

Submission on the Proposed Canterbury Air Regional Plan

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

EC - CHCH	
FILE REF: <u>AR PLAN 1P/650/3</u>	
DOCUMENT No.:	
24 APR 2015 58156	ACTION INFO
Submitter ID:	
File No: <u>B. Aldridge</u>	

Form 5: Submissions on a Publicly Notified Proposed Policy Statement or Regional Plan under Clause 6 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991

Return your signed submission by 5.00pm, Friday 1 May 2015 to:

Freepost 1201
Proposed Canterbury Air Regional Plan.
Environment Canterbury
P O Box 345
Christchurch 8140

A

Full Name: Warwick Max de Lacey

Phone (Hm): (03) 6888342

Organisation*: _____

Phone (Wk): _____

* the organisation that this submission is made on behalf of

Postal Address: 5 Richmond St
Timaru 7910

Phone (Cell): _____

Postcode: 7910

Email: _____

Fax: _____

Contact name and postal address for service of person making submission (if different from above):

Trade Competition

Pursuant to Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991, a person who could gain an advantage in trade competition through the submission may make a submission only if directly affected by an effect of the proposed policy statement or plan that:

- a) adversely affects the environment; and
- b) does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.

Please tick the sentence that applies to you:

- ☒ I could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission; or
- ☐ I could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission. **If you have ticked this box please select one of the following:**
- ☐ I am directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission
 - ☐ I am not directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission

Signature: W. de Lacey

Date: 21/4/15

(Signature of person making submission or person authorised to sign on behalf of person making the submission)

Please note:

(1) all information contained in a submission under the Resource Management Act 1991, including names and addresses for service, becomes public information.

B

- ☐ I do not wish to be heard in support of my submission; or
- ☒ I do wish to be heard in support of my submission; and if so,
- ☒ I would be prepared to consider presenting your submission in a joint case with others making a similar submission at any hearing

C (1) The specific provisions of the proposal that my submission relates to are: (Specify page number and subsection numbering for each separate provision).	(2) My submission is that: (State concisely whether you support or oppose each separate provision being submitted on, or wish to have amendments made and the reasons for your views.)	(3) I seek the following decisions from Environment Canterbury: (Please give precise details for each provision. The more specific you can be the easier it will be for the Council to understand your concerns.)
	I wish to have amendments made	
7.90 - Timaru clean air zone	<p>I got rid of a Kent logburner 9 years ago and installed the cleanest burner on the market (consumer testing) Ethos ones, 'Solely to reduce emissions'.</p> <p>Is it not lazy bureaucratic thinking to put a blanket ban on all non ultra low burners despite how cleanly they are operated - I operate mine with air control in fully open position 99% of the time.</p>	<p>allow the very best of the previous generation burners for the rest of their practical and safe life while insisting that air controls are <u>not</u> shut down except in exceptional weather conditions eg very strong winds - Temperature control can be achieved by varying fuel input.</p>
7.76 - Region wide	<p>Firewood being allowed to have 25% moisture content is surely a joke. In my experience the majority of logburner users still haven't got the message that buying wood in April for that winter that is barely dry enough is not acceptable.</p>	<p>Cut the moisture content allowable in Firewood in half.</p>

Add further pages as required.

7.76

Region
wide

I have come across many people
with near new burners that smoke
badly with firewood that seems dry
sometimes firewood size is to blame or
not allowing the firebox to get hot enough
or the burner itself being of poor design
or installation not up to scratch.

using more stick - not just carrot
(like Iverson) greater enforcement
of Firewood merchants with a more
realistic moisture content (15%?)

→ ban logburners
according to their
emissions rating not
whether the are
low or ultra low.
greater enforcement
of smoky flues
rather than penalising
responsible owners
of Ethos gas models