

Schedule One: Decisions on sites included in proposed bylaw

| Site | Site Assessment Review Report | Proposed Bylaw | Submissions | Consideration/Decision |
|---------------|---|--------------------------------------|--|--|
| | | | | |
| District wide | Restricted to CSC up to two consecutive nights in any four week period. | As per site assessment review report | Many submitters sought a total prohibition on freedom camping. Those supporting freedom camping considered the district wide provision was appropriate but should be made more prominent in the draft bylaw. | <p>There have been impacts from freedom camping on the Marlborough environment that have become unsustainable over time. Issues have arisen because of an increase in campers, the type of vehicles used, increased frequency of occupation of sites and the behaviours of some campers.</p> <p>Much of the land that is controlled or managed by the Council is already prohibited for freedom camping in terms of the provisions of the Reserves Act 1977. This is because camping has not been provided for in reserve management plans or otherwise approved by the Council.</p> <p>There are health and safety issues for camping along many of the local roads which are windy and narrow and there is also an increased fire risk apparent in many rural locations in the east Marlborough coast.</p> <p>When considering all of these factors the decision reached was that the district wide provision enabling freedom camping should be removed from the draft bylaw. The consequence of this is that unless freedom camping occurs in one of the five sites identified above it will be prohibited elsewhere in the District.</p> <p><i>Decision: The district wide provision for freedom camping be removed from the draft bylaw to protect</i></p> |

| Site | Site Assessment Review Report | Proposed Bylaw | Submissions | Consideration/Decision |
|----------------------------|---|---|--|--|
| | | | | <i>the area, to protect the health and safety of people who may visit the area and to protect access to the area.</i> |
| Blenheim Urban Area | Prohibited | As per site assessment review report | Few comments were made in submissions concerning the proposed bylaw classification. Those supporting freedom camping in towns suggested several locations around Blenheim they considered appropriate. An assessment of these follows in Schedule Two. | <p>The primary rationale for prohibiting freedom camping relates to effects on access and visual effects. As Marlborough is the gateway to the South Island by campervans, there is potential for significant use of urban streets and resulting negative impacts on residents' access to their properties and amenity.</p> <p><i>Decision: The Blenheim Urban Area (except for Wynen Street Carpark) is confirmed as prohibited for freedom camping to protect the area, to protect the health and safety of people who may visit the area and to protect access to the area.</i></p> |
| | Wynen Street Carpark – restricted to CSC. Allow stay of two consecutive nights in any four week period on no more than two occasions. | CSC, staying no more than one night in any four week period, parking within the mapped area and vehicles are only able to be parked between the hours of 6pm and 9am. | <p>Some submitters who supported freedom camping considered this site to not be pleasant to stay or attractive as it is completely tar-sealed and surrounded by buildings.</p> <p>Other sites providing more pleasant surroundings were suggested. An assessment of these follows in Schedule Two.</p> | <p>The site is a carpark area able to accommodate a significant number of vehicles compared with other freedom camping sites. The site is also centrally located in Blenheim and is no more than a 1- 2 minute walk from the Taylor River Reserve, providing an extensive area of green space for visitors to enjoy.</p> <p><i>Decision: Wynen Street Carpark is confirmed as appropriate for freedom camping subject to the restrictions as notified in the proposed bylaw.</i></p> |
| Taylor Dam Reserve | Prohibited in lower area of the reserve. | As per site assessment review report | No specific comments were made in submissions concerning the proposed bylaw classification. | Given the values at the Taylor Dam Reserve lower level, its popularity for day use and natural hazard risk, the current prohibition is considered appropriate. There is also an increasing awareness of the risk levels from fire in the drier eastern rural |

| Site | Site Assessment Review Report | Proposed Bylaw | Submissions | Consideration/Decision |
|--|---|--------------------------------------|---|--|
| | | | | <p>areas of Marlborough.</p> <p><i>Decision: Taylor Dam Reserve – lower level is confirmed as prohibited for freedom camping to protect the area, to protect the health and safety of people who may visit the area and to protect access to the area.</i></p> |
| | Restricted in the upper carpark area. Vehicles to be CSC, parking for 10 vehicles and a stay of two consecutive nights in any four week period on no more than two occasions. | As per site assessment review report | No specific comments were made in submissions concerning the proposed bylaw classification. | <p>Use of the upper level carpark for freedom camping is currently occurring and is considered appropriate subject to the CSC and two day stay restrictions. This area of the reserve is not covered by the Taylor Dam Recreation Reserve Management Plan.</p> <p><i>Decision: Taylor Dam Reserve – upper level is confirmed as appropriate for freedom camping subject to the restrictions as notified in the proposed bylaw.</i></p> |
| Upper Spring Creek Reserve | Prohibited | As per site assessment review report | No specific comments were made in submissions concerning the proposed bylaw classification. | <p>This reserve has been a problem area for campers in the past. It is a narrow strip with little separation from the road and a scenic margin that would be compromised by a proliferation of campervans.</p> <p><i>Decision: Upper Spring Creek Reserve is confirmed as prohibited to protect the area and to protect the health and safety of people who may visit the area.</i></p> |
| Grovetown Lagoon along Steam Wharf Road | Not assessed | Prohibited | There was some support for freedom camping at the site however more submitters were opposed to camping at this location. Reasons for opposition were impacts on natural values including on wildlife, cultural values and day use of the Lagoon area. | <p>A significant restoration project has been underway at the Grovetown Lagoon for a number of years. The site was identified as prohibited in the proposed bylaw to protect the natural habitat and reduce the potential for disturbance that could result from overnight camping.</p> <p>The restoration project has also seen increased</p> |

| Site | Site Assessment Review Report | Proposed Bylaw | Submissions | Consideration/Decision |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|--|
| | | | | <p>public use of the site with walking routes around the Lagoon. The area is also of cultural significance for local iwi.</p> <p><i>Decision: Grovetown Lagoon along Steam Wharf Road is prohibited for freedom camping to protect the area and to protect access to the area.</i></p> |
| River Reserve on Steam Wharf Road | Prohibited | As per site assessment review report | No specific comments were made in submissions concerning the proposed bylaw classification. | <p>This reserve has been a problem area for campers in the past particularly due to congestion and access issues and environmental effects. Without a prohibition in place this area would continue to be compromised by a proliferation of campervans.</p> <p><i>Decision: River Reserve on Steam Wharf Road is prohibited for freedom camping to protect the area and to protect access to the area.</i></p> |
| River Reserve on Jones Road | Prohibited | As per site assessment review report | No specific comments were made in submissions concerning the proposed bylaw classification. | <p>This reserve has been a problem area for campers in the past particularly due to congestion and access issues and environmental effects. Without a prohibition in place this area would continue to be compromised by a proliferation of campervans.</p> <p><i>Decision: River Reserve on Jones Road is prohibited for freedom camping to protect the area and to protect access to the area.</i></p> |
| Ferry Bridge Picnic Area | Prohibited | As per site assessment review report | No specific comments were made in submissions concerning the proposed bylaw classification. | <p>This reserve has been a problem area for campers in the past particularly due to congestion and access issues and environmental effects. Without a prohibition in place this area would continue to be compromised by a proliferation of campervans. Work is also underway to develop the picnic area as a day use area for wider public use through the</p> |

| Site | Site Assessment Review Report | Proposed Bylaw | Submissions | Consideration/Decision |
|------------------|---|--------------------------------------|--|--|
| | | | | <p>Council's Small Townships Programme.</p> <p><i>Decision: Ferry Bridge Picnic Area is prohibited for freedom camping to protect the area and to protect access to the area.</i></p> |
| Wairau Diversion | Prohibited at eastern end near Diversion Mouth | As per site assessment review report | There was support in submissions for retention of the prohibited freedom camping area at the eastern end of the Diversion site. | <p>The Wairau Diversion serves a variety of interests for day use in addition to overnight freedom camping activities. The area is popular for fishing and picnicking around the Diversion mouth.</p> <p>Proposals to upgrade the site will provide a clear delineation between day users and campers. This will enable the area for day use to be enhanced to provide facilities for those users.</p> <p><i>Decision: The Wairau Diversion mouth area is prohibited for freedom camping to protect the area, to protect the health and safety of people who may visit the area and to protect access to the area.</i></p> |
| | Restricted for remainder of the area. Restricted to CSC and a stay of two consecutive nights in any four week period. | As per site assessment review report | <p>There was a mix of views about the use of the Wairau Diversion for freedom camping. Some submitters were concerned at the approach of closing Koromiko and concentrating more campers at the Diversion. Fire risk, conflict with recreational users, health and safety concerns, a lack of adequate provision for toilets and rubbish and access into the site were identified as issues.</p> <p>Other submitters considered this site to be appropriate for freedom camping, noting its location away from urban</p> | <p>The Wairau Diversion serves a variety of interests for day use in addition to overnight freedom camping activities. The area is popular for whitebaiting from August through until November. Walking, biking, picnicking and motorbike activities all take place at varying locations along the length of the Diversion from Neal Road.</p> <p>Proposed upgrades to the area for freedom camping include new toilet facilities, shelters and planting. This will provide a clear delineation between day users and campers and enhance campers experience at the site.</p> <p>The area able to be occupied by campers will also</p> |

| Site | Site Assessment Review Report | Proposed Bylaw | Submissions | Consideration/Decision |
|--|---|---|--|---|
| | | | areas. | <p>be reduced at the western end to avoid conflict with other users. The Diversion site is extensive and management of freedom camping will be easier in a more confined space.</p> <p><i>Decision: The area west of the prohibited area for freedom camping at the Wairau Diversion Mouth is restricted for freedom camping. Restrictions are those included in the proposed bylaw.</i></p> |
| Rarangi Blue Gum/Millennium Rock Road Reserve | Prohibited | As per site assessment review report | No specific comments were made in submissions concerning the proposed bylaw classification. | <p>The Department of Conservation has confirmed that a prohibition is useful to assist in ensuring protection of the adjacent conservation land. Enhancement plans proposed through the Council's Small Townships Programme for this area would not be compatible with use by freedom camping. Day use is the preferred activity for this site.</p> <p><i>Decision: Rarangi Blue Gum/Millennium Rock Road Reserve is prohibited for freedom camping to protect the area and to protect access to the area.</i></p> |
| Picton Urban Area | Prohibited but recommended consideration be given to a small area for overnight stays for CSC vehicles e.g. 44 High St carpark, marina carpark or overnight parking as part of the ferry precinct redevelopment | <p>As per site assessment review report</p> <p>Restricted site for 10 CSC vehicles in carpark at 44 High Street</p> <p>Restricted site for 10 CSC vehicles at Memorial Park</p> | <p>Many submitters supported an overall prohibition on freedom camping in the Picton Urban Area. Others considered some areas should be available particularly for those leaving or entering Picton from the interisland ferries.</p> <p>The proposed site at 44 High Street was opposed by adjacent landowners who had experienced issues with freedom campers at this location previously when it had been used on a trial basis. Issues with noise and behaviour of campers were of particular concern so a loss of</p> | <p>After considering the submissions and the issues around freedom camping, particularly for those arriving on late ferries or leaving on early ferries, the decision is to exclude the 44 High Street and Memorial Park sites from the draft bylaw. This would help to ensure the quality of local communities is maintained and reduce impacts on surrounding properties. Health and safety of those using marina facilities and the emergency operations centre would also be maintained.</p> <p><i>Decision: Picton Urban Area is prohibited for freedom camping to protect the area, to protect the health and safety of people who may visit the area</i></p> |

| Site | Site Assessment Review Report | Proposed Bylaw | Submissions | Consideration/Decision |
|--|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|--|
| | | | <p>amenity values would be apparent with campers at this site.</p> <p>For the Memorial Park site, the proximity of the site to the emergency centre facility was of concern to many submitters as was the loss of area for boat trailer parking on the reserve, the impact on the amenity of the Park and to nearby marina activities.</p> | <i>and to protect access to the area.</i> |
| Koromiko Recreation (Collins Memorial) Reserve and Freeths Road | Prohibited | As per site assessment review report | <p>Submitters opposing the closure of the Koromiko Recreation (Collins Memorial) Reserve site did so on the basis of the site being recently upgraded and being preferred over the two proposed sites in Picton.</p> <p>Others supporting the closure considered the site to be too small for freedom camping, that it was often overflowing with vehicles, had lost its original day use purpose and was too close to State Highway 1.</p> <p>No opposition to the prohibited area along Freeths Road was evident.</p> | <p>The proposed change in use of the Wairau Diversion as the preferred fatigue stop for those travelling to or from the interisland ferries in Picton and some concerns about traffic management risks related to the adjacent State Highway 1 were reasons why the Koromiko Recreation Reserve was proposed to become prohibited for freedom camping.</p> <p>In addition the Reserve was previously a day use location for picnics, for a toilet stop and for providing access to the adjacent QE II National Trust area.</p> <p>In considering these factors the Panel considered the Koromiko Recreation (Collins Memorial) Reserve should be returned to a day use purpose.</p> <p><i>Decision: Koromiko Recreation (Collins Memorial) Reserve and Freeths Road are prohibited for freedom camping to protect the health and safety of people who may visit the areas and to protect access to the area.</i></p> |
| Port Underwood Road and Tumbledown Bay | Port Underwood Road – prohibited | As per site assessment review | Submitters supported the prohibition for the Port Underwood Road noting safety concerns with the narrow and winding | A significant rationale for prohibiting freedom camping on the Port Underwood Road relates to safety issues associated with a narrow winding road |

| Site | Site Assessment Review Report | Proposed Bylaw | Submissions | Consideration/Decision |
|-----------------------|---|--------------------------------------|---|---|
| Road | | report | nature of the Road. | <p>with poor visibility with few turning places or parking areas. There are almost no facilities and those that do exist are designed for day use and day use volumes.</p> <p><i>Decision: Port Underwood Road is prohibited for freedom camping to protect the area, to protect the health and safety of people who may visit the area and to protect access to the area.</i></p> |
| | Tumbledown Bay Road – restricted in terms of district wide rules (CSC vehicles up to two consecutive nights in any four week period). | As per site assessment review report | Submitters opposed the exclusion of the Tumbledown Bay Road and foreshore areas from a prohibited classification for freedom camping. Reasons why a prohibition sought is for the same reasons as for the Port Underwood Road. Additionally, concerns over the fire risk from those camping, the human waste and rubbish left behind and loss of some areas for day users were identified as reasons for wanting a prohibition along this road. | <p>The initial site assessment noted that Tumbledown Bay Road has the same features as Port Underwood Road but that pressure by campers has been lower.</p> <p>However in response to submitters requesting a total prohibition of camping on all Port Underwood roads, including Tumbledown Bay Road, this road has been added to the bylaw. Protecting health and safety of visitors is a major factor as is a need to protect access to the area. This latter aspect was highlighted by submitters who considered access had been restricted for day use in a number of areas along Tumbledown Bay Road.</p> <p><i>Decision: Tumbledown Bay Road is prohibited for freedom camping to protect the area, to protect the health and safety of people who may visit the area and to protect access to the area.</i></p> |
| Queen Charlotte Drive | Prohibited | As per site assessment review report | No specific comments were made in submissions concerning the proposed bylaw classification. | The Marlborough Sounds environment in which these roads are located is a sensitive area with many cultural, natural and landscape values. Collectively, the area is considered of such significance that any camping should occur within areas where there are facilities to service the needs |

| Site | Site Assessment Review Report | Proposed Bylaw | Submissions | Consideration/Decision |
|--------------------------------|---|--------------------------------------|---|--|
| | | | | <p>of campers.</p> <p>In addition a significant rationale for prohibiting freedom camping on this road relates to safety issues associated with a narrow winding road with poor visibility, few turning places or parking areas. There are also few facilities and those that do exist are designed for day use and day use volumes.</p> <p><i>Decision: Queen Charlotte Drive is prohibited for freedom camping to protect the area, to protect the health and safety of people who may visit the area and to protect access to the area.</i></p> |
| Anakiwa Road and Village Green | Anakiwa Road – prohibited | As per site assessment review report | Several submitters commented on the presence of campervans parked along the Anakiwa Road which is narrow in parts. They supported the prohibition of freedom camping along this road. | <p>The proliferation of camping along the Anakiwa Road would have an adverse effect on day use access to the coastal environment hence a prohibition is considered justifiable. Some health and safety concerns were identified by submitters with parts of the road being too narrow for campervans to park safely.</p> <p><i>Decision: Anakiwa Road is prohibited for freedom camping to protect the health and safety of people who may visit the area and to protect access to the area.</i></p> |
| | Village Green – restricted to CSC, 6 vehicles and a stay of two consecutive nights in any four week period. | As per site assessment review report | Concerns highlighted by those opposing freedom camping on the Village Green site included health and safety issues, intimidation of locals, noise, original day use purpose lost, impact on roads leading to the site, water quality and availability and rubbish. The visual impact of freedom camping vehicles at this site was an additional issue for | <p>In considering the future of the Anakiwa Village Green, Double Bay and Ohingaroa Bay sites the Hearings Panel was mindful of the likely impact of closing one or two of them on the remaining site(s) in this grouping. The Panel's approach was that either none of the sites would be closed or all of them would be closed.</p> <p>In considering submissions it was noted that there</p> |

| Site | Site Assessment Review Report | Proposed Bylaw | Submissions | Consideration/Decision |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|--|
| | | | <p>some submitters.</p> <p>There were some submitters who supported freedom camping at the site stating that it worked well at the location.</p> | <p>had been a reported loss of enjoyment by local residents and visitors experienced across the three sites from freedom camping.</p> <p>For Anakiwa, the area is already under considerable parking pressure in terms of providing access to the Queen Charlotte Track, which starts just metres away from the freedom camping site. The Village Green is a popular parking and community space for day use. The continued presence of freedom camping has the potential to affect these uses, particularly if this site remains the only one open in the Marlborough Sounds area.</p> <p><i>Decision: Anakiwa Village Green is prohibited for freedom camping to protect the area and to protect access to the area.</i></p> |
| Kenepuru Sound Roads | Prohibited | As per site assessment review report | Few comments were made in relation to the prohibition on Kenepuru Sounds Roads. | <p>The Marlborough Sounds environment in which these roads are located is a sensitive area with many cultural, natural and landscape values. Collectively, the area is considered of such significance that any camping should occur within areas where there are facilities in place to service the needs of campers.</p> <p>Additionally one of the major reasons for prohibiting freedom camping on these roads relates to safety issues associated with a narrow winding road with poor visibility, few turning places or parking areas. There are also few facilities and those that do exist are designed for day use and day use volumes. Prohibiting freedom camping for only part of this road will result in an exacerbation of activity and impact on any remaining sections of road.</p> |

| Site | Site Assessment Review Report | Proposed Bylaw | Submissions | Consideration/Decision |
|---------------------------|-------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | | | <i>Decision: Kenepuru Roads are prohibited for freedom camping to protect the area, to protect the health and safety of people who may visit the area and to protect access to the area.</i> |
| Double Bay Reserve | Prohibited | Restricted to CSC, 6 vehicles in marked area and a stay of two consecutive nights in any four week period. | Many submissions were received on the Double Bay site seeking its closure for freedom camping and a return to day use only. Concerns highlighted by those opposing freedom camping included health and safety issues, intimidation of locals, noise, original day use purpose lost, danger on roads leading to the site, water quality and availability and rubbish. | <p>In considering the future of the Anakiwa Village Green, Double Bay and Ohingaroa Bay sites the Hearings Panel was mindful of the likely impact of closing one or two of them on the remaining site(s) in this grouping. The Panel's approach was that either none of the sites would be closed or all of them would be closed.</p> <p>In considering submissions it was noted that there had been a reported loss of enjoyment by local residents and visitors experienced across the three sites from freedom camping. The loss of Double Bay as a day use site and the other reported amenity related issues were such that the Panel concluded the site should become prohibited for freedom camping.</p> <p><i>Decision: Double Bay is prohibited for freedom camping to protect the area to protect the health and safety of people who may visit the area and to protect access.</i></p> |
| Ohingaroa Bay | Prohibited | Restricted to CSC, 4 vehicles in marked area and a stay of two consecutive nights in any four week period. | Concerns highlighted by those opposing freedom camping at Ohingaroa included health and safety issues, intimidation of locals, noise, original day use purpose lost and rubbish. | <p>In considering the future of the Anakiwa Village Green, Double Bay and Ohingaroa Bay sites the Hearings Panel was mindful of the likely impact of closing one or two of them on the remaining site(s) in this grouping. The Panel's approach was that either none of the sites would be closed or all of them would be closed.</p> <p>In considering submissions it was noted that there</p> |

| Site | Site Assessment Review Report | Proposed Bylaw | Submissions | Consideration/Decision |
|------------------|--|----------------|---|--|
| | | | | <p>had been a reported loss of enjoyment by local residents and visitors experienced across the three sites from freedom camping. For Ohingaroa Bay with only four available spaces for vehicles, this will not result in a significant loss for freedom campers, particularly as there are a number of Department of Conservation campsites in the area providing a similar camping option. This decision allows the Bay to return to day use purposes.</p> <p><i>Decision: Ohingaroa Bay is prohibited for freedom camping to protect the area and to protect access to the area.</i></p> |
| Ohauparuparu Bay | District wide-restriction applicable to road reserve | Prohibited | <p>Limited comment was received on this site. Several of those supporting freedom camping considered the site was appropriate as it was away from built up areas and there were few sites available.</p> <p>Those opposing said there were nearby campgrounds with facilities and the adverse effects from campers' behaviour and lack of respect for the environment were increasingly of concern.</p> | <p>The Ohauparuparu Bay freedom camping site is located on land that is a mixture of Sounds Foreshore Reserve, private ownership and an unformed legal road with the site being predominantly in private ownership. As the land is not all under the control or management of the Council, the Council cannot legally control freedom camping on the areas of private land or Sounds Foreshore Reserve – see Section 3 of the FCA.</p> <p>Although the initial site assessment recommended the site could be subject to the district-wide provision for freedom camping, with the removal of that provision any ability for camping on legal road has also been removed.</p> <p><i>Decision: In that part of Ohauparuparu Bay that is road reserve freedom camping is prohibited to protect the area, to protect the health and safety of people who may visit the area and to protect access.</i></p> |

| Site | Site Assessment Review Report | Proposed Bylaw | Submissions | Consideration/Decision |
|-----------------------|---|--------------------------------------|---|---|
| Havelock Urban Area | Prohibited | As per site assessment review report | No specific comments were made in submissions concerning the proposed bylaw classification. | <p>The primary rationale for prohibiting freedom camping relates to effects on access and visual effects. As Havelock is on the main road towards Nelson, there has been significant use of urban streets and resulting negative impacts.</p> <p><i>Decision: Havelock Urban Area is prohibited for freedom camping to protect the area, to protect the health and safety of people who may visit the area and to protect access.</i></p> |
| French Pass Roads | Prohibited | As per site assessment review report | No specific comments were made in submissions concerning the proposed bylaw classification. | <p>The Marlborough Sounds environment in which these roads are located is a sensitive area with many cultural, natural and landscape values. Collectively the area is considered of such significance that any camping should occur within areas where there are facilities in place to service the needs of campers.</p> <p><i>Decision: The French Pass Roads are prohibited for freedom camping to protect the area, to protect the health and safety of people who may visit the area and to protect access.</i></p> |
| Alfred Stream Reserve | Freedom camping restricted to CSC and a stay of two consecutive nights in any four week period. | As per site assessment review report | <p>Submitters opposing freedom camping at the site raised the issue of the flood hazard risk to campers and the loss of the site for day use.</p> <p>Those opposing the district wide prohibition on non self-contained vehicles, included cyclists who identified the Alfred Stream site as an ideal resting point either heading to or coming from Nelson. The presence of a toilet at the site meant from the submitters' point of</p> | <p>For camping to be sustainable, there needs to be conditions where the environment can sustain the numbers of campers staying at a site. Many submitters supported the change in approach to CSC noting a degradation of the environment in locations where there hadn't been a requirement for CSC previously.</p> <p>Because of this the CSC requirement has been retained to protect freedom camping sites as well as the health and safety of people who may visit the sites. It is appropriate and proportionate to retain</p> |

| Site | Site Assessment Review Report | Proposed Bylaw | Submissions | Consideration/Decision |
|-------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|--|
| | | | view that there was no requirement for freedom campers to be CSC at this location. | <p>the requirement for CSC across the district.</p> <p>In considering submissions to close Alfred Stream Reserve for freedom camping it is noted the purpose of this reserve is Local Purpose (picnic area). The use of the reserve for freedom camping has seen a detrimental effect on day use and therefore the primary purpose of the reserve.</p> <p>In addition there is a flood risk at the reserve which means managing overnighing campers can be difficult. The costs and practicality of implementing flood protection works or a more formalised flood warning system for this site is not warranted.</p> <p><i>Decision: Alfred Stream Reserve is prohibited for freedom camping to protect access to the area and to protect the health and safety of people who may visit the area.</i></p> |
| Brown River | Prohibited | As per site assessment review report | <p>Of the specific comments made on the proposed closure of this site, those that did support closure highlighted flood risk and that the site should be used for local community use and passing visitors rather than overnight camping.</p> <p>There were several submitters supporting the retention of the site for freedom camping noting the site was well away from residents being an 'out of town' location.</p> | <p>The flood risk at the site and the speed with which flooding can occur means managing overnighing campers can be difficult. The costs and practicality of implementing flood protection works or a more formalised flood warning system for this site are not warranted.</p> <p>The site has also been a popular day use area for the local community and they have shown a preference for it to be returned to that use.</p> <p><i>Decision: The Brown River site is prohibited for freedom camping to protect access to the area and to protect the health and safety of people who may visit the area.</i></p> |

| Site | Site Assessment Review Report | Proposed Bylaw | Submissions | Consideration/Decision |
|-------------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|---|---|
| Penzance Bay Township | Prohibited | As per site assessment review report | No specific comments were made in submissions concerning the proposed bylaw classification. | <p>This area was a problem area for a number of years, however with the addition of this area as a prohibited area for freedom camping most of these issues have been resolved. In addition the Marlborough Sounds environment in which this area is located is a sensitive area with many cultural, natural and landscape values. Collectively the area is considered of such significance that any camping should occur within areas where there are facilities in place to service the needs of campers.</p> <p><i>Decision: Penzance Bay Township is prohibited for freedom camping to protect the area, to protect the health and safety of people who may visit the area and to protect access to the area.</i></p> |
| Renwick Urban Area and Domain | Renwick Urban Area – prohibited | As per site assessment review report | No specific comments were made in submissions concerning the proposed bylaw classification. | <p>The primary rationale for prohibiting freedom camping in the urban area of Renwick relates to effects on access and visual effects. As Renwick is close to a number of different attractions, including wineries, there has in the past been significant use of urban streets and resulting negative impacts.</p> <p><i>Decision: The Renwick Urban Area is prohibited for freedom camping to protect the area, to protect the health and safety of people who may visit the area and to protect access to the area.</i></p> |
| | Renwick Domain – restricted subject to no more than 10 CSC vehicles, parking in the marked area, and parked between the hours of 6pm and | As per site assessment review report | No specific comments were made in submissions concerning the proposed bylaw classification. | <p>The Renwick Domain is considered an appropriate place for freedom camping being located away from residences.</p> <p><i>Decision: Renwick Domain is confirmed as a restricted area for freedom camping subject to the notified restrictions in the proposed bylaw.</i></p> |

| Site | Site Assessment Review Report | Proposed Bylaw | Submissions | Consideration/Decision |
|-------------------------------------|---|--------------------------------------|--|---|
| | 9am and staying no more than two consecutive nights in a four week period | | | |
| Seddon Urban Area and Domain | Prohibited | As per site assessment review report | No specific comments were made in submissions concerning the proposed bylaw classification. | <p>The primary rationale for prohibiting freedom camping relates to effects on access and visual effects. As Seddon is on State Highway 1 there has been increasing use of streets and resulting negative impacts. The current prohibition was brought in after lower levels of control failed to sufficiently reduce issues.</p> <p><i>Decision: Seddon Urban Area is prohibited for freedom camping to protect the area, to protect the health and safety of people who may visit the area and to protect access to the area.</i></p> |
| Blairich Reserve | Restricted to CSC and a stay of two consecutive nights in any four week period. | As per site assessment review report | Few submitters commented on freedom camping at Blairich Reserve and those that did described how the site provided for tenting (in the current bylaw), including for those cycling through the Molesworth Station. The change to CSC being required at all freedom camping sites removed this opportunity. | <p>The initial site assessment did not raise any significant issues with the continued use of the site for freedom camping although the potential for flooding during extreme events was noted. The flooding risk is from the Awatere River which is immediately adjacent to the site.</p> <p>Of more concern is the fire risk that exists in this very dry east Marlborough rural environment. The potential for fires can result from natural hazards in certain weather conditions but is more likely to result from activities undertaken by humans in this area.</p> <p>Although the Reserve is adjacent to the Awatere Valley Road it is some distance from a main road i.e. State Highway 1 and there are few escape routes in</p> |

| Site | Site Assessment Review Report | Proposed Bylaw | Submissions | Consideration/Decision |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|--|
| | | | | <p>the event of fire.</p> <p><i>Decision: Blairich Reserve is prohibited for freedom camping to protect the health and safety of people who may visit the area.</i></p> |
| Marfells Beach Road | Prohibited | As per site assessment review report | This was a mix of support and opposition to the prohibition along Marfells Beach Road although limited specific comments were made. Several acknowledged the narrow road leading into the DOC campsite and that camping vehicles could be dangerous and there are important values to be protected in this area. | <p>The Council assessed a request from the Department of Conservation to prohibit camping on an area of road reserve along the Marfells Beach Road, near the Department of Conservation camping area. The reasons for this were to protect the area and access to the area – more people and vehicles are using the dune area along this road and causing damage to the natural environment.</p> <p><i>Decision: Marfells Beach Road is prohibited for freedom camping to protect the area, to protect the health and safety of people who may visit the area and to protect access to the area.</i></p> |
| Lake Elterwater Road Reserve | Remove from bylaw | As per site assessment review report | Many submitters sought the retention of this site in preference to a new freedom camping site proposed for Ward Domain. | <p>The area has been an area for freedom camping under the current bylaw, however as the site is not under the control or management of the Council as is required by section 3 of the FCA, it was to be removed through the proposed bylaw.</p> <p>For that reason Ward Domain was identified as a location where freedom camping could be appropriate. However, the Council is now pursuing a delegation from NZTA to enable the Council to have management responsibilities for vehicles at the site including for the purposes of freedom camping rather than retaining the proposed site at Ward Domain.</p> <p><i>Decision: Lake Elterwater Road Reserve is restricted</i></p> |

| Site | Site Assessment Review Report | Proposed Bylaw | Submissions | Consideration/Decision |
|----------------------------|---|---|--|---|
| | | | | <i>for freedom camping subject to vehicles being CSC and staying no more than two nights in any four week period. Inclusion of the site in the bylaw is further subject to the Council being able to gain control or management of the site from NZTA.</i> |
| Ward Domain | Restricted to CSC and a stay of two consecutive nights in any four week period. | Restricted to CSC, a stay of two consecutive nights in any four week period, parked within marked area and limited to 10 vehicles | Many submissions were received opposing the inclusion of Ward Domain as a site for freedom camping. Concerns raised by submitters included pollution of waterways, water availability, littering, the presence of other accommodation facilities nearby, security concerns, impact of dogs on stock grazing at the Domain, proximity of Ward Memorial to the camping site and community use of the Domain. | <p>The Council acknowledged the importance of the wide range of community uses carried out at the Domain and the related values the community expressed about the Domain and nearby memorial. The Panel considered that community use could be compromised or made more difficult if freedom camping was to occur at the site.</p> <p><i>Decision: Ward Domain is prohibited for freedom camping to protect the area and to protect access to the area.</i></p> |
| Mapping and Signage | Port Underwood Road | N/A | Some issues were raised in relation to mapping of the prohibited area along the Port Underwood Road and that some areas, notably what is known as the 'Ocean Bay Reserves' appeared to be missed from the Council's Camping Smart Maps. | <p>It is important to note that in respect of roads that are prohibited for freedom camping the location of the formed road does not always follow the boundaries of the legal road. This means that if the formed road has extended over private land or land that is not under the control or management of the Council, the provisions of the bylaw cannot apply to it. This is apparent in some areas of the Marlborough Sounds for example where the formed road extends over Sounds Foreshore Reserve.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this and as advised in the Decision Report, the Council is removing the district wide provision for freedom camping. This means that camping may only take place at five locations on Council managed or controlled land and everywhere else in the District it will be prohibited. The related mapping in the bylaw will therefore only show those</p> |

| Site | Site Assessment Review Report | Proposed Bylaw | Submissions | Consideration/Decision |
|------|--|----------------|--|---|
| | | | | areas where freedom camping may occur. |
| | Moetapu Bay Road from Kenepuru Road to the end of the road | - | <p>A submitter considered that the mapping of Moetapu Bay Road was inconsistent with the wording of the bylaw. The description in the proposed bylaw identified the prohibited road in 8(k) as follows:</p> <p><i>Moetapu Bay Road which runs from Kenepuru Road to Hoods Bay.</i></p> <p>The submitter considered this description would see the area prohibited for freedom camping as falling approximately 3 kilometres short of the road end.</p> | <p>The simplest way to rectify any confusion around the description is to remove the reference to Hoods Bay and simply say 'to road end' as has been done for other roads. This would see 8(k) read as follows:</p> <p><i>Moetapu Bay Road which runs from Kenepuru Road to road end.</i></p> <p>However, as advised in the Decision Report, the Council's decisions provide that camping may only take place at five locations on Council managed or controlled land and everywhere else in the District it will be prohibited. The related descriptions and mapping in the bylaw will therefore only describe/show those areas where freedom camping may occur. By default everywhere else is prohibited.</p> |
| | Signage | - | A number of submitters requested improved signage at various locations particularly in relation to signalling where prohibitions apply. | As a consequence of decisions made by the Hearings Panel a complete review of all signage will be undertaken at both the freedom camping sites and where prohibitions apply. |

Schedule Two: Additional sites requested to become prohibited or made available for freedom camping

| Site | Submission | Consideration/Decision |
|---|---|--|
| Railway Station, Blenheim | Alternatives for camping such as the area behind the Blenheim Railway Station were sought in preference to the Wynen Street carpark as it was considered that site is not particularly pleasing for campers to stay at. | Aside from an area immediately adjacent to the Ōpaoa River that is esplanade reserve, the land between the esplanade reserve and the railway station is not owned or in the control of the Council. Therefore this cannot be managed for camping under the Freedom Camping Act 2011. <i>Decision: Area not available for freedom camping.</i> |
| Horton Park old netball courts, Blenheim | Alternatives for camping such as the Horton Park old netball courts were sought in preference to the Wynen Street carpark as it was considered that site is not particularly pleasing for campers to stay at. | The netball court area is being considered for other activities so isn't readily available for a freedom camping site. <i>Decision: Area not available for freedom camping.</i> |
| Pollard Park, Blenheim | The parking area on the western side of the entranceway into Pollard Park was identified through submission as an appropriate and pleasant area for camping for self-contained vehicles. | In terms of the criteria for assessing the appropriateness of the Pollard Park carpark, this would have the same outcome as for the Blenheim Urban Area. There would be greater pressure on recreational assets such as the toilets, parking, barbecues etc. that receive a lot of evening use by residents during the summer months. This is a premier park for Marlborough and all areas should remain freely available for users and not specifically for overnight campers. <i>Decision: Freedom camping is prohibited at Pollard Park.</i> |
| Stadium 2000 carpark | Alternatives for camping such as the Stadium 2000 carpark were sought in preference to the Wynen Street carpark as it was considered that site is not particularly pleasing for campers to stay at. | The carpark does have a more open character than the Wynen Street site and has a small park. However, the issue for this site is that there are a number of after-hours users of the carpark and freedom camping vehicles could impact on availability for existing users. <i>Decision: Freedom camping is prohibited at the Stadium 2000 carpark.</i> |
| Roadside area south of State Highway 6 | This area south of the SH 6 bridge just north of Rapaura Road intersection was proposed as an appropriate area for freedom camping. The | This land is not available for a freedom camping site as it is the area where a roundabout with the intersection with State Highway 6 and Rapaura Road is |

| Site | Submission | Consideration/Decision |
|--|---|--|
| Wairau River Bridge | submitter noted the area is already used by trucks, buses and caravans as a pull over area and there is a lot of room. It is prominently positioned for monitoring and a good location for ferry traffic. | currently being constructed. <i>Decision: Area not available for freedom camping.</i> |
| Ward Beach and Ward Beach Road | <p>The area was identified as an alternative to the proposed freedom camping site at Ward Domain. The area is available for freedom camping under the current bylaw in accordance with the district wide provision. This means camping can occur in a CSC vehicle and stay for two nights.</p> <p>Other submitters sought a specific prohibition for freedom camping at Ward Beach and along Ward Beach Road.</p> <p>This area has also been requested to be made a prohibited area to protect a wide range of values along the East Marlborough Coast.</p> | <p>Ward Beach area and Ward Beach Road area available now through the current bylaw for freedom camping in accordance with the district wide provision. This means camping can occur in a CSC vehicle and a stay of two nights in any four week period.</p> <p>The land at Ward Beach is road reserve under the control of the Council as is the Ward Beach Road. Private land immediately adjoining the Ward Beach area provides camping for NZMCA members. The area is a popular day use location and has a Council funded toilet located on the road reserve.</p> <p>Given the Council's approach to providing for sustainable freedom camping at five other sites the Ward Beach and Ward Beach Road areas are not proposed to become a freedom camping site.</p> <p><i>Decision: Freedom camping is prohibited at Ward Beach and Ward Beach Road.</i></p> |
| Ward Roads | A number of roads around the Ward township were proposed by submitters to be prohibited for freedom camping in the same way roads in other urban areas had been prohibited. Roads identified included Seddon Street, Clermont Street, Mill Street, Ward Street, Duncan Street, Tachells Road, Gulch Road, Needles Road, Taimate Road, Peggioh Road, Cape Campbell Road. | <p>Although Ward is not as compact an urban area as other townships are which also have prohibitions, the issues expressed by the local community are nonetheless similar.</p> <p>Given the Council's approach to providing for sustainable freedom camping at five other sites the Ward Roads will become a prohibited area for freedom camping.</p> <p><i>Decision: Freedom camping is prohibited on Ward Local Roads.</i></p> |
| Lake Grassmere to Waima River coastline | Submitters sought a prohibition for freedom camping along the coastline from Lake Grassmere to Waima River. Reasons for seeking the opposition were risks to the coastal environment including physical damage to ecology and | There is legal road extending around the coast east from Mussel Point (between Lake Grassmere and Cape Campbell) to just north of the Waima River. This road is shown as Open Space 1 in the MEP and is in the control of the Council. The Council does not have other reserve land along the |

| Site | Submission | Consideration/Decision |
|--|---|--|
| | landscape from parking and camp sites, increased fire risk and sometimes disposal of waste. | <p>coast.</p> <p>This area is currently the subject of separate investigation into the impacts of motor vehicle access as a consequence of the area being much more accessible after the 2016 Kaikoura earthquake. This may result in a bylaw that would prevent vehicle access, which would effectively prevent freedom camping.</p> <p>Prohibiting freedom camping would be protecting the area in terms of the criteria for assessing a restriction or prohibition, particularly conservation, natural resource and landscape and amenity values.</p> <p>Given the Council's approach to providing for sustainable freedom camping at five other sites the Lake Grassmere to Waima River coastline will become prohibited for freedom camping.</p> <p><i>Decision: Freedom camping is prohibited along the Lake Grassmere to Waima River coastline.</i></p> |
| Awatere Valley Road from Blairich Station to Molesworth (including Medway) Northbank Road | Submitters considered that freedom camping beside or off road creates biosecurity risks for stock health and farm safety, that dogs travelling with campers are harmful to sheep and cattle and that camp cookers are also a risk in dry seasons. | <p>Land owners highlighted the risks with campers overnighting adjacent to operating farms with biosecurity risk from animals travelling with campers and the fire risk.</p> <p>Given the Council's approach to providing for sustainable freedom camping at five other sites the Awatere Valley Road and Northbank Road will become prohibited for freedom camping.</p> <p><i>Decision: Freedom camping is prohibited along the Awatere Valley Road and Northbank Road.</i></p> |
| D'Urville Island | There was concern expressed by submitters that the environmentally sensitive nature of d'Urville Island means it is not appropriate for freedom camping to occur there. The island is of significant cultural value to Ngāti Koata. | <p>The island has many of the same characteristics that the French Pass Roads have, which have a prohibition for freedom camping.</p> <p>Given the Council's approach to providing for sustainable freedom camping at five other sites all of the D'Urville Island Roads will become prohibited for</p> |

| Site | Submission | Consideration/Decision |
|--|---|---|
| | | <p>freedom camping.</p> <p><i>Decision: Freedom camping is prohibited along the D'Urville Island Roads.</i></p> |
| Cissy Bay and Te Towaka | <p>Submitters highlighted that the proposed prohibition on the French Pass Roads did not include the township of Cissy Bay with 30+ residences nor Cissy Bay Road. Te Towaka Rd and adjacent Te Towaka itself were also requested to be added to the prohibited area for freedom camping.</p> | <p>These two townships and roads have many of the same characteristics that the French Pass Roads and townships in this area have, which have a prohibition for freedom camping.</p> <p>Given the Council's approach to providing for sustainable freedom camping at five other sites, the townships of Cissy Bay and Te Towaka and the road leading to these townships will become prohibited for freedom camping.</p> <p><i>Decision: Freedom camping is prohibited at the townships of Cissy Bay and Te Towaka and the road leading to these townships.</i></p> |
| Foreshore Reserves - Kenepuru and Pelorus Sound | <p>A submitter sought all foreshore reserves in the Kenepuru and Pelorus Sounds be prohibited for freedom camping as these reserves are in a fragile environment.</p> | <p>Most foreshore reserves around the Marlborough Sounds are under the control of the Department of Conservation although the Council does have control of some esplanade reserves. These reserves are in a sensitive environment although some of these are in locations where access is difficult and therefore camping is extremely unlikely, particularly given the requirement for CSC.</p> <p>Given the Council's approach to providing for sustainable freedom camping all esplanade reserves will become prohibited for freedom camping.</p> <p><i>Decision: Freedom camping is prohibited on esplanade reserves.</i></p> |