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: Ross William Manson
Phone (Hm): 027140916
Organisation*: Personal
* the organisation that this submission is made on behalf of
Postal Address: Sir Steiner Reed R.D.
Darfield
Phone (Wk):
Phone (Cell):
Postcode:
Fax:
Email:
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: Ross Manson
Date: 1-5-2015

(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.

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

Add further pages as required.
My general submission on Evans proposal for air quality.
I would like to make the following points.

Humans have had wood fires for at least ½ million yrs. It has been part of our progress and is probably so ingrained in our development that we will be genetically imprinted, i.e. it is good for our health.
We use smell and taste to decide whether things are good for us and I would suggest that nobody dislikes the smell of wood smoke, unlike coal, diesel fumes etc.
Therefore I am against any restriction on controlled wood fires that could impact on our health and ability to keep warm.

As a farmer of fifty plus years I have always used the burning of rubbish etc with respect.
Therefore I support the controlled burning of anything flamable as the best and cheapest method of disposing of unwanted material.
There will always be times when burning is the only practical solution as when we had 7 kilometres of shelter belts blown over on 14 Sept 2019. The only solution was to stack the tens of thousands of tons of wood into heaps and burn.
(we extracted tens of tons of firewood before burning).

I also believe that the burning of straw after grain harvesting should be aloud if there is no practical alternative both for health (it removes nitrate and controls diseases) and economic reasons.

Thank you.

Ray Newman.