

Make Submission

Consultee	Mr gary edwards (63006)
Email Address	gary@firenzo.co.nz
Company / Organisation	hewitsons ltd
Address	98 niven street onekawa napier 4142
Event Name	Proposed Canterbury Air Regional Plan
Submission by	hewitsons ltd (Mr gary edwards)
Submission ID	pCARP-863
Response Date	1/05/15 2:30 PM
Consultation Point	13 MANDATORY INFORMATION (View)
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.2
To Be Heard	
Please select the appropriate option from the following:	I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my submission; or
If so	

Make Submission

Consultee	Mr gary edwards (63006)
Email Address	gary@firenzo.co.nz
Company / Organisation	hewitsons ltd
Address	98 niven street onekawa napier 4142
Event Name	Proposed Canterbury Air Regional Plan
Submission by	hewitsons ltd (Mr gary edwards)
Submission ID	pCARP-415
Response Date	1/05/15 2:30 PM
Consultation Point	Proposed Canterbury Air Regional Plan (View)
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Web
Version	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:

Since the notification by ECAN of the intent and subsequent actioning of this proposed air plan, there have been some major developments that put into question the science and targets, that much of this plan is based on and in turn meant to impact and hopefully improve air quality.

Dr Jan Wright in her report as parliamentary commissioner for the environment on the Air Domain 2014 report from the MFE, clearly maps out that the targets of what to measure and then action from the MFE, s national environment standard for air , are skewed, and that the MFE need to urgently address the issues raised.

This change of thinking has already led to Auckland Council pull out from actioning an intended air plan change pending a review of the issues raised, to ensure a line of action with huge impacts to its

residents is not done on misguided logic and then not achieve the targets that are clearly about to change.

ECAN currently has a very robust air plan that has made huge inroads into christchurch,s air quality and will continue to do so. There is no doubt the greater canterbury region will require work to achieve the same sort of results, and an air plan will be required to implement the actions required to achieve them.

As the MFE has solely focused om pm10 short term exposure, but the science and development is now focusing to include pm2.5 short and long term exposure, any air plan delivery now will be premature and will certainly be ineffectual in delivering what are going to be a whole new set of principles and objectives. As Dr Wrights report highlights, christchurch itself may well already nearly be reaching some of the suggested new criteria levels, but will require some very different thinking and actions to maintain acceptable levels within some of the others.

The GNS Science Consultancy Report 2015/21, and the Air Quality Status Report, Christchurch Air Shed R14/116 in their conclusions, also both elude, the current focus is likely incorrect and further work needs to be done to clearly understand what is.

So, trying to implement an air plan to make positive changes into something that is clearly just about to change, so rendering the air plan ineffectual can make no common sense.

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:

That the air plan proposal as it currently stands be postponed from further progression, untill a clear picture of what forth coming changes to the MFE objectives and subsequent alterations to the NES are understood, and can be incorporated into an air plan change designed to meet them.

There is a very robust air plan in place that is working, so to change this now without clearly understanding where the goal posts will be in the future makes no common sense and does not serve the best interests of the community you are empowered to protect.

Air Shed

Which Air Shed does this submission relate to or none

Choose one of the following three

Tick relevant topics

Make Submission

Consultee	Mr Gary Edwards (63006)
Email Address	gary@firenzo.co.nz
Company / Organisation	Hewitsons Limited
Address	98 Niven Street Onekawa Napier 4142
Event Name	Proposed Canterbury Air Regional Plan
Submission by	Hewitsons Limited (Mr Gary Edwards)
Submission ID	pCARP-1985
Response Date	1/05/15 2:30 PM
Consultation Point	Proposed Canterbury Air Regional Plan (View)
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Web
Version	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:

Since the notification by ECAN of the intent and subsequent actioning of this proposed air plan, there have been some major developments that put into question the science and targets, that much of this plan is based on and in turn meant to impact and hopefully improve air quality.

Dr Jan Wright in her report as parliamentary commissioner for the environment on the Air Domain 2014 report from the MFE, clearly maps out that the targets of what to measure and then action from the MFE, s national environment standard for air , are skewed, and that the MFE need to urgently address the issues raised.

This change of thinking has already led to Auckland Council pull out from actioning an intended air plan change pending a review of the issues raised, to ensure a line of action with huge impacts to its

residents is not done on misguided logic and then not achieve the targets that are clearly about to change.

ECAN currently has a very robust air plan that has made huge inroads into christchurch,s air quality and will continue to do so. There is no doubt the greater canterbury region will require work to achieve the same sort of results, and an air plan will be required to implement the actions required to achieve them.

As the MFE has solely focused om pm10 short term exposure, but the science and development is now focusing to include pm2.5 short and long term exposure, any air plan delivery now will be premature and will certainly be ineffectual in delivering what are going to be a whole new set of principles and objectives. As Dr Wrights report highlights, christchurch itself may well already nearly be reaching some of the suggested new criteria levels, but will require some very different thinking and actions to maintain acceptable levels within some of the others.

The GNS Science Consultancy Report 2015/21, and the Air Quality Status Report, Christchurch Air Shed R14/116 in their conclusions, also both elude, the current focus is likely incorrect and further work needs to be done to clearly understand what is.

So, trying to implement an air plan to make positive changes into something that is clearly just about to change, so rendering the air plan ineffectual can make no common sense.

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:

That the air plan proposal as it currently stands be postponed from further progression, untill a clear picture of what forth coming changes to the MFE objectives and subsequent alterations to the NES are understood, and can be incorporated into an air plan change designed to meet them.

There is a very robust air plan in place that is working, so to change this now without clearly understanding where the goal posts will be in the future makes no common sense and does not serve the best interests of the community you are empowered to protect.

Please summarise decision requested

Planner - Summary of Decision Requested

Retain Chapter 3: Air Quality of the Natural Resources Regional Plan.

Air Shed

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

Choose one of the following three . Recommend Reject

Tick relevant topics