

BEFORE THE HEARING PANEL IN TIMARU

IN THE MATTER of the Resource Management Act 1991

AND

IN THE MATTER of the hearing of submissions in relation to the Proposed
Timaru District Plan

**SUMMARY OF PRIMARY EVIDENCE OF EOGHAN O'NEILL ON BEHALF OF
PRIMEPORT TIMARU LIMITED AND TIMARU DISTRICT HOLDINGS LIMITED**

**HEARING STREAM E
STORMWATER**

Dated: 12 February 2025

INTRODUCTION

1. My full name is Eoghan Michael O'Neill. I am employed as Technical Director – Water Infrastructure with Pattle Delamore Partners Ltd. I have prepared this statement of evidence on behalf PrimePort Timaru Limited (**PrimePort**) and Timaru District Holdings Limited (TDHL) in respect of matters arising from PrimePort's and TDHL's submissions and further submissions on the Proposed Timaru District Plan (**Proposed Plan**).
2. The purpose of this summary is to provide the Panel and submitters with the following:
 - (a) Brief summary of the key issues raised in my evidence;
 - (b) Review of Reporting Officer Summary Statement.

SUMMARY OF KEY ISSUES

3. In my primary evidence I raised and discussed the following key issues:
 - (a) I consider that the stormwater chapter in the Proposed Plan seems an unnecessary addition given the other regulatory controls that Timaru District Council already has to implement their stormwater quantity and quality objectives through the stormwater connection process and stormwater bylaw.
 - (b) I am of the opinion that the definition of "stormwater neutrality" should be altered to delete the references to management of pre-development volumes to no more than post-development volumes.
 - (c) I consider that the 30m² additional impervious area provision for the implementation of stormwater neutrality provisions in SW-S2 is very stringent relative to other districts. A change to 150m², as per the change made to Table 7 would be more consistent with other districts.
 - (d) I consider that, based on the supporting memo from WSP, the proposed approach to implementation of stormwater neutrality and calculation of storage volumes is very onerous when compared to practices in other districts.
 - (e) I have concerns about the ability of most commonly used stormwater treatment devices to meet the minimum removal rates specified in the

Proposed Plan. I also consider it very unusual for this type of technical detail to be included within a Proposed Plan.

- (f) I recommend that the contaminant removal standards specified in Table 7 are removed from the Proposed Plan and the standards incorporated into a design standards document or code of practice.
- (g) I recommend that the definition of "impervious surface" is adjusted to better define the nature of impermeable surfaces and include additional common functional uses of compacted gravel surfaces.

SUMMARY OF KEY ISSUES

- 4. I acknowledge the comments of Mr Willis in Paragraph 12(a) of his summary statement where he recommends a review of the stormwater provisions. I agree that further dialogue between Council experts and affected parties would be beneficial.

Date: 12/02/2025

Eoghan O'Neill