From:	Jackie and Russell
To:	Mailroom Mailbox
Subject:	air plan submission
Date:	Friday, 1 May 2015 12:42:18 p.m.
Attachments:	air plan submission.pdf

Last evening I made the attached submissions via the Ecan website. I want to confirm that I do wish to be heard on these submissions – there didn't seem to be a check box for this on the web based forms I completed
Kind regards
Jackie Wright

Make Submission

Consultee	Jackie Wright (62960)
Email Address	camdave@xtra.co.nz
Address	87 Wakanui School Road Ashburton 7777
Event Name	Proposed Canterbury Air Regional Plan
Submission by	Jackie Wright
Submission ID	pCARP-840
Response Date	30/04/15 11:10 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	

Submissions

Proposed Canterbury Air Regional Plan (28/02/15 to 1/05/15)

Submission by	Jackie Wright
Submission ID	pCARP-354
Response Date	30/04/15 11:10 PM
Consultation Point	1 Introduction (View)
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.1

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 support the intent of the plan and the introduction to it with the following exception. I oppose the wording of the following paragraph and request changes as shown: Outdoor burning and rural discharges of contaminants

Outdoor burning of household, garden and farm rubbish can cause nuisance problems and can generate potentially hazardous compounds, depending on the material burnt. Burning of organic and non-organic waste has been phased out in urban areas under the Canterbury Natural Resources Regional Plan, and is generally no longer an issue. Burning of inorganic waste has also been phased out in rural areas. Burning of organic matter in rural areas is still practised, and although considered by some to be a ~~in some instances is a~~ crucial land management tool, it ~~but often~~ results in nuisance and potential health effects.

Discharges of odour in rural areas have, in the past, been associated mainly with intensive pork, poultry farming, and meat processing facilities . Discharges of odour from dairy practices is an emerging issue as land use intensifies in Canterbury's rural areas.

Agricultural sprayers and powder spreaders also disseminate chemical dust and droplets of varying chemical compostion which drift across rural areas with potential health effects.

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 seek the amendments to the above paragraph as I believe the introduction as written fails to recognise all the airborne contaminants associated with the rural Canterbury environment and unless these are addressed the plan will fail in its intention to provide for community wellbeing

Submission by	Jackie Wright
Submission ID	pCARP-355
Response Date	30/04/15 11:17 PM
Consultation Point	Figure 1.1 Non-regulatory work programmes (View)
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.1

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 support the importance of clean dry firewood but

I oppose the statement"Encouraging housholds to move away from woodburners where possible. Current alternatives include pellet fires, heat pump,gas and electricity"

Given the significant weather and environmental events of the last 10 years it is important for people to have a heating and cooking source which is independent of outside suppy lines such as gas or electricity. To force people to relinquish their fires in favour of heat pumps means they will be without heat at a time when they most need it. Having been without power for 5 days during the snow of 2006 I know first hand the importance of an off-the-grid heat source.

It is also important for people on lower incomes to have a heat source that they can feed without a significant cash input and particularly with the wind events of the last few years there has been great opportunity to gather and store wood for future use at a cost lower than other heating sources.

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:

To recognise the overall value of a wood fire that is fed appropriately dried and stored natural firewood and not force people into electric heating as their sole heating source.

Submission by	Jackie Wright
Submission ID	pCARP-356
Response Date	30/04/15 11:18 PM
Consultation Point	Table 2.1 General Definitions (View)
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.1

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 the definition of hazardous substance as it is written and I support a definition as follows

Means any substance with one or more of the following intrinsic properties:

1. Explosiveness; or
2. Flammability; or
3. A capacity to oxidise; or
4. Corrosiveness; or
5. Toxicity (including chronic toxicity); or
6. Ecotoxicity, with or without bioaccumulation; or
7. Carcinogenic; or
8. Which on contact with air or water ; (other than air or water where the temperature or pressure has been artificially increased or decreased) generates a substance with any one or more of the properties specified in 1. to ~~6~~ 7 . above;

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 seek the change as described above

Submission by	Jackie Wright
Submission ID	pCARP-357
Response Date	30/04/15 11:18 PM
Consultation Point	5 Objectives (View)
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.1

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 support the objectives as written but request an additional 10th objective as follows:

5.10 Ongoing monitoring of emission content and research into health effects is supported and encouraged

We don't know what we don't know until we seek it out and only when we know the true content and implications of our region's emissions can we put in place remedies to ensure the wellbeing of all those in our communities.

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 10th objective is included in the plan.

Submission by	Jackie Wright
Submission ID	pCARP-358
Response Date	30/04/15 11:20 PM
Consultation Point	7.8 Paragraph (View)
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.1

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

My submission is that: . Oppose

Please state your reasons for supporting/opposing/amendments sought

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

Having read the rules 7.8 and 7.9 and schedules 2 and 3 I oppose the rules as written.

This year due to a total fire ban for most of the summer much crop residue was baled, not burnt. Burning is not essential to our crop rotation. We can not tell how hazardous (not just objectionable and offensive) the smoke is from crop residue burning is until we do detailed analysis of the smoke itself and long term health sudies of communities exposed to it. What we do know is that the crops are treated with fertiliser, fungicides and pesticides during their growing time and that some of these are present in the residue. The risks around the smoke generated from crop residue burnoff are not just smoke particles but these superheated chemicals and their carcinogenic potential. When a 40 hectare paddock is burned the smoke cloud drifts for miles (making a mockery of the requirement not to cause an objectionable or offensive effect beyond that property's boundary. As it drifts the smoke settles in hollows enveloping homes in these areas; the smoke (and particulate matter of around 1cm in size) coat vege gardens and washing on lines as well as invading homes by making its way through window frames - resulting in smoke residue of immediate nuisance value but with longer term more sinister potential which needs to be properly investigated and acted on.

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 seek further research on the content and risks associated with crop residue smoke.

I seek policies and rules which discourage crop residue burning and supports and encourages alternative means of using/removing crop residue

Make Submission

Consultee	Mrs Jackie Wright (62960)
Email Address	camdave@xtra.co.nz
Address	87 Wakanui School Road RD 7 Ashburton 7777
Event Name	Proposed Canterbury Air Regional Plan
Submission by	Mrs Jackie Wright
Submission ID	pCARP-1275
Response Date	30/04/15 11:17 PM
Consultation Point	Proposed Canterbury Air Regional Plan (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

Please state your reasons for supporting/opposing/amendments sought

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

I support the importance of clean dry firewood but

I oppose the statement"Encouraging housholds to move away from woodburners where possible. Current alternatives include pellet fires, heat pump,gas and electricity"

Given the significant weather and environmental events of the last 10 years it is important for people to have a heating and cooking source which is independent of outside suppy lines such as gas or electricity. To force people to relinquish their fires in favour of heat pumps means they will be without heat at a time when they most need it. Having been without power for 5 days during the snow of 2006 I know first hand the importance of an off-the-grid heat source.

It is also important for people on lower incomes to have a heat source that they can feed without a significant cash input and particularly with the wind events of the last few years there has been great opportunity to gather and store wood for future use at a cost lower than other heating sources.

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:

To recognise the overall value of a wood fire that is fed appropriately dried and stored natural firewood and not force people into electric heating as their sole heating source.

Please summarise decision requested

Planner - Summary of Decision Requested

Supports the Proposed Plan. No decision requested.

Air Shed

Which Air Shed does this submission relate to or none	.	Not Air Shed Related
Choose one of the following three	.	Recommend Accept

Tick relevant topics

Make Submission

Consultee	Mrs Jackie Wright (62960)
Email Address	camdave@xtra.co.nz
Address	87 Wakanui School Road RD 7 Ashburton 7777
Event Name	Proposed Canterbury Air Regional Plan
Submission by	Mrs Jackie Wright
Submission ID	pCARP-1276
Response Date	30/04/15 11:17 PM
Consultation Point	Figure 1.1 Non-regulatory work programmes (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

Please state your reasons for supporting/opposing/amendments sought

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

I support the importance of clean dry firewood but

I oppose the statement"Encouraging housholds to move away from woodburners where possible. Current alternatives include pellet fires, heat pump,gas and electricity"

Given the significant weather and environmental events of the last 10 years it is important for people to have a heating and cooking source which is independent of outside suppy lines such as gas or electricity. To force people to relinquish their fires in favour of heat pumps means they will be without heat at a time when they most need it. Having been without power for 5 days during the snow of 2006 I know first hand the importance of an off-the-grid heat source.

It is also important for people on lower incomes to have a heat source that they can feed without a significant cash input and particularly with the wind events of the last few years there has been great opportunity to gather and store wood for future use at a cost lower than other heating sources.

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:

To recognise the overall value of a wood fire that is fed appropriately dried and stored natural firewood and not force people into electric heating as their sole heating source.

Please summarise decision requested

Planner - Summary of Decision Requested

Amend Table 1.1 to recognise the overall value of a wood fire that is fed appropriately dried and stored natural firewood and [do] not force people into electric heating as their sole heating source.

Air Shed

Which Air Shed does this submission relate to or none	.	Not Air Shed Related
	.	Home Heating
Choose one of the following three	.	Recommend Accept in Part

Tick relevant topics

Make Submission

Consultee	Mrs Jackie Wright (62960)
Email Address	camdave@xtra.co.nz
Address	87 Wakanui School Road RD 7 Ashburton 7777
Event Name	Proposed Canterbury Air Regional Plan
Submission by	Mrs Jackie Wright
Submission ID	pCARP-1280
Response Date	30/04/15 11:18 PM
Consultation Point	Table 2.1 General Definitions (View)
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.6

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: . 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 the definition of hazardous substance as it is written and I support a definition as follows

Means any substance with one or more of the following intrinsic properties:

1. Explosiveness; or
2. Flammability; or
3. A capacity to oxidise; or
4. Corrosiveness; or
5. Toxicity (including chronic toxicity); or
6. Ecotoxicity, with or without bioaccumulation; or
7. Carcinogenic; or

8. Which on contact with air or water ; (other than air or water where the temperature or pressure has been artificially increased or decreased) generates a substance with any one or more of the properties specified in 1. to ~~6~~7 . above;

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 seek the change as described above

Please summarise decision requested

Planner - Summary of Decision Requested

Amend the definition of hazardous substance in Table 2.1 to read:

"Means any substance with one or more of the following intrinsic properties:

1. Explosiveness; or
2. Flammability; or
3. A capacity to oxidise; or
4. Corrosiveness; or
5. Toxicity (including chronic toxicity); or
6. Ecotoxicity, with or without bioaccumulation; or
7. Carcinogenic; or
8. Which on contact with air or water; (other than air or water where the temperature or pressure has been artificially increased or decreased) generates a substance with any one or more of the properties specified in 1 to ~~6~~7, above;

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

Make Submission

Consultee	Mrs Jackie Wright (62960)
Email Address	camdave@xtra.co.nz
Address	87 Wakanui School Road RD 7 Ashburton 7777
Event Name	Proposed Canterbury Air Regional Plan
Submission by	Mrs Jackie Wright
Submission ID	pCARP-1282
Response Date	30/04/15 11:18 PM
Consultation Point	5 Objectives (View)
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.4

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

Please state your reasons for supporting/opposing/amendments sought

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

I support the objectives as written but request an additional 10th objective as follows:

5.10 Ongoing monitoring of emission content and research into health effects is supported and encouraged

We don't know what we don't know until we seek it out and only when we know the true content and implications of our region's emissions can we put in place remedies to ensure the wellbeing of all those in our communities.

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 10th objective is included in the plan.

Please summarise decision requested

Planner - Summary of Decision Requested

Insert Objective as follows:

"5.10 ongoing monitoring of emission content and research into health effects is supported and encouraged."

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	Mrs Jackie Wright (62960)
Email Address	camdave@xtra.co.nz
Address	87 Wakanui School Road RD 7 Ashburton 7777
Event Name	Proposed Canterbury Air Regional Plan
Submission by	Mrs Jackie Wright
Submission ID	pCARP-1284
Response Date	30/04/15 11:20 PM
Consultation Point	7.9 Paragraph (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: . Oppose

Please state your reasons for supporting/opposing/amendments sought

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

Having read the rules 7.8 and 7.9 and schedules 2 and 3 I oppose the rules as written.

This year due to a total fire ban for most of the summer much crop residue was baled, not burnt. Burning is not essential to our crop rotation. We can not tell how hazardous (not just objectionable and offensive) the smoke is from crop residue burning is until we do detailed analysis of the smoke itself and long term health sudies of communities exposed to it. What we do know is that the crops are treated with fertiliser, fungicides and pesticides during their growing time and that some of these are present in the residue. The risks around the smoke generated from crop residue burnoff are not just smoke particles but these superheated chemicals and their carcinogenic potential. When a 40 hectare paddock is burned the smoke cloud drifts for miles (making a mockery of the requirement not to cause an objectionable or offensive effect beyond that property's boundary. As it drifts the smoke settles in hollows enveloping homes in these areas; the smoke (and particulate matter of around 1cm in size) coat vege gardens and washing on lines as well as invading homes by making its way through

window frames - resulting in smoke residue of immediate nuisance value but with longer term more sinister potential which needs to be properly investigated and acted on.

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 seek further research on the content and risks associated with crop residue smoke.

I seek policies and rules which discourage crop residue burning and supports and encourages alternative means of using/removing crop residue

Please summarise decision requested

Planner - Summary of Decision Requested

Opposes Rule 7.9. Further research on the content and risks associated with smoke from crop residue burning is sought.

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	Mrs Jackie Wright (62960)
Email Address	camdave@xtra.co.nz
Address	87 Wakanui School Road RD 7 Ashburton 7777
Event Name	Proposed Canterbury Air Regional Plan
Submission by	Mrs Jackie Wright
Submission ID	pCARP-1285
Response Date	30/04/15 11:20 PM
Consultation Point	Schedule 2: Assessment of offensive and objectionable effects (View)
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.4

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: . Oppose

Please state your reasons for supporting/opposing/amendments sought

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

Having read the rules 7.8 and 7.9 and schedules 2 and 3 I oppose the rules as written.

This year due to a total fire ban for most of the summer much crop residue was baled, not burnt. Burning is not essential to our crop rotation. We can not tell how hazardous (not just objectionable and offensive) the smoke is from crop residue burning is until we do detailed analysis of the smoke itself and long term health sudies of communities exposed to it. What we do know is that the crops are treated with fertiliser, fungicides and pesticides during their growing time and that some of these are present in the residue. The risks around the smoke generated from crop residue burnoff are not just smoke particles but these superheated chemicals and their carcinogenic potential. When a 40 hectare paddock is burned the smoke cloud drifts for miles (making a mockery of the requirement not to cause an objectionable or offensive effect beyond that property's boundary. As it drifts the smoke settles in hollows enveloping homes in these areas; the smoke (and particulate matter of around 1cm in size) coat vege gardens and washing on lines as well as invading homes by making its way through

window frames - resulting in smoke residue of immediate nuisance value but with longer term more sinister potential which needs to be properly investigated and acted on.

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 seek further research on the content and risks associated with crop residue smoke.

I seek policies and rules which discourage crop residue burning and supports and encourages alternative means of using/removing crop residue

Please summarise decision requested

Planner - Summary of Decision Requested

Opposes Schedule 2. Further research on the content and risks associated with smoke from crop residue burning is sought.

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	Mrs Jackie Wright (62960)
Email Address	camdave@xtra.co.nz
Address	87 Wakanui School Road RD 7 Ashburton 7777
Event Name	Proposed Canterbury Air Regional Plan
Submission by	Mrs Jackie Wright
Submission ID	pCARP-1287
Response Date	30/04/15 11:20 PM
Consultation Point	Schedule 3: Content of smoke management plans for the outdoor burning of organic material in rural areas (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: . Oppose

Please state your reasons for supporting/opposing/amendments sought

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

Having read the rules 7.8 and 7.9 and schedules 2 and 3 I oppose the rules as written.

This year due to a total fire ban for most of the summer much crop residue was baled, not burnt. Burning is not essential to our crop rotation. We can not tell how hazardous (not just objectionable and offensive) the smoke is from crop residue burning is until we do detailed analysis of the smoke itself and long term health sudies of communities exposed to it. What we do know is that the crops are treated with fertiliser, fungicides and pesticides during their growing time and that some of these are present in the residue. The risks around the smoke generated from crop residue burnoff are not just smoke particles but these superheated chemicals and their carcinogenic potential. When a 40 hectare paddock is burned the smoke cloud drifts for miles (making a mockery of the requirement not to cause an objectionable or offensive effect beyond that property's boundary. As it drifts the smoke settles in hollows enveloping homes in these areas; the smoke (and particulate matter of around 1cm

in size) coat vege gardens and washing on lines as well as invading homes by making its way through window frames - resulting in smoke residue of immediate nuisance value but with longer term more sinister potential which needs to be properly investigated and acted on.

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 seek further research on the content and risks associated with crop residue smoke.

I seek policies and rules which discourage crop residue burning and supports and encourages alternative means of using/removing crop residue

Please summarise decision requested

Planner - Summary of Decision Requested

Oppose Schedule 3 and seeks further research on the content and risks associated with smoke from crop residue 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

Make Submission

Consultee	Mrs Jackie Wright (62960)
Email Address	camdave@xtra.co.nz
Address	87 Wakanui School Road RD 7 Ashburton 7777
Event Name	Proposed Canterbury Air Regional Plan
Submission by	Mrs Jackie Wright
Submission ID	pCARP-1288
Response Date	30/04/15 11:20 PM
Consultation Point	Outdoor burning (View)
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.4

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: . Oppose

Please state your reasons for supporting/opposing/amendments sought

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

Having read the rules 7.8 and 7.9 and schedules 2 and 3 I oppose the rules as written.

This year due to a total fire ban for most of the summer much crop residue was baled, not burnt. Burning is not essential to our crop rotation. We can not tell how hazardous (not just objectionable and offensive) the smoke is from crop residue burning is until we do detailed analysis of the smoke itself and long term health sudies of communities exposed to it. What we do know is that the crops are treated with fertiliser, fungicides and pesticides during their growing time and that some of these are present in the residue. The risks around the smoke generated from crop residue burnoff are not just smoke particles but these superheated chemicals and their carcinogenic potential. When a 40 hectare paddock is burned the smoke cloud drifts for miles (making a mockery of the requirement not to cause an objectionable or offensive effect beyond that property's boundary. As it drifts the smoke settles in hollows enveloping homes in these areas; the smoke (and particulate matter of around 1cm in size) coat vege gardens and washing on lines as well as invading homes by making its way through

window frames - resulting in smoke residue of immediate nuisance value but with longer term more sinister potential which needs to be properly investigated and acted on.

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 seek further research on the content and risks associated with crop residue smoke.

I seek policies and rules which discourage crop residue burning and supports and encourages alternative means of using/removing crop residue

Please summarise decision requested

Planner - Summary of Decision Requested

Insert policies and rules to provide for further research on the content and risks associated with crop residue 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

Make Submission

Consultee	Mrs Jackie Wright (62960)
Email Address	camdave@xtra.co.nz
Address	87 Wakanui School Road RD 7 Ashburton 7777
Event Name	Proposed Canterbury Air Regional Plan
Submission by	Mrs Jackie Wright
Submission ID	pCARP-1289
Response Date	30/04/15 11:20 PM
Consultation Point	Outdoor burning (View)
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.3

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: . Oppose

Please state your reasons for supporting/opposing/amendments sought

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

Having read the rules 7.8 and 7.9 and schedules 2 and 3 I oppose the rules as written.

This year due to a total fire ban for most of the summer much crop residue was baled, not burnt. Burning is not essential to our crop rotation. We can not tell how hazardous (not just objectionable and offensive) the smoke is from crop residue burning is until we do detailed analysis of the smoke itself and long term health sudies of communities exposed to it. What we do know is that the crops are treated with fertiliser, fungicides and pesticides during their growing time and that some of these are present in the residue. The risks around the smoke generated from crop residue burnoff are not just smoke particles but these superheated chemicals and their carcinogenic potential. When a 40 hectare paddock is burned the smoke cloud drifts for miles (making a mockery of the requirement not to cause an objectionable or offensive effect beyond that property's boundary. As it drifts the smoke settles in hollows enveloping homes in these areas; the smoke (and particulate matter of around 1cm in size) coat vege gardens and washing on lines as well as invading homes by making its way through

window frames - resulting in smoke residue of immediate nuisance value but with longer term more sinister potential which needs to be properly investigated and acted on.

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 seek further research on the content and risks associated with crop residue smoke.

I seek policies and rules which discourage crop residue burning and supports and encourages alternative means of using/removing crop residue

Please summarise decision requested

Planner - Summary of Decision Requested

Insert policies which discourage crop residue burning and support and encourage alternative means of using or removing crop residue.

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	Mrs Jackie Wright (62960)
Email Address	camdave@xtra.co.nz
Address	87 Wakanui School Road RD 7 Ashburton 7777
Event Name	Proposed Canterbury Air Regional Plan
Submission by	Mrs Jackie Wright
Submission ID	pCARP-1290
Response Date	30/04/15 11:20 PM
Consultation Point	Outdoor burning (View)
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.4

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: . Oppose

Please state your reasons for supporting/opposing/amendments sought

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

Having read the rules 7.8 and 7.9 and schedules 2 and 3 I oppose the rules as written.

This year due to a total fire ban for most of the summer much crop residue was baled, not burnt. Burning is not essential to our crop rotation. We can not tell how hazardous (not just objectionable and offensive) the smoke is from crop residue burning is until we do detailed analysis of the smoke itself and long term health sudies of communities exposed to it. What we do know is that the crops are treated with fertiliser, fungicides and pesticides during their growing time and that some of these are present in the residue. The risks around the smoke generated from crop residue burnoff are not just smoke particles but these superheated chemicals and their carcinogenic potential. When a 40 hectare paddock is burned the smoke cloud drifts for miles (making a mockery of the requirement not to cause an objectionable or offensive effect beyond that property's boundary. As it drifts the smoke settles in hollows enveloping homes in these areas; the smoke (and particulate matter of around 1cm in size) coat vege gardens and washing on lines as well as invading homes by making its way through

window frames - resulting in smoke residue of immediate nuisance value but with longer term more sinister potential which needs to be properly investigated and acted on.

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 seek further research on the content and risks associated with crop residue smoke.

I seek policies and rules which discourage crop residue burning and supports and encourages alternative means of using/removing crop residue

Please summarise decision requested

Planner - Summary of Decision Requested

Insert rules which discourage crop residue burning and support and encourage alternative means of using or removing crop residue.

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