - would create a better dispersal of freedom campers  <u>Disadvantages:</u> Limits supply of freedom camping sites - reduces numbers of places available on a popular site for freedom campers to use - may create competition for popular areas
<b>Ease of implementation</b>	✓✓ <u>Advantages:</u> Easy to understand Easy to communicate Easy for enforcement No additional information on signs needed about maximum numbers.	✓ <u>Advantages:</u> Easy to understand Easy to communicate  <u>Disadvantages:</u> Additional information on signage will be required to communicate numbers. More complicated to enforce.

Staff recommend that all sites scheduled as restricted in the bylaw include a restriction on the numbers of freedom campers on a site. This option is more likely to effectively manage freedom camping by balancing the needs of the freedom campers along with the needs and perceptions of other users of a site. While it will limit the number of campers per site, it would not prevent an increase in available sites from current provision under the legacy bylaws.

Clear communication and information about other available options when a site is full (other freedom camping sites and/or nearby commercial accommodation options) will help mitigate issues for freedom campers when a site reaches its maximum number and to encourage voluntary compliance.

<b>Whether restricted sites should identify a designated area on a site for freedom camping</b>		
<b>Criteria</b>	<b>No designated area</b>	<b>Designated area</b>
<b>Meets legislative criteria</b>	✓✓ The Act is permissive by default of all freedom camping and does not specify where on a site that it can occur.	✓✓ The Act enables the council to restrict the activity to protect access, the area and health and safety. Staff have assessed that designating an area on a restricted site for freedom camping to occur is a proportionate response.
<b>Effectiveness</b>	✗ <u>Advantages:</u> Supply of freedom camping areas increase <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- more opportunities for freedom camping</li> <li>- allows freedom campers to select where they stay on a site</li> <li>- any issues are not concentrated as campers spread around a parking area</li> </ul> <u>Disadvantages:</u> Negative environmental impact <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- creates risk of damage to a site and environment if freedom campers use inappropriate areas</li> </ul> Cause conflict with other users <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- creates a risk to other users through obstruction of access or infrastructure on a site</li> <li>- likely to cause disruption and conflict with other users of a site</li> </ul>	✓✓ <u>Advantages:</u> Minimise conflict with other users <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- protects access for existing users</li> <li>- allows for placement of freedom campers in an area appropriate for their needs as well as other uses and features of the site</li> </ul> Encourage responsible camping <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- allows for freedom campers to be grouped together</li> <li>- ensures it does not occur in less appropriate parts of a site, especially where there are two or more parking areas on a site</li> </ul> <u>Disadvantages:</u> Limits supply of camping areas (alongside maximum number restriction) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- reduces places for campers to stay</li> <li>- places may not be the 'best areas' on the site</li> </ul>
<b>Ease of implementation</b>	✓ <u>Advantages:</u> Easy for freedom campers to understand Easy to communicate Implementation costs minimised  <u>Disadvantages:</u> Would make a maximum number restriction difficult to enforce as no way to know which campers were on site first.	✓ <u>Advantages:</u> Easy to communicate Easy for freedom campers to understand <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- designated areas for activities are common</li> <li>- national consistency with how other freedom camping sites provide for areas for the activity to occur on a site</li> </ul> Easy for enforcement officers to enforce  <u>Disadvantages:</u> Will require additional signage on a site

Staff recommend that all sites scheduled as restricted in the bylaw require freedom camping to only occur on a designated area on the site. This option is more likely to effectively manage freedom camping by ensuring the freedom campers are located in areas appropriate for the activity and reduce conflict with other users. When combined with a maximum number restriction the supply of camping spots will be limited, but this will not prevent an increase in available sites from current provision under the legacy bylaws.

Any confusion about location on a site can be mitigated through clear signage and line marking on a site to specify the area for freedom campers to use. This will also make it easier for enforcement officers to see who is not complying with the bylaw and for freedom campers to identify if a site is full.

<b>Whether restricted sites with high day use should be limited to overnight only</b>		
<b>Criteria</b>	<b>No change from default of two nights maximum</b>	<b>Overnight only</b>
<b>Meets legislative criteria</b>	✓✓ The Act is permissive by default and does not specify the length of time a freedom camper can stay on a site	✓✓ The Act enables the council to restrict the activity to protect access, the area and health and safety. Where there is a desirable area with some high day use, staff have assessed that overnight only use by freedom campers is a proportionate response to protect access to the site for other users.
<b>Effectiveness</b>	✗ <u>Advantages:</u> Encourages responsible camping <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- aligns to camper preference (pilot study found over 80% campers stay at a site two or less nights)</li> <li>- provides a longer time for a freedom camper to stay in that part of the region and potentially visit nearby businesses and tourist activities</li> </ul> <u>Disadvantages:</u> Potential conflict with other users <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- likely to cause disruption and conflict with other users of sites</li> <li>- will reduce ability for other users of site to have access to it</li> <li>- urban sites which require parking to be available for customers or other users (i.e. sports use) would be negatively affected</li> </ul> May decrease availability of freedom camping sites <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- some sites with high day use may require prohibition from freedom camping to protect access for other users if freedom campers were to stay during the day also</li> </ul>	✓✓ <u>Advantages:</u> Minimise conflict with other users <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- protects access for existing users</li> <li>- perception of privatisation of public space reduced</li> </ul> Increase availability of freedom camping sites <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- some sites with high day use would be available for freedom camping</li> </ul> <u>Disadvantages:</u> Potential conflict with other users <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- high turnover at sites can create increased traffic</li> </ul>
<b>Ease of implementation</b>	✓✓ <u>Advantages:</u> Easy for enforcement officers to enforce <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- enforcement don't need to record how long a camper has been at site</li> <li>- voluntary compliance likely to be higher as aligns with camper preference and general rules</li> </ul> Easy for campers to understand <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- consistent with general rules</li> </ul> Easy to communicate	✓ <u>Advantages:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Easy to understand provided a time to leave the site is communicated</li> <li>- Easy to communicate</li> </ul> <u>Disadvantages:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- May be difficult to enforce</li> <li>- Will require additional signage on a site</li> </ul>

Staff recommend that restricted sites with some high day use (usually urban sites) should be restricted to overnight only use by freedom campers. This option will allow for more sites to be available to freedom campers to use, whilst still ensure that the day use of the site is not affected.

A consistent time to leave these sites would mitigate issues of confusion for freedom campers and enforcement officers.

<b>Whether overnight only restricted sites require a consistent time for when freedom campers must leave the site</b>				
<b>Criteria</b>	<b>No consistent restriction on time to leave a site</b>	<b>Leave all sites by 8am</b>	<b>Leave all sites by 9am</b>	<b>Leave all sites by 10am</b>
<b>Meets legislative criteria</b>	<p>✓✓</p> <p>The Act is permissive by default and does not place a restriction on how long campers can stay.</p> <p>Site by site assessment for overnight only sites could be completed to determine the response proportionate to that site.</p>	<p>✗</p> <p>The Act enables the council to restrict the activity to protect access, the area and health and safety. Staff have assessed that a leave time of 8am for all overnight only sites may not be a proportionate response.</p>	<p>✓</p> <p>The Act enables the council to restrict the activity to protect access, the area and health and safety.</p> <p>As most sites with high day use will be between 8am and 9am, staff have assessed that a leave time of 9am for all overnight only sites is a proportionate response.</p>	<p>✓</p> <p>The Act enables the council to restrict the activity to protect access, the area and health and safety.</p> <p>Staff have assessed that a leave time of 10am for all overnight only sites may not be a proportionate response.</p>
<b>Effectiveness</b>	<p>✓</p> <p><u>Advantages:</u> Minimise conflict with other users</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- time to leave site appropriate to individual site and its uses</li> </ul> <p><u>Disadvantages:</u> Does not encourage responsible camping</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- different rules for different sites would make voluntary compliance difficult for freedom campers</li> </ul> <p>Potential conflict with other users</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- if sites do not have a time to leave, freedom camping activity may conflict with other users</li> </ul>	<p>✓</p> <p><u>Advantages:</u> Minimise conflict with other users</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- ensure campers to leave area before usual business hours</li> <li>- allows time between retail and businesses standard opening hours and time when campers leave area of approximately one hour</li> </ul> <p><u>Disadvantages:</u> Does not encourage responsible camping</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- early morning start for campers. Pilot study provided that 61% of campers preferred a time to leave an area of 10am or later.</li> <li>- does not allow freedom</li> </ul>	<p>✓✓</p> <p><u>Advantages:</u> Minimise conflict with other users</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- ensure campers to leave site at the same time as many business hours start</li> <li>- frees up parking areas for other users</li> </ul> <p>Encourages responsible camping</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- sometime in morning to visit local food establishments</li> </ul> <p><u>Disadvantages:</u> Does not encourage responsible camping</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- pilot study provided that 61% of campers preferred a time to leave an area of 10am or later.</li> </ul>	<p>✓</p> <p><u>Advantages:</u> Encourage responsible camping</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- allows for campers to stay in the area and visit nearby retail or food establishments</li> <li>- pilot study provided that 61% of campers preferred a time to leave an area of 10am or later</li> <li>- aligns with many hotel check out times throughout Auckland and New Zealand.</li> </ul> <p><u>Disadvantages:</u> Potential conflict with other users</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- high day use usually starts with the working day (i.e.9am). Leaving later would reduce effectiveness and potentially cause conflict with other users</li> </ul>

		campers any time to visit local businesses		
<b>Ease of implementation</b>	<p>✘</p> <p><u>Disadvantages:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- difficult to communicate as each site will have different rules</li> <li>- difficult for freedom campers to understand as no consistency</li> <li>- each sign would need to be specific for the area</li> </ul>	<p>✓</p> <p><u>Advantages:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- easy to communicate</li> <li>- easy to understand</li> <li>- all overnight signage would have the same time for when the freedom camper needs to leave the site</li> </ul> <p><u>Disadvantages:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Difficult for enforcement to know if the person had stayed overnight or if they had arrived that morning to also use the area (i.e. shop etc). Bylaw does not stop persons in vehicles used for freedom camping to not visit other areas (i.e. retail).</li> </ul>	<p>✓</p> <p><u>Advantages:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- easy to communicate</li> <li>- easy to understand</li> <li>- all overnight signage would have the same time for when the freedom camper needs to leave the site</li> </ul> <p><u>Disadvantages:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Difficult for enforcement to know if the person had stayed overnight or if they had arrived that morning to also use the area (i.e. shop etc). Bylaw does not stop persons in vehicles used for freedom camping to not visit other areas (i.e. retail).</li> </ul>	<p>✓</p> <p><u>Advantages:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- easy to communicate</li> <li>- easy to understand (creates consistency with check out times nationally)</li> <li>- all overnight signage would have the same time for when the freedom camper needs to leave the site</li> <li>- voluntary compliance likely to be higher as aligns with camper preference</li> </ul> <p><u>Disadvantages:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Difficult for enforcement to know if the person had stayed overnight or if they had arrived that morning to also use the area (i.e. shop etc). Bylaw does not stop persons in vehicles used for freedom camping to not visit other areas (i.e. retail).</li> </ul>

Staff recommend that where overnight only rules apply to a site, there is a consistent approach to the time to leave the site. For sites with high day use, to balance the demand from freedom campers and the existing demands on a site, staff recommend a time of 9am for the freedom camper to leave the site. This is to free up parking space for customers or

employees who require use of the parking facilities or allow access for other users of a site (like a sports field). For many sites, a leaving time of 10am or later may not reduce conflict with other users and a prohibition from freedom camping may be required instead. An earlier leave time for these sites will allow for more freedom camping spots which otherwise may require prohibition.

Signage can include the time to leave a site where high day use applies. A consistent approach will be easier for freedom campers and enforcement staff to apply.

## Analysis of proposed general rules

<b>Whether general rules required</b>
Rules that apply to areas not specifically scheduled in the bylaw and that are not subject to any other enactment (general rules)
<b>Proposed rules</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• General rule on maximum number of night stay within a four week consecutive period</li><li>• General rule on type of vehicle</li></ul>

### Assessment Criteria:

#### **Meets legislative criteria** means:

- section 11 evidential criteria met
- option is a proportionate response to the perceived problem

**Effectiveness** means the option achieves the purpose of effectively managing freedom camping by:

- increasing supply
- minimising conflict with other users of the site
- minimising environmental impact
- encouraging responsible camping

#### **Ease of implementation** means:

- easy for campers to understand
- easy for enforcement to enforce
- easy to communicate
- implementation costs minimised

Rules that apply to areas not specifically scheduled in the bylaw and that are not subject to any other enactment (general rules)		
Criteria	No general rules in the bylaw	General rules included in the bylaw
<b>Meet legislative criteria</b>	✓✓ The Act is permissive by default of all types of camping.	✓ The Act enables the council to restrict freedom camping on Auckland Council and Auckland Transport managed or controlled land. Staff have assessed this as a proportionate response to the perceived problem, discussed further as part of risks.
<b>Effectiveness</b>	✗ <u>Advantages</u> - Increases supply of areas to camp - Minimises potential unintended consequences on people who are homeless living in vehicles  <u>Disadvantages</u> May create conflict with other users of the area - Could displace the activity onto roads near prohibited sites - No limitation on night stay on a road may lead to perceptions of privatisation of public space - May lead to displacement of the freedom camping issue and regular reviews will be required to include latest hot spot areas  May have a negative environmental impact - No restriction to self-contained vehicles on roads means inadequate access to toilets for campers  Does not encourage responsible camping - Campers not encouraged to go to 'restricted' sites which have been identified as the most suitable for camping, and where the activity can be managed  Campers can flout the rules by driving around the corner and camping (unrestricted by vehicle and time) on a road or site not scheduled in the bylaw (i.e. next to a prohibited site)	✓✓ <u>Advantages:</u> - Minimise environmental impact of the activity by ensuring anyone who camps in a vehicle overnight has access to a toilet. This is consistent with the logic behind restricted sites. - Provides ability for enforcement to move people on, which will minimise conflict with other users by reducing the perception of privatisation of public space. This is consistent with the logic behind the restrictions on restricted sites. - Increase supply of areas to camp in a controlled way due to general rules applying in more areas  <u>Disadvantages:</u> - The broadness of these rules may disproportionately affect people who are homeless.
<b>Ease of implementation</b>	✓✓ <u>Advantages:</u> - Consistency throughout Auckland - Easy to communicate - Easy to enforce, although enforcement tools are limited to only sites scheduled in the bylaw.  <u>Disadvantages:</u> Additional areas likely to require restrictions or prohibitions as they are discovered by campers. This will have costs for bylaw review	✓✓ <u>Advantages:</u> - Consistency throughout Auckland - Consistency with restricted sites - Easy to communicate - Easy to enforce - Consistent with most other local authorities  <u>Disadvantages:</u> - Difficult to know what areas are excluded from the general rules due to the Reserves Act

	and consultation, as well as additional communication materials and signage. Constant change of restrictions and prohibitions may lead to confusion and non-compliance.	- May create expectations that compliance staff will be monitoring all of Auckland for freedom campers.
<b>Risks</b>	<p><b>Bylaw may simply displace the problem</b> Without general rules the council may find that a bylaw simply moves the problem to a different area. The management approach will be more reactive with the schedules of the bylaw requiring amendment as issues arise. This would likely create additional resourcing requirements and reputational risk for the council.</p>	<p><b>Bylaw may displace and penalise homeless</b> An unintended consequence of restricting freedom camping generally to self-contained vehicles is that people who are homeless living in vehicles will be technically breaching the bylaw. To mitigate this risk, staff propose that a humane approach to enforcement is taken. Currently staff work with social service agencies to ensure an individual is connected with the right support. The adoption of this bylaw will not change this approach.</p> <p><b>Bylaw may be subject to legal challenge</b> Restrictions must be aligned to s11 and be proportionate to the problem. There is a risk that a general restriction on all areas including roads may not be a proportionate response due to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Freedom camping primarily occurring on parks and reserves. 22% of complaints relating to freedom camping were on roadside from Jan 2017-Feb 2018.</li> <li>- Roadside areas in high demand already have parking restrictions in place (AT parking policy) (access is protected through other mechanisms)</li> <li>- Unsafe parking on roads (e.g. obstructing sight lines is already controlled by other legislation like the Land Transport Act).</li> </ul>

Staff recommend that the bylaw include general rules that apply to areas not specifically scheduled in the bylaw or subject to any other enactment. This will help ensure the bylaw is effective at proactively managing freedom camping.

This does pose a risk of penalising people who are homeless. This can be mitigated by including an explanatory note within the bylaw that it is not the intent of the bylaw to manage people who are homeless. A humane approach to enforcement will also help mitigate this risk.

While there is some risk in the bylaw containing general rules that apply throughout Auckland, staff have assessed that general rules are a proportionate response to the problem. This analysis is included in each of the proposed general rule tables.

General rule on maximum number of night stay within a four week consecutive period				
Criteria	No restriction on number of nights	1 night maximum	2 night maximum	3 night maximum
<b>Meets legislative criteria</b>	✓✓ The Act is permissive by default and does not place a restriction on how long campers can stay.	✗ While the Act enables the council to restrict the activity, staff have assessed this may not be a proportionate response.	✓✓ The Act enables the council to restrict activity to protect access, the area and health and safety. Staff have assessed this as a proportionate response.	✓✓ The Act enables the council to restrict activity to protect access, the area and health and safety. Staff have assessed this as a proportionate response.
<b>Effectiveness</b>	✗ <u>Disadvantages:</u> - Likely to cause conflict with community due to the perception of privatisation of public space Does not encourage responsible camping - Vehicles not required to leave site and therefore less likely to empty wastewater tanks - May create competition for spaces and tension between campers	✓ <u>Advantages:</u> Increase availability of camping areas - Help ensure turnover at sites Minimise conflict with community - Perception of privatisation of public space reduced Encourage responsible camping - Vehicles required to leave and therefore more likely to appropriately dump waste <u>Disadvantages:</u> Conflict with community - High turnover creates increased traffic	✓✓ <u>Advantages:</u> Increase availability of camping areas - Help ensure turnover at sites Minimise conflict with community - Perception of privatisation of public space reduced Encourage responsible camping - Vehicles likely to move on and appropriately dump waste (certified self-contained vehicles required to have water and wastewater capacity for three days) Responsible camping - Aligns to camper preference (pilot study found over 80% campers stay at a site two or less nights)	✓ <u>Advantages:</u> Increase availability of camping areas - Some turnover at sites will occur <u>Disadvantages:</u> Responsible camping - May be competition between campers for sites due to lack of turnover - Does not require campers to leave site and appropriately dump waste within 3 day timeframe More likely to cause conflict with community due to the perception of privatisation of public space

<b>Ease of implementation</b>	<p>✓✓</p> <p><u>Advantages:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Enforcement don't need to record how long a camper has been at site</li> <li>- Easy for campers to know the rules</li> <li>- Easy to communicate</li> </ul>	<p>✓</p> <p><u>Advantages:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Easy to understand (creates consistency with high use areas where one-night site specific restriction may apply)</li> <li>- Easy to communicate</li> </ul> <p><u>Disadvantages:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Difficult to enforce as high level of monitoring required to know how long vehicles have stayed</li> </ul>	<p>✓</p> <p><u>Advantages:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Easy to communicate</li> <li>- Voluntary compliance likely to be higher as aligns with camper preference</li> <li>- Consistent with other territorial authority bylaws</li> </ul> <p><u>Disadvantages:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Monitoring required to understand length of time vehicles have stayed</li> </ul>	<p>✓</p> <p><u>Advantages:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Easy to communicate</li> <li>- Voluntary compliance likely to be high</li> <li>- Consistent with other territorial authority bylaws</li> </ul> <p><u>Disadvantages:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Monitoring required to understand length of time vehicles have stayed</li> </ul>
-------------------------------	--	---	--	---

Staff recommend that camping is allowed for a maximum number of two nights in any four week consecutive period. This option is more likely to effectively manage freedom camping by ensuring turnover at sites whilst promoting voluntary compliance as this is aligned to camper preference.

General rule on type of vehicle		
Criteria	No general rule on type of vehicle	General rule that vehicles must be certified self-contained
<b>Meets legislative criteria</b>	✓✓ The Act is permissive by default of all types of camping.	✓✓ The Act enables the council to restrict activity to protect access, the area and health and safety. Staff have assessed this as a proportionate response as risk to the environment and health and safety is likely to be high if campers do not have access to facilities at all times.
<b>Effectiveness</b>	✗ <u>Advantages:</u> Increase supply of freedom camping sites <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Provides more opportunities for non-self-contained camping</li> <li>- Will help meet demand for non-self-contained camping</li> </ul> <u>Disadvantages:</u> Negative environmental impact and does not encourage responsible camping <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Lack of access to 24-hour toilets increases risk of human waste damaging environment</li> <li>- Risk of rubbish being left if vehicles not required to have rubbish bins</li> <li>- Risk of grey water (water used to wash dishes, clothes etc.) running off into the environment</li> <li>- Campers encouraged to stay in places where there may not be adequate access to drinking water with no requirement to carry their own</li> </ul> May cause conflict with other users <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Non-self-contained campers are more likely to take up more space due to inability to carry out activities within the vehicle e.g. cooking, dressing.</li> </ul>	✓✓ <u>Advantages:</u> Minimise environmental impact and encourages responsible camping <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Ensuring access to facilities at all times e.g. toilets, rubbish bins.</li> <li>- Self-contained campers more equipped to stay in isolated areas</li> </ul> Reduce conflict with other users of the site <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Negative perceptions and experiences with non-self-contained campers means communities generally more accepting of self-contained campers.</li> </ul> <u>Disadvantages:</u> Limits supply of freedom camping sites <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Reduces number of areas that non-self-contained campers can go.</li> <li>- Fewer opportunities for lower cost camping as self-contained vehicles are more expensive to rent or own.</li> </ul>
<b>Ease of implementation</b>	✓✓ <u>Advantages</u> Easy for campers to understand Easy to communicate	✓ <u>Advantages</u> National certification standard ensures consistency and provides a method for enforcement officers to identify certified-self-contained vehicles.  Easy to communicate as nationally recognised standard.  <u>Disadvantages</u> Risk that people who are homeless may be impacted by the enforcement of the bylaw as they are unlikely to be in self-contained vehicles.

Staff recommend a general rule that vehicles must be certified self-contained be included in the bylaw. This option is more likely to effectively manage freedom camping by minimising the environmental impact of the activity and reducing conflict with other users of the site. The risk of people who are homeless being impacted by this restriction can be mitigated by the use of the graduated enforcement model which takes individual circumstances into consideration.