Submission on the Proposed Canterbury Air Regional Plan

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) 688342
Organisation*: Phone (Wk):
* the organisation that this submission is made on behalf of Phone (Cell):
Postal Address: 5 Richmond St
Timaru 7910
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: Warwick Max 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
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(1) The specific provisions of the proposal that my submission relates to are: (Specify page number and subsection numbering for each separate provision).</th>
<th>(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.)</th>
<th>(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.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.10 - Timaru clean air zone</td>
<td>I wish to have amendments made.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I got rid of an old log burner 9 years ago and installed the cleanest burner on the market (consumer testing). To this day, I never use the air controls, solely to reduce emissions. Is it not lazy bureaucracy thinking to put a blanket ban on all weather conditions eg. very hot ultra low burners despite having been shown to comply with air quality standards? How would they be operated? I operate mine with air controls in varying fuel inputs, fully open position 99% of the time.</td>
<td>For the rest of their production life, use the previously generation burners for the rest of their production life, solely to reduce emissions. Is it not lazy bureaucracy thinking to put a blanket ban on all weather conditions eg. very hot ultra low burners despite having been shown to comply with air quality standards? How would they be operated? I operate mine with air controls in varying fuel inputs, fully open position 99% of the time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1.6 - Region wide</td>
<td>Firewood being allowed to have 25% moisture content is surely a joke. In my experience the majority of log burners, even still haven't got the message that buying wood in April for that winter that's barely dry enough is not acceptable.</td>
<td>Cut the moisture content allowable in Firewood in half.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I have come across many people with new wood 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 Iveson) or greater enforcement of Firewood merchants with a more realistic moisture content (15%?)

Region wide