

PC23 - Whisper Creek Residential

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 26/11/2025

First name: Andrew

Last name: Hicks

Preferred method of contact

Email: andrew.hicks@LIB.co.nz

Resident or Ratepayer *

Which Area is your property in? *

*

I could not **Gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission**

directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that:

a. adversely affects the environment, and

I am not **b. does not relate to the trade competition or the effects of trade competitions.**

Note to person making submission:

If you are a person who could gain an advantage in trade competition through the submission, your right to make a submission may be limited by clause 6(4) of Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991

Consultation Document Submissions

Provision:

Oppose

Decision Requested:

The decision I would like the Council to make is: 1. To approve the application only with significant conditions attached that address the preservation of natural values and the enhancement of cycle safety and connectivity. 2. Regarding natural values and visual impact: a. Condition the approval on a significant increase in the quantity and maturity of native plantings within the 5-metre landscape buffer strips, increased to a more substantial width buffer strip that allows for a private pathway, along Spencerville Road and other boundary roads. The goal should be to create a dense and effective visual screen that preserves the natural character of the approach to Spencerville and obscures the housing from key viewpoints. b. Require the developer to establish a substantial native greenbelt between the proposed development and the existing Spencerville settlement, providing a clear visual and ecological separation that allows for wildlife corridors and passive recreation. 3. Regarding road safety and cycle connectivity: a. Condition the approval on the developer funding and delivering significant safety upgrades to Spencerville Road and Lower Styx Road for their entire length connecting the development to Spencerville and the existing cycle network. This must include, at a minimum, physically separated, dedicated cycleways on these roads, not just painted lines or shared paths. b. Require the proposed shared path network to be redesigned in key areas to provide separate, dedicated paths for cyclists and pedestrians, particularly on the main thoroughfare connecting towards Spencerville. This path should be designed for safe travel at higher speeds to be a viable transport option, not just a recreational one. c. Require the creation of a direct, high-quality, and exclusive cycle path connecting the heart of the new development to the Spencerville township and its amenities, ensuring this connection is treated as a primary transport route and not a secondary recreational track. This path should be seen as a critical piece of infrastructure to reduce car dependency for the 800 new households. I'm not against the development in general, but I do protest the removal of native New Zealand because they don't want to build in a more traditional area. And believe that we need to keep parts of Christchurch green and wild. Not drive out the wildlife population. How can anyone expect to be living next to nature when everything looks cultivated? Eg, prestons looks like they want to keep nature at arms length. Also, shouldn't we be rezoned away from a small residential settlement if we're not going to be so isolated?

Reason for Decision Requested:

Specific Provisions

The specific provisions that my feedback relates to are the intensity of the proposed residential development, the impact on the natural values and visual amenity of the area, and the provisions for active transport, specifically the safety of existing roads for cyclists and the design and connectivity of the proposed shared path network to the Spencerville community. My submission also addresses the proposed transport network, including the new walking and cycling tracks and their integration with Spencerville Road and Lower Styx Road.

Reasons

My primary concern is that the increased intensity of development will negatively impact the natural character of the area, which is a significant draw for existing residents and visitors. While I acknowledge the inclusion of open green spaces and wetland restoration in the plan, I am worried that the view from Spencerville and surrounding areas will become dominated by housing, creating an eyesore and diminishing the sense of living in a green, nature-focused city. My submission is based on the belief that the development, as proposed, will transform the horizon into a continuous residential landscape. Secondly, I am heavily concerned about the impact on road safety for cyclists and other non-vehicular road users. I do not use a car and already find Spencerville Road and Lower Styx Road to be unsafe for biking. The proposal will significantly increase traffic volumes, and while it includes plans for internal walking and cycling tracks, it does not seem to provide for crucial safety upgrades to the existing roads I and others must use to connect to these new paths. I believe some thoughts from another resident has already highlighted the need for a safer space for school children biking along Spencerville Road and Turners Road, which reinforces my concern. A shared path is often not suitable for cyclists or e-scooter users travelling at a reasonable pace and can create conflict with pedestrians. Forcing cyclists onto roads that are not fit for purpose is dangerous. I have personally experienced the hazards on Lower Styx Road, where the road design can force a choice between falling into traffic or into bushes. Without dedicated and safe cycling infrastructure on the main connecting roads, the new development will only increase the danger for the growing number of people who choose to cycle. Finally, the proposed active transport links feel like an afterthought for the existing Spencerville community. The plans detail connections towards Prestons and Ouruhia, but the connection to Spencerville seems less considered. A functional cycle path needs to allow for efficient travel; it should be a preferable alternative to taking a car. The proposal does not give me confidence that I will have a safe and direct cycle route from my home in Spencerville to Prestons, for example, without being forced onto dangerous roads or slow, winding shared paths. This development should be an opportunity to create superior, dedicated cycleways that properly integrate Spencerville into the wider Christchurch cycle network, encouraging more people to get out of their cars and not to feel unsafe or unplanned for. Encourage the natural values instead of fighting it via more cars.
