

## Summary of Evidence Statement for proposed Timaru District Plan

### Hazards and Risks (Natural Hazards only) and Other District-wide Matters - Hearing F

Thursday 1 May 2025.

Tēnā koutou katoa, ko Deidre Francis tōku ingoa, my name is Deidre Francis. I am appearing before the Hearings Panel today on behalf of the Canterbury Regional Council (Environment Canterbury). With me today are Mr Nick Griffiths, Team Leader Hazards Science and Ms Jolene Irvine, Team Leader Rivers Planning.

Thank you for the opportunity to present to you today. I would like to acknowledge the positive interactions we have had with the section 42A officers in the lead up to this hearing. We have appreciated the opportunity to talk through issues with them and with other submitters before the s42A reports were finalised.

I have one correction to Appendix 1 of my evidence:

On page 12 of my evidence, paragraph 62, I recommend an amendment to the wording of ASW-O1. Unfortunately, the final wording as shown in paragraph 62 was not transferred to Appendix 1 and an earlier recommendation that I considered is shown. On page 20 Appendix 1 the relief sought should read as follows:

*The ecological, recreational, natural character and cultural values of the District's rivers are protected from ~~the~~ inappropriate adverse effects of activities on the surface of water.*

The evidence of the Regional Council is largely focused on the Natural Hazards Chapter of the proposed Plan. I have provided evidence from a planning perspective, while Mr Griffiths has provided technical evidence. The three main points covered in Mr Griffiths' evidence concern diversion and displacement of floodwater, amendments to the flood assessment certificate wording and the need for amendments to the flood assessment overlay.

Ms Irvine's evidence outlines Regional Council responsibilities in providing flood and erosion protection and drainage and how those responsibilities are delivered. She recommends further amendments to the proposed Plan to facilitate community flood and erosion protection efforts.

In my evidence, I have supported Timaru District Council's ability to include rules that control land use to protect drinking water quality. I have also included a Table in Appendix 3 of my evidence to assist the panel with understanding the Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan rules that apply in drinking water protection zones. I do, however, consider the package of provisions would benefit from more discussion.

The final issue covered in my evidence concerns Mr MacLennan's recommendation to amend ASW-O1 to refer to protecting the values of the District's rivers from "inappropriate activities" on the surface of water. The difference between my recommended wording and Mr MacLennan's is subtle but in my opinion provides a clearer alignment with the direction of the proposed Plan.

Mr Griffiths, Ms Irvine and I are all happy to answer any questions from the panel about our evidence.

No reira, tēnā koutou, tēnā koutou, tēnā tātou katoa.