

RecordId	21
time_submitted	6/07/2010 19:51
Name	Matthew Thredgold
Organisation/Agency	private citizen who has previously had to move home because of excessive woodsmoke pollution
Address	
Phone	
Email	
In favor of 4a?	NO
Reason/s	<p>The existing 50 micrograms of PM10 per cubic metre of air over 24 hours can hide terrible peaks, such as 160 and 170 ug as measured in Masterton and Arrowtown. 50ug is also very, very high. The standard is lax. It should be set at 5 or 10ug per cubic metre. The peaks which occur in the early evening are statistically valid and are miserable to live through. There should be no exceedances at all. It should not be measured over 24 hours, but over 10 or 15 metres and the limits should be set at a level of 5 or 10 ug per cubic metre.</p> <p>The standards should be lowered now. People's misery is continuing due to woodsmoke and extending it out to 2018 is perpetuating misery, nuisance, death and disease.</p> <p>There should be mandatory reporting (online with results up after 24 hours, but not longer than 48 hours) There should be a polluter-pays principle cover the cost. i.e. those burning wood should pay a levy for monitoring costs.</p> <p>I am of the opinion that woodburners should be completely banned in towns, suburbs and closely settled rural areas. Wood smoke is toxic. It is poisonous. All good policy should actually acknowledge the poisonous nature of wood smoke and coal smoke.</p> <p>Have there been any standards on how a 50ug standard is perceived? What percentage of the population finds 5ug, 10ug, 20ug, 30ug, 40ug, 50ug tolerable or desirable? I bet that most people put in a room at 50ug concentration would hate it. Do these levels contribute to asthma? Do they cause lung cancers? No industry should be allowed to breach PM10 standards in any airshed where people live, without exception.</p>
Any changes?	Yes
Suggested changes	The goal should be to minimise the concentration of woodsmoke in the atmosphere. The PM10 standards should be toughened up to 5 or 10 ug, with zero incidences. If this means a total ban on woodburners, then great. They are not suitable technology because of their design flaw. The design flaw being that they emit toxic polluting emissions.
In favor of 4b?	NO
Reason/s	No exceedances can be tolerated. There are people suffering through each one. Smoke limits all outdoor activity. It is not fair on anyone to have their freedom of movement curtailed. That is what woodsmoke does. Exceptional events should most definitely count towards exceedances. When Raumati South fills with smoke under an inversion layer it would be put down as an exceptional event, but that is the reality. Raumati South suffers incredibly bad woodsmoke pollution often. That's why I had to move away.
Any changes?	Yes
Suggested changes	Ban all woodburners in settled areas. Prohibit the fouling of the air around domestic premises. Ban all burning off of rubbish in rural zones. Do not water the standards down, strengthen them.
CB accurately reflected?	NO
How can estimates be improved?	The real costs of woodsmoke emissions are people like me, who live next door to woodburners, and have had to move away from their own home. The polluting woodburner users (which is all of them) externalise their costs onto their neighbours. It is an outrage.
Any overlooked costs?	The neighbours who have had to move home. I can't actually live in 95% of the places in NZ where people live because of the wood smoke. How is that fair? I've had to buy asthma medicine again because of seasonal asthma. Many people have asthma in the winter months because of woodsmoke. The cost to society of people giving up sport. (It's too polluted to train). Health costs caused by woodsmoke. It kills 100s of New Zealanders every year. The cost of using my electric dryer because I can't line dry because of the smoke.
Information you'd like included	The real cost of woodsmoke on people's lives. I would put the personal cost of woodburners on me at over \$50,000 and yet I never have used one. That is the direct losses involved in trying to escape my neighbours woodburners. I believe if the externalise costs were included in the accounting then woodburners would be banned overnight.

Increase from 1 to 3	0
Exclude exc events	0
Mandatory offsets	0
No industry restrictions	0
Extend to 2018	0
Mandatory reporting	0
S 27	0
AQCS	Yes
Funding links	0
Other suggested amendments	<p>Ban all woodburners in settled districts, towns and suburbs. Acknowledge that 1.5ug of smoke per kg of dry wood fires are in fact themselves polluting as opposed to what the New Zealand Home Heating Association would mislead us to believe. Ban all burning off in suburban and rural zones. Reduce the allowable limit of PM10 to 5ug per cubic metre. Introduce a standard for PM2.5 emissions. Acknowledge that we should minimise woodsmoke concentration in the air we breathe, and the theoretical minimum is zero. Consult with epidemiologists and smoke chemists to understand that great harm is being caused by woodsmoke.</p>