



# Submission on the Proposed Canterbury Air Regional Plan

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

EC - CHCH		
FILE REF: AIR / PLAN / IP / GSU / 2		
DOCUMENT No.:		ACTION
30 APR 2015		
61205		INFO
Submitter ID: Brett Aldridge		
File No:		

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: Cicely & Helen Corbett Phone (Hm): 03) 302 3723

Organisation\*: \_\_\_\_\_ Phone (Wk): \_\_\_\_\_

\* the organisation that this submission is made on behalf of

Postal Address: 99 Corbetts Road South Phone (Cell): \_\_\_\_\_

R O 7, Ashburton Postcode: 7777

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: H Corbett Date: 26/4/2015

(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

# **SUBMISSION FOR: CANTERBURY AIR REGIONAL PLAN**

## **BURNING OF CROP RESIDUE**

We put forward the many benefits of this practice which has been conducted for hundreds of years:

1. Burning crop stubble produces ash which is a great fertiliser and is incorporated back into the soil.
2. Burning greatly reduces the build-up of weed seed in the soil.
3. Reduces pests thus keeping them better controlled.
4. It also reduces the chemical usage to control weeds and pests.
5. Reduces the number of cultivation passes the paddock requires, thus saving on fuel, machinery wear and also man hours.
6. Burning off is only for a short time of the year.

If crop stubble/residue fires are banned from current farming practices, the following information needs to be addressed.

1. Who compensates the farmer for the cost of fuel, baling, cartage, storage and fertiliser lost from the stubble? Extra chemical and extra fertiliser would need to be carted and spread onto fields all at extra cost. This cost of this extra chemical and fertiliser, in full, needs to be recouped from Environment Canterbury.
2. For all tree prunings, trimmings, fallen branches etc which is a normal farming practice, burning is the normal disposal of these prunings, to be banned, Environment Canterbury need to collect and dispose of this waste. If this debris is cleaned up and burnt in a controlled manner by the land owner, this reduces the risk of scrub fires occurring as in Australia.

## **MOTION:**

**We Oppose the abolishment of stubble fires which is centuries old and is an effective part of current farming management.**

## **HOME HEATING FIRES**

Dwelling fireplaces that are certified and meet the code, should still be allowed to be used, in place of heatpumps, for the follow reasons:

1. Electricity is a limited resource, especially when rivers and lakes are low.
2. In the instance of a power cut, a fire place can still warm a dwelling.
3. Most stand-alone fires can be used for cooking.
4. Those with wet-backs are used for heating water.
5. Cones, fallen trees and branches can be used for these fires that allows the country to stay tidy of nature's natural debris.

## **MOTION:**

**We oppose certified home fires being removed from dwellings in favour of electrical heating devices.**