

**BEFORE INDEPENDENT HEARING COMMISSIONERS AT LOWER HUTT
I MUA NGĀ KAIKŌMIHANA WHAKAWĀ MOTUHAKE
TE AWA KAIRANGI**

IN THE MATTER of the Resource Management Act 1991 (Act)

AND

**IN THE MATTER of the hearing of submissions on the
Proposed Lower Hutt District Plan**

HEARING TOPIC Residential and Rural Zones (Hearing Stream 3)

**STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF MATTHEW AITCHISON ON BEHALF OF HUTT
CITY COUNCIL
(CIVIL ENGINEERING)
15 JUNE 2026**

INTRODUCTION

1. My full name is Matthew Aitchison. I am a senior civil engineer and project manager at Envelope Engineering Limited. I have been engaged by Hutt City Council (HCC) as a Consultant Development Engineer. I have been working for HCC as a Consultant Development Engineer on a part-time basis for six years.
2. This evidence relates to the requested rezoning of land owned by Silverstream Park Christian Centre.
3. I am authorised to give this evidence on behalf of Hutt City Council.
4. While this is a Council level hearing, I confirm that I have read the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses in the Environment Court Practice Note 2023 and agree to comply with it. My evidence is within my area of expertise, except where I state that I rely on the evidence of others.

QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE

5. I have thirty five years' experience in civil engineering, land development, three waters infrastructure, stormwater management, flood assessment, infrastructure servicing and subdivision / land development engineering.
6. I am a Senior Engineer at Envelope Engineering Ltd (Envelope), an engineering consultancy practice, with offices in Wellington, Tauranga, Christchurch, and Auckland. Prior to joining

Envelope, I was a Senior Development Engineer at Wellington Water, and a Asset Manager at Kapiti Coast District Council

7. I have the following academic qualifications: I hold a NZ Certificate in Engineering (Civil).
8. I am a Member of Engineering New Zealand.
9. I reviewed the previous successful resource consent and engineering approval applications for Silverstream Park Christian Centre which provide insight into the existing servicing of the site. I understand the extent of the site includes:
 - 320 Eastern Hutt Road, Stokes Valley.
 - 3 & 15 Reynolds Bach Drive and Section 2 SO 429576.
 - Sections 1–5 SO 461420.

CODE OF CONDUCT

10. While this is a Council level hearing, I have read the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses set out in the Environment Court's Practice Note 2023. I have complied with that Code when preparing my written statement of evidence and I agree to comply with it when I give any oral evidence.
11. My qualifications as an expert are set out above. I confirm that the issues addressed in this statement of evidence are within my area of expertise, and I have not omitted to consider material facts known to me that might alter or detract from my expressed opinions.

SCOPE OF EVIDENCE

12. I have been requested by Hutt City Council to review the evidence put forward by Samuel Godwin of Cuttriss in support of the proposed rezoning and to respond with my professional assessment on behalf of Council. I have also considered the comments provided by Caroline

Horrox of Wellington Water (dated 12/05/26) as well as my review of previous approved consents for the site.

13. My evidence addresses the feasibility of rezoning the medium density residential. Specifically, I will address the following topics:

- Wastewater Servicing
- Potable and Firefighting Water Supply
- Stormwater Management and Flood Risk

14. In preparing my evidence, I have reviewed the following documents:

Statement of Evidence – Corporate – Silverstream Park Christian Centre Charitable Trust prepared by John Ross, dated 5th June 2026;

HCC PDP s42A – 320 Eastern Hutt Road Rezoning – Wellington Water Feedback comments prepared by Caroline Horrox, dated 12th May 2026;

Statement of Evidence – Engineering – Silverstream Park Christian Centre Charitable Trust prepared by Samuel Godwin, dated 5th June 2026;

Statement of Evidence – Planning – Silverstream Park Christian Centre Charitable Trust prepared by Glen Cooper, dated 5th June 2026; and

METHODOLOGY

15. I have reviewed the above information and evidence and have also reviewed the previous resource consent and engineering approval documentation for the current development of part of the site.

16. I visited the site on 15 June 2026.

17. My approach to considering the feasibility of rezoning the land was to consider how a future development may be serviced. The requested zoning would allow a higher density of impervious

servicing, a higher intensity of accommodation, and for subdivision into individual ownership. Against this I considered the suitability of the existing of the existing public network to accommodate these increases in demand.

SITE LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION

18. The site is located in the northern part of Stokes Valley and has primary accesses from Eastern Hutt Road and Reynolds Bach Drive, with secondary access available from the end of Kingsley Street. The site is held in a single ownership across the following parcels:

- 320 Eastern Hutt Road, Stokes Valley.
- 3 & 15 Reynolds Bach Drive and Section 2 SO 429576.
- Sections 1–5 SO 461420.

CONCEPT DEVELOPMENT DESIGN

19. A concept design for a possible development of the rezoned site has not been submitted. My assessment is therefore based on the type of development that would be enabled by the proposed rezoning.

WASTEWATER SERVICING

20. The site is currently serviced by the existing public wastewater network. A wastewater main which acts as leachate drain for the nearby landfill bisects the site. While the primary function of

this pipe is as a leachate drain, it is constructed as a conventional wastewater pipe and is currently utilised as a connection point for the current site.

21. Subject to capacity assessment this pipe serves as a suitable connection point to the public network.
22. While WWL have advised that there are downstream constraints they have also acknowledged that either demand management (flow mitigation) or downstream upgrades, or a combination of the two could be used to accommodate additional development of the site.
23. Any future application for resource consent would need to be supported by an analysis of spare capacity of the existing public network, both within the site and further downstream. But this is not unusual for large scale developments and there are options to mitigate any potential constraints.
24. I agree with the Cuttriss evidence that, with respect to wastewater, engineering solutions exist to enable further development of the site, including rezoning. Overall, I believe that solutions exist and these could be detailed through a possible future consenting process.

POTABLE AND FIREFIGHTING WATER SUPPLY

25. The WWL commentary and Cuttriss statement both describe the existing water supply network and I do not repeat those descriptions here. As far as I'm aware accurate as-built plans or design calculations are not available for the existing private aspects of the supply network.
26. The supply system is a fairly complicated combination of public supply with private storage tanks, private pumps, and private pipework. Some parts of the site are essentially serviced from the public system (with on-site pipework being private) but other parts are mostly a private system.
27. Subject to appropriate ongoing monitoring and maintenance, the existing supply is suitable for the existing use (including recently obtained consents) and may be suitable for other similar uses.

However, the current system relies upon a single entity being responsible for use, maintenance, and management.

28. In terms of the proposed rezoning, a significantly greater water demand could be anticipated, along with diverse ownership following subdivision.
29. While private entities, such as residents' associations, could be set up to maintain a private water supply, it has not been adequately demonstrated that the existing supply is suitable for the development that would be enabled with the requested rezoning. In my opinion, much more engineering work is required to demonstrate that a feasible water solution exists from source to end user for a residential development scenario.
30. While detailed design of the internal water network could be resolved at detailed design stage through the consenting process, the main supply flow rates and storage need to be resolved prior to rezoning. It has not yet been demonstrated that a workable solution exists.
31. I note that Wellington Water have also not been able to conclude that there is an adequate supply of water to service a large residential development on the site (as would be enabled by the rezoning).
32. Within the Wellington region almost all public fire hydrants are supplied by a gravity-based water network, providing a robust reliable water supply for fire-fighting purposes. It appears that, based on the current supply, this would not be possible over the extent of the area requested to be rezoned.
33. While there are options to upgrade the existing public network, in my view these have not been progressed to the point where it could be concluded that they are practicable.
34. To summarise the above, I am not able to support the requested rezoning until further design work demonstrating that an adequate water supply exists or could be practicably constructed.

STORMWATER MANAGEMENT AND FLOOD RISK

35. While there is no public flood model for the site, by inspection the site is significantly elevated and not generally prone to significant ponding risk. There may be parts of the site subject to an

overland flow risk but, as the catchment size is limited, the extent of any overland flow areas is likely to be limited.

36. Isolated private flood models have been provided in the past. But there may be sensitive downstream catchments that need protection from increased flood risk that may occur with development of the site. Typical measures would be expected to include tanks, over-sized pipes, or ponds.
37. There is sufficient land on the site to attenuate these increased flows using a combination of the methods noted above, and overall I'm satisfied that flood risk could be addressed through a future consenting process.
38. There is a significant gully system through the site that conveys stormwater through and away from the site. Rezoning would enable more intensive development that would be expected to allow increased impervious surfaces and increased stormwater flows. These will need to be carefully managed to manage any potential erosion/stability risk within the gully and the risk of flooding to downstream receiving catchment.
39. A comprehensive stormwater management plan (SMP) should be prepared to support further development of the site. It is likely that land will need to be utilised for storage (ponds or tanks) and this should be shown spatially within the SMP.
40. An SMP should be provided as the first part of a consenting process, and provided that is carried out that would, in my view lead to a satisfactory outcome from a flood risk and stormwater management perspective as well as ensuring an efficient use of land. On the other hand, a rezoning that allows piecemeal development and subdivision without a comprehensive SMP could lead to unsatisfactory outcomes.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

41. My evidence discusses the three waters issues associated with the proposed rezoning. Overall I am satisfied that any constraints associated with wastewater can be addressed through a future consenting process. Similarly, stormwater and flooding issues could be addressed through the consenting process but this should be addressed by preparing a comprehensive site-wide Stormwater Management Plan. Regarding potable and fire-fighting water I do not believe enough

design and investigation work has been carried out to provide certainty that there are solutions to provide a suitable water supply.

LIMITATIONS

42. This evidence does not consider geotechnical, traffic, utility servicing (electricity and telecommunications) issues.

Date: 15/06/2026



.....
Matthew Aitchison – Senior Civil
Engineer