1 May 2015

The Manager Enviroment Canterbury Freepost 1201 Christchurch

Dear Sir

Enclosed is my response to the Air plan proposals.

As one who is not exactly with computer technology I am grateful and appreciated the assistance I received from your Timaru staff. They were patient, understanding and willing to help. Their attitude was very much appreciated.

Yours Faithfully

Roylorlin

Roy Carter

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY



submission at any hearing

Submission on the Proposed Canterbury Air Regional Plan

Submitter ID: 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: CARTER, Roy QUARTLY	Phone (Hm): DR 686 2533	
Full Name:	Phone (Wk): <u>53 6862533</u>	
* the organisation that this submission is made on behalf of		
SLENWOOD, TIMARU. 7910 Email: ROYCARTER@FARMENDE.CO.NZ. (LOUGER CASE)	Postcode: <u>7970</u>	
Contact name and postal address for service of person making sub	mission (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 I could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission I could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission I could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission I could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission I could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission I could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission I could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission I could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission 	ssion. <i>If you have ticked this box please</i> of the submission	
I am not directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission		
Signature: Roylerin	Date: 61 MAY 2015	
(Signature of person making submission or person authorised to sign on behalf of person making the su		
Please note: (1) all information contained in a submission under the Resource Management Act 1991, including name	es and addresses for service, becomes public information.	
B I do not wish to be heard in support of my submission; or		
I would be prepared to consider presenting your submission	in a joint case with others making a similar	

TIMARL CLEAN AIR ZONE SEE ATTACHED PARES PAGE 71 0 Subsection 7.89 0 2.q	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.)
PqgE = 71 $OPPose Subssection 7.89 OPPose 2 q OPPose OPPose 2 b OPPose OPPose 2 b OPPose OPPose 2 b OPPose OPPose 2 q OPPose OPPos$	TIMARY CLEAN AIR ZONE		SEE ATTACHED PARES
Substant 04903£ 2 q	PASE 71		
	SUBSECTION 7.89	OPPOSE	
	29		
	26		
			7) 1)
			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
			· ·

Add further pages as required.

-

14.

SUBMISSION PROPOSED AIR PLAN ENVIRONMENT CANTERBURY

Page: 71 Subsection: 7.89

OVERVIEW

An older type log burner is installed in my house and as far as I am aware it has always been clean burning. Maybe just a few minutes emission at startup mainly when it hasn't been in use for a period. The chimney was swept a few weeks ago (first time for about 3 years as I am away for periods in the winter time) and there was no residue in the chimney etc. The glass on the door never needs cleaning as it never soots over. This is due to the fact that:-

- There was a simple modification made to the unit after it was installed to ensure 'clean burning'.
- Quality firewood is always purchased and used.
- Firewood is purchased DRY and 18 months ahead of use and stored in well ventilated situations away from inclement weather.
- Startup material (kindling etc.) is kept in a warm cupboard to ensure a fast startup which eliminates a smoking chimney to a minimum at startup.

EFFICIENCY. Log Burner/Heat Pump.

A log burner is has the ability to heat the whole home with greater efficiency and at a much lesser cost than other means. There's also the choice of heating the water as well which eliminates power charges. A cost advantage.

I have a 6.5kw Heat Pump which struggles with the living area in the colder winter months and the cost to run it is prohibitive when real heat is required.

HEALTH & WELL-BEING

Comments concerning the effects on health are noted. One has to ask in the absence of scientific evidence is this just a calculated guess? Has the death numbers referred to, been deaths directly and solely caused by (so called) polluted air?? Or has it become a convenient 'buzz phrase' to achieve an outcome? Twenty years ago there was a drive to get rid of 'open fires' (which I agreed with) and replace them with the more efficient Log Burners. Now there is a push to get rid of log burners, what next??

The COST involved has to be a consideration. There are many people on fixed incomes and/or dependant on superannuation who simply will not be able to afford the changes suggested even if some financial assistance is offered. If we look back to the 2006 snow with power outages etc., homes without a log burner were a very cold place. A situation is now being created where there is a high dependency on electricity. Without it many homes become non-functional. Most other heating devices are dependant on electricity to operate them. Hence elderly people and people with given ailments are put at serious risk. At least with a log burner there is heat and in many cases hot water and minimal cooking. This also has to be of concern with young families as well.

MONITORING SITES.

The monitoring sites are located in Anzac Square and Washdyke. Both are in low lying areas and are either industrial or light industrial/residential. There appears to be no monitoring around or near Highfield, Gleniti, Glenwood, Marchweil areas where I am sure the pollution readings would be vastly different. These areas are being penalized!! As some would say, "if there was one naughty boy in the school, the whole school is punished." If policy is being developed on these two sites the outcomes will be floored and undemocratic.

CLEAN AIR ZONE SITES

It is noted that sites greater than 2 hectares are privileged with a different code for compliance. Around Timaru there is lifestyle blocks greater than 2 hectares surrounded by dwellings on lesser sized sections. This would seem to be an outrageous example of **double standards.** If changes are deemed necessary and acceptable to the populace it should apply to the whole area which takes me to the next question;

RURAL STUBBLE BURN-OFF'S

One thing that is noticed is the burn-offs that take place in farming areas around Timaru and the smoke that drifts in over the town. I have attached a photo of but one instance which is self explanatory. These situations obviously affect Timaru readings, what is Ecan doing about this? If it's going to allowed to continue as an approved activity it is in detriment to Timaru, again do we have 'double standards?

LOG BURNER ASSESSMENT

It appears to date that there is no individual inspection of log burners to assess the condition/performance outcomes. Let's look at another analogy and that of a motor vehicle. It has to be inspected by a certified person who has the credentials to carry out such an inspection. If it passes he is authorized to issue a certificate in support. His authority also allows him to deem the vehicle unfit to be on the road. A transparent and democratic process.

Ecan's approach of 15 years (or January 2017) and out without inspection or reason can be seen as an <u>undemocratic and dictatorial</u> action which will not endear anyone to Ecan. There are probably plenty of older log burners that are working very efficiently that are being put on death row for no good reason, causing homeowners considerable anguish for no good reason.

<u>SUMMARY</u>

- 1. Monitoring needs to be carried out in all areas, not just Washdyke and Anzac Square.
- 2. Sites greater than 2 hectares should not be treated separately.
- 3. Stubble burn off affects the town. What action is needed?
- 4. Lack of inspection of log burners.
- 5. The whole process not only to be democratic, but seen to be democratic.

Hey Carlin Roy Carter

01 May, 2015

FILE REF. EC - TIM	and an and the second se
- 4 MAY 2015	VCION
4-55	VCION

