

## Make Submission

<b>Consultee</b>	Andrew Fisher (62820)
<b>Email Address</b>	andrew@fisherfarms.co.nz
<b>Address</b>	227 Cochranes road Ashburton 7777
<b>Event Name</b>	Proposed Canterbury Air Regional Plan
<b>Submission by</b>	Andrew Fisher
<b>Submission ID</b>	pCARP-808
<b>Response Date</b>	30/04/15 9:22 AM
<b>Consultation Point</b>	13 MANDATORY INFORMATION ( <a href="#">View</a> )
<b>Status</b>	Submitted
<b>Submission Type</b>	Web
<b>Version</b>	0.2
<b>To Be Heard</b>	
<b>Please select the appropriate option from the following:</b>	I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my submission; or
<b>If so</b>	

## Make Submission

<b>Consultee</b>	Andrew Fisher (62820)
<b>Email Address</b>	andrew@fisherfarms.co.nz
<b>Address</b>	227 Cochranes road Ashburton 7777
<b>Event Name</b>	Proposed Canterbury Air Regional Plan
<b>Submission by</b>	Andrew Fisher
<b>Submission ID</b>	pCARP-314
<b>Response Date</b>	30/04/15 9:22 AM
<b>Consultation Point</b>	Proposed Canterbury Air Regional Plan ( <a href="#">View</a> )
<b>Status</b>	Submitted
<b>Submission Type</b>	Web
<b>Version</b>	0.1

### Support Oppose

Supports in Part or Opposes in Part

*State concisely whether you support or oppose the provision being submitted on, or wish to have amendments made.*

**My submission is that:**  Support  Oppose

*Please state your reasons for supporting/opposing/amendments sought*

### My reason(s) for supporting, opposing or requesting amendments to this specific provision are:

Submission against burning restrictions.

I write re suggested restrictions to the agricultural practise of stubble burning. I wish to present certain facts for your consideration during this decision making. Ashburton is situated in an agricultural area on which it's prosperity is based and thus a threat to best practises will impact in far reaching areas. The best environmental practice is ZERO TILL, proven throughout The States, Canada and Australia. Zero till in New Zealand has contributed to our world record setting yields coinciding with heavy stubble. This practice requires the burning of heavy crop residues but in turn: 1. Eliminates unnecessary ploughing which releases more carbon to the atmosphere than burning a wheat stubble. 2. Uses far less fuel, preserving world resources. 3. Prevents damage to soil structure through ploughing, preserving worm populations. Further benefits of burning are: 1. Aids in destroying damaging insect and slug populations reducing the need of insecticides otherwise required. 2. Aids in crop disease cleanup, again saving heavy use of fungicide chemicals. 3. Allows for timely sowing dates leading to higher yields thus improving prosperity of the district. Allowance of flexible times to burn helps to ensure better weather conditions are being advantaged. Burning of heavy stubble residue is a comparably short, hot burn

unlike green hedge clippings and the like that smoulder in damp conditions for days, and while spectacular from a town residents' point of view, actually causes little damage to air quality as proven by testing recordings made during these days. Smoke quickly rises into the outer atmosphere and disperses without causing the assumed discomfort. Especially if correct weather conditions are used to advantage. Farmers on the east side of town in particular, use wind conditions that don't impact on the town and it would be an unfortunate and unnecessary imposition to apply such restrictions in this way. Canterbury, New Zealand, has the added advantage of an extremely large body of water (the Pacific Ocean) running it's length helping in the dispersion of smoke residue, unlike continental areas such as Europe, where they are unable to use these best practices due to restrictions that you are considering, and inland Canada and therefore cannot be used in comparison. Also, the fire risk is extremely low (except for foolish behaviour) than our closest agricultural neighbour, Australia. I ask for extreme care to be taken before such restrictions are introduced without studying the relevant facts, testings and recordings and comparing them fairly, instead of pandering to the whim of the uneducated populous. As it is, a percentage of the cropping acreage has been converted to dairying which does not participate as much in this practice but instead brings other unattractive smells and sights. Is it the councils wish that we all convert and add to these in greater proportions and thus ring Ashburton township with unsightly dairy cows? Cropping actually brings its own investment, tourism and education into the area making it an extremely popular destination. I am regarded as a very successful, informed and intelligent arable farmer and my business would be severely disadvantaged if stubble burning was restricted to unworkable conditions.

*Please give precise details for each provision. The more specific you can be the easier it will be for the Council to understand the outcome you are seeking.*

**I seek the following decisions from Environment Canterbury:**

I just want the statist quo to prevail

**Air Shed**

**Which Air Shed does this submission relate to or none**

**Choose one of the following three**

**Tick relevant topics**

## Make Submission

<b>Consultee</b>	Mr Andrew Fisher (62820)
<b>Email Address</b>	andrew@fisherfarms.co.nz
<b>Address</b>	227 Cochranes Road RD 7 Ashburton 7777
<b>Event Name</b>	Proposed Canterbury Air Regional Plan
<b>Submission by</b>	Mr Andrew Fisher
<b>Submission ID</b>	pCARP-2411
<b>Response Date</b>	30/04/15 9:22 AM
<b>Consultation Point</b>	7.9 Paragraph ( <a href="#">View</a> )
<b>Status</b>	Submitted
<b>Submission Type</b>	Web
<b>Version</b>	0.2

### Support Oppose

Supports in Part or Opposes in Part

*State concisely whether you support or oppose the provision being submitted on, or wish to have amendments made.*

**My submission is that:**  Support  Oppose

*Please state your reasons for supporting/opposing/amendments sought*

### My reason(s) for supporting, opposing or requesting amendments to this specific provision are:

Submission against burning restrictions.

I write re suggested restrictions to the agricultural practise of stubble burning. I wish to present certain facts for your consideration during this decision making. Ashburton is situated in an agricultural area on which it's prosperity is based and thus a threat to best practises will impact in far reaching areas. The best environmental practice is ZERO TILL, proven throughout The States, Canada and Australia. Zero till in New Zealand has contributed to our world record setting yields coinciding with heavy stubble. This practice requires the burning of heavy crop residues but in turn: 1. Eliminates unnecessary ploughing which releases more carbon to the atmosphere than burning a wheat stubble. 2. Uses far less fuel, preserving world resources. 3. Prevents damage to soil structure through ploughing, preserving worm populations. Further benefits of burning are: 1. Aids in destroying damaging insect and slug populations reducing the need of insecticides otherwise required. 2. Aids in crop disease cleanup, again saving heavy use of fungicide chemicals. 3. Allows for timely sowing dates leading to higher yields thus improving prosperity of the district. Allowance of flexible times to burn helps to ensure better weather

conditions are being advantaged. Burning of heavy stubble residue is a comparably short, hot burn unlike green hedge clippings and the like that smoulder in damp conditions for days, and while spectacular from a town residents' point of view, actually causes little damage to air quality as proven by testing recordings made during these days. Smoke quickly rises into the outer atmosphere and disperses without causing the assumed discomfort. Especially if correct weather conditions are used to advantage. Farmers on the east side of town in particular, use wind conditions that don't impact on the town and it would be an unfortunate and unnecessary imposition to apply such restrictions in this way. Canterbury, New Zealand, has the added advantage of an extremely large body of water (the Pacific Ocean) running it's length helping in the dispersion of smoke residue, unlike continental areas such as Europe, where they are unable to use these best practices due to restrictions that you are considering, and inland Canada and therefore cannot be used in comparison. Also, the fire risk is extremely low (except for foolish behaviour) than our closest agricultural neighbour, Australia. I ask for extreme care to be taken before such restrictions are introduced without studying the relevant facts, testings and recordings and comparing them fairly, instead of pandering to the whim of the uneducated populous. As it is, a percentage of the cropping acreage has been converted to dairying which does not participate as much in this practice but instead brings other unattractive smells and sights. Is it the councils wish that we all convert and add to these in greater proportions and thus ring Ashburton township with unsightly dairy cows? Cropping actually brings its own investment, tourism and education into the area making it an extremely popular destination. I am regarded as a very successful, informed and intelligent arable farmer and my business would be severely disadvantaged if stubble burning was restricted to unworkable conditions.

*Please give precise details for each provision. The more specific you can be the easier it will be for the Council to understand the outcome you are seeking.*

**I seek the following decisions from Environment Canterbury:**

I just want the statist quo to prevail

*Please summarise decision requested*

**Planner - Summary of Decision Requested**

Retain Chapter 3: Air Quality of the Natural Resources Regional Plan with regard to rural outdoor burning.

**Air Shed**

**Which Air Shed does this submission relate to or none** . Not Air Shed Related

**Choose one of the following three** . Recommend Accept in Part

**Tick relevant topics**