

Make Submission

Consultee	mr john wells (61455)
Email Address	j.wells2355@gmail.com
Address	23 Charles st Ashburton 7700
Event Name	Proposed Canterbury Air Regional Plan
Submission by	mr john wells
Submission ID	pCARP-889
Response Date	26/04/15 8:43 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 john wells (61455)
Email Address	j.wells2355@gmail.com
Address	23 Charles st Ashburton 7700
Event Name	Proposed Canterbury Air Regional Plan
Submission by	mr john wells
Submission ID	pCARP-287
Response Date	26/04/15 8:43 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:

I oppose sections of this plan for several reasons;

1: I doubt the figures quoted about premature deaths. I feel these statistics are weighted to suit Ecan's cause. These figures are based on **correlation of statistics, not causation facts**. I find it distasteful that Ecan feel the need to twist mortality figures to intimidate the public.

Nothing is mentioned about the stress which is placed on the elderly when faced with putting in a new log burner. Allot of these people simply don't have the money and this proposal is only going to compound their financial hardship.

Over the years I have lost many friends to Cancer, heart attacks, obesity related disease and car accidents, but never one to PM10 poisoning. So if the 400plus people who die each year as quoted by Ecan is true, it is not happening in my part of the world!! Maybe Ecan and its staff live in a darker part of the planet to those of us in the real world.

Fact: statistics can be easily read or miss read to suit or exaggerate one cause!!

2: Log Fires. Ecan are jumping the gun with this, and the present plan is not fully in place yet. The town I live in (Ashburton) still have an estimated 1000 homes to convert to the new low omission type wood fires.

My point: We have not completed the first plan so how the hell can Ecan know whether it has worked. Yet before the first plan is completed they want to tear it down and introduce another plan. What does the future hold? two years time yet another plan? I suggest Ecan may be out of control and need Government auditing as they are spending public money.

3: The registration of log fire installers. This present proposal is floored. It forces all builders and plumbers to join the NZHHA and pay their absorbent yearly subs as well as attend their costly courses on regular basis. This is not only undemocratic, but gives NZHHA a monopoly.

I am a registered builder and install approx 20 to 30 fires a year. I strongly object to being told that I must now pay another \$466.00 per year to the NZHHA, plus \$116.00 to be nominated, plus \$460.00 to attend training course one, then another \$260 in two years to attended a refresher course. I like so many others simply will not bother. We already have a serious shortage of trades people to do this job.

We as LBP's (Licence Building Practitioners) are already in a scheme where the penalties for poor work are very clear. My loyalties lie with the Ministry of housing business innovations(MBIE). Who control the building code of New Zealand. Those codes clearly define the standards we must work to. It appears that both Ecan and the NZHHA are trying to put themselves above the MBIE (the legal administrator building code laws and changes).

It is painfully obvious that the people who stand to financially profit the most is the NZHHA as they will have total control over all builders and plumbers operating in this field. I am not anti some kind of control over installers, just anti the sweeping dictatorship type controls as outlined in this proposal.

4: Ashburtons PM10 problem is minimal. A few years ago when people were burning heavy sulphur type coals on a cold winters night yes the air was pungent and hard to breath, we still have allot of old type fires to replace, every year as fires are replaced it gets better. Ecan must be patient and wait until this process is complete before they can make a judgement, instead of rushing off half cocked into another tangent.

Summary: HAPINZ study clearly states that these figures are for Christchurch use only and was started at the beginning of the fire transition and last updated 2012, they must wait until the present scheme is complete, only then can it be judged.

It seems to be a syndrome of modern high turn over work force that they have to constantly change things to justify their jobs. Ecan are going to move the stick in the sand again which only leads to confusion and disharmony. If they want the retain any public credibility sections of the present plan must be aloud to evolve.

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:

1: I would like to see Ecan stop misleading the public by misinterpreting HAPINZ report and start dealing with hard legal facts. The average New Zealander is no fool and can see straight through Ecans propaganda type tactics.

2: They must wait until sections of the present scheme are complete, then judge whether it has been a success. At the moment the new proposal is almost unworkable. The only Ultra Low emissions burner on the market is worth \$10,000.00, weight's 300kg and is manually operated. Ecan must wait until more affordable and practical options are available. Then weigh up whether we need to change.

3: Ecan must work with MBIE (the government appointed body to manage the building code and licensing) to get some kind of licensing scheme in place for solid fuel fire installers. This is the way it

is supposed to work. This system was put in place to standardise the rules through out the country. Now Ecan are trying to break away from that structure and create their own rules and standards. This is winding the clock back and repeating history a human failing we continually repeat.

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 John Wells (61455)
Email Address	j.wells2355@gmail.com
Address	23 Charles Street Allenton Ashburton 7700
Event Name	Proposed Canterbury Air Regional Plan
Submission by	Mr John Wells
Submission ID	pCARP-1839
Response Date	26/04/15 8:43 PM
Consultation Point	Space heating Region wide (View)
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.5
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:

I oppose sections of this plan for several reasons;

1: I doubt the figures quoted about premature deaths. I feel these statistics are weighted to suit Ecan's cause. These figures are based on **correlation of statistics, not causation facts** . I find it distasteful that Ecan feel the need to twist mortality figures to intimidate the public.

Nothing is mentioned about the stress which is placed on the elderly when faced with putting in a new log burner. Allot of these people simply don't have the money and this proposal is only going to compound their financial hardship.

Over the years I have lost many friends to Cancer, heart attacks, obesity related disease and car accidents, but never one to PM10 poisoning. So if the 400plus people who die each year as quoted

by Ecan is true, it is not happening in my part of the world!! Maybe Ecan and its staff live in a darker part of the planet to those of us in the real world.

Fact: statistics can be easily read or miss read to suit or exaggerate one cause!!

2: Log Fires. Ecan are jumping the gun with this, and the present plan is not fully in place yet. The town I live in (Ashburton) still have an estimated 1000 homes to convert to the new low omission type wood fires.

My point: We have not completed the first plan so how the hell can Ecan know whether it has worked. Yet before the first plan is completed they want to tear it down and introduce another plan. What does the future hold? two years time yet another plan? I suggest Ecan may be out of control and need Government auditing as they are spending public money.

3:The registration of log fire installers . This present proposal is floored. It forces all builders and plumbers to join the NZHHA and pay their absorbent yearly subs as well as attend their costly courses on regular basis. This is not only undemocratic, but gives NZHHA a monopoly.

I am a registered builder and install approx 20 to 30 fires a year. I strongly object to being told that I must now pay another \$466.00 per year to the NZHHA, plus \$116.00 to be nominated, plus \$460.00 to attend training course one, then another \$260 in two years to attended a refresher course. I like so many others simply will not bother. We already have a serious shortage of trades people to do this job.

We as LBP's (Licence Building Practitioners) are already in a scheme where the penalties for poor work are very clear. My loyalties lie with the Ministry of housing business innovations(MBIE). Who control the building code of New Zealand. Those codes clearly define the standards we must work to. It appears that both Ecan and the NZHHA are trying to put themselves above the MBIE (the legal administrator building code laws and changes).

It is painfully obvious that the people who stand to financially profit the most is the NZHHA as they will have total control over all builders and plumbers operating in this field. I am not anti some kind of control over installers, just anti the sweeping dictatorship type controls as outlined in this proposal.

4: Ashburtons PM10 problem is minimal . A few years ago when people were burning heavy sulphur type coals on a cold winters night yes the air was pungent and hard to breath, we still have allot of old type fires to replace, every year as fires are replaced it gets better. Ecan must be patient and wait until this process is complete before they can make a judgement, instead of rushing off half cocked into another tangent.

Summary: HAPINZ study clearly states that these figures are for Christchurch use only and was started at the beginning of the fire transition and last updated 2012, they must wait until the present scheme is complete, only then can it be judged.

It seems to be a syndrome of modern high turn over work force that they have to constantly change things to justify their jobs. Ecan are going to move the stick in the sand again which only leads to confusion and disharmony. If they want the retain any public credibility sections of the present plan must be aloud to evolve.

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:

1: I would like to see Ecan stop misleading the public by misinterpreting HAPINZ report and start dealing with hard legal facts. The average New Zealander is no fool and can see straight through Ecans propaganda type tactics.

2: They must wait until sections of the present scheme are complete, then judge whether it has been a success. At the moment the new proposal is almost unworkable. The only Ultra Low emissions burner on the market is worth \$10,000.00, weight's 300kg and is manually operated. Ecan must wait until more affordable and practical options are available. Then weigh up whether we need to change.

3: Ecan must work with MBIE (the government appointed body to manage the building code and licensing) to get some kind of licensing scheme in place for solid fuel fire installers. This is the way it is supposed to work. This system was put in place to standardise the rules through out the country. Now Ecan are trying to break away from that structure and create their own rules and standards. This is winding the clock back and repeating history a human failing we continually repeat.

Please summarise decision requested

Planner - Summary of Decision Requested

Retain space heating rules and policies in the NRRP and wait until these are fully implemented before introducing new rules and policies.

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

Make Submission

Consultee	Mr John Wells (61455)
Email Address	j.wells2355@gmail.com
Address	23 Charles Street Allenton Ashburton 7700
Event Name	Proposed Canterbury Air Regional Plan
Submission by	Mr John Wells
Submission ID	pCARP-1842
Response Date	26/04/15 8:43 PM
Consultation Point	Schedule 7: Installation, registration and maintenance of domestic solid fuel burners (View)
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.5

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:

I oppose sections of this plan for several reasons;

1: I doubt the figures quoted about premature deaths. I feel these statistics are weighted to suit Ecan's cause. These figures are based on **correlation of statistics, not causation facts** . I find it distasteful that Ecan feel the need to twist mortality figures to intimidate the public.

Nothing is mentioned about the stress which is placed on the elderly when faced with putting in a new log burner. Allot of these people simply don't have the money and this proposal is only going to compound their financial hardship.

Over the years I have lost many friends to Cancer, heart attacks, obesity related disease and car accidents, but never one to PM10 poisoning. So if the 400plus people who die each year as quoted

by Ecan is true, it is not happening in my part of the world!! Maybe Ecan and its staff live in a darker part of the planet to those of us in the real world.

Fact: statistics can be easily read or miss read to suit or exaggerate one cause!!

2: Log Fires. Ecan are jumping the gun with this, and the present plan is not fully in place yet. The town I live in (Ashburton) still have an estimated 1000 homes to convert to the new low omission type wood fires.

My point: We have not completed the first plan so how the hell can Ecan know whether it has worked. Yet before the first plan is completed they want to tear it down and introduce another plan. What does the future hold? two years time yet another plan? I suggest Ecan may be out of control and need Government auditing as they are spending public money.

3:The registration of log fire installers . This present proposal is floored. It forces all builders and plumbers to join the NZHHA and pay their absorbent yearly subs as well as attend their costly courses on regular basis. This is not only undemocratic, but gives NZHHA a monopoly.

I am a registered builder and install approx 20 to 30 fires a year. I strongly object to being told that I must now pay another \$466.00 per year to the NZHHA, plus \$116.00 to be nominated, plus \$460.00 to attend training course one, then another \$260 in two years to attended a refresher course. I like so many others simply will not bother. We already have a serious shortage of trades people to do this job.

We as LBP's (Licence Building Practitioners) are already in a scheme where the penalties for poor work are very clear. My loyalties lie with the Ministry of housing business innovations(MBIE). Who control the building code of New Zealand. Those codes clearly define the standards we must work to. It appears that both Ecan and the NZHHA are trying to put themselves above the MBIE (the legal administrator building code laws and changes).

It is painfully obvious that the people who stand to financially profit the most is the NZHHA as they will have total control over all builders and plumbers operating in this field. I am not anti some kind of control over installers, just anti the sweeping dictatorship type controls as outlined in this proposal.

4: Ashburtons PM10 problem is minimal . A few years ago when people were burning heavy sulphur type coals on a cold winters night yes the air was pungent and hard to breath, we still have allot of old type fires to replace, every year as fires are replaced it gets better. Ecan must be patient and wait until this process is complete before they can make a judgement, instead of rushing off half cocked into another tangent.

Summary: HAPINZ study clearly states that these figures are for Christchurch use only and was started at the beginning of the fire transition and last updated 2012, they must wait until the present scheme is complete, only then can it be judged.

It seems to be a syndrome of modern high turn over work force that they have to constantly change things to justify their jobs. Ecan are going to move the stick in the sand again which only leads to confusion and disharmony. If they want the retain any public credibility sections of the present plan must be aloud to evolve.

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:

1: I would like to see Ecan stop misleading the public by misinterpreting HAPINZ report and start dealing with hard legal facts. The average New Zealander is no fool and can see straight through Ecans propaganda type tactics.

2: They must wait until sections of the present scheme are complete, then judge whether it has been a success. At the moment the new proposal is almost unworkable. The only Ultra Low emissions burner on the market is worth \$10,000.00, weight's 300kg and is manually operated. Ecan must wait until more affordable and practical options are available. Then weigh up whether we need to change.

3: Ecan must work with MBIE (the government appointed body to manage the building code and licensing) to get some kind of licensing scheme in place for solid fuel fire installers. This is the way it is supposed to work. This system was put in place to standardise the rules through out the country. Now Ecan are trying to break away from that structure and create their own rules and standards. This is winding the clock back and repeating history a human failing we continually repeat.

Please summarise decision requested

Planner - Summary of Decision Requested

Delete Part 1 of Schedule 7 and work with the Ministry of Building, Innovation and Employment to require correct installation under the Building Code.

Air Shed

Which Air Shed does this submission relate to or none . All Air Sheds
 . Home Heating

Choose one of the following three . Recommend Accept in Part

Tick relevant topics