I have been involved in local governemnt as an elected member since 1985. I was a member of Bulls District Community Council, a part of the Rangitikei County Council. This was dissolved in 1989. In 1995 I was elected to the Rangitikei District Council and have been a councillor since then.

I became a commissioner and was chair of thepanel hearing submissions for the Rangitikei District Council District Plan which became operative in 1999. I am an accredited commissiooner.

The summary of submissions suppled to the public is misleading with regard to mysubmssion. It omits my complete address, giving the road but not the town. It also states that I support the concept of a single plan but omits the additional statement that the proposed plan should be changed.

There are difficulties with the linkages in the plan and the decision I seek is that the plan is reconstructed to overcome difficultiesgthat users will have in working with the plan in its present form.

The administrative section, following the Section 32 document, has an objective and policies relating to consent conditions, duration, review, multiple sites or activities, enforcement procedures but no objective or policy identifying types of activities or where any identification of types of activities can be found in the RPS or in the Plan itself. The outcome I seek isguidance to users of the plan in the RPS administrative section about types of activities in the Plan or where the information can be found in the Plan.

I use as another example the information on ambient air quality, a type of activity which is permitted or discretionay and this relates to rules. There are rules in Chapter 14 and other chapters in the plan. An activity which does not comply with the rules is discretionary except in circumstances when other rules relevant to the activity apply. At the risk of repetition it would be usefulto list 12.7 and 12.8 as an addendum in Chapter 14 or alternately add the relevant requirements of these policies to 14.1 and 14.2.

Policies.

Policies are identified in the RPS for regionally significant resource management issues and outlines objectives, policies and methods to 'address the issues'. The Regional Plan lists thepolicies and rules to control the use of natural and physical resources. There is a fine line between controlling the use of natural and physical resources and addressing significant resource management issues and users of the Plan have to sort out the relevant significance for a proposede activity between the policies in the RPS and the policies in the Plan itself. For example in the RPS thepolicies concerning ambient air quality relate to standards and incompatible land uses. In theP lan itself the policies about ambient air quality relate to consent decision making for agrichemicals and consent decision making for other discharges to air and in addition to these to have particular regard to the policies in the RPS.

The outcome I seek is clearer statements which explain and define the relationship between the two groups of policies in order to make iteasier for a person considering a proposed activity which might affect air quality to understand all the Regional Council's requrements.

I also seek similar clarification for all other activities.

Jill Strugnell