

PC23 - Whisper Creek Residential

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 26/11/2025

First name: Jesse

Last name: Lowe

Preferred method of contact

Email: jd.lowe16@gmail.com

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:

Reject the proposal. Discourage the rezoning and "urban sprawl".

Reason for Decision Requested:

Specific Provisions

I oppose the application in full, for the following reasons: The proposed rezoning of the land from Special Purpose Golf Resort Zone and Rural Urban Fringe to Residential New Neighbourhood, including x4 existing Rural Urban Fringe (RUF) blocks. The overall subdivision proposal, including the re purposing of viable farmland and the scale and density of the housing being sought. The lack of any meaningful access or transport-network improvements, particularly at the Lower Styx Road / Spencerville Road intersection. The inherent ecological risks associated with development and construction of this scale. The absence of clear or sufficient benefits to the existing community.

Reasons

I oppose the proposal in its entirety, for the following reasons: The development is largely self-serving and does not adequately provide for low-cost housing, community housing, or genuinely affordable housing. Existing residents will experience negative impacts, including increased traffic volumes, higher carbon emissions and pollution, and elevated risks to pedestrians and cyclists due to additional vehicles on local roads. The proposal reduces the amount of green space currently available in the area. There has been insufficient consultation with the local community who live in and will be directly affected by the development. The use of the Fast-Track process appears to serve little purpose other than to bypass meaningful engagement with affected parties. The rationale for using this process is unclear. If the intent is to avoid objections, this is deeply concerning. The ecological risks associated with the development outweigh any claimed benefits, particularly under a Fast-Tracked process. Statements within the

appendices that the project is “likely to be economically viable” are not sufficient justification for proceeding. There is significant vagueness regarding ecological risks. While flood risk is acknowledged, there is little clarity about the level of development risk considered acceptable, and no firm commitments to mitigation measures. Infrastructure and servicing constraints are noted, yet the documentation lacks clear explanations of how these issues will be addressed, creating considerable uncertainty. Several of the claimed benefits are “NOT GUARANTEED”, and many risks are not fully quantified. There is unclear long-term management responsibility, including who will inherit costs if mitigation fails or if development-related issues arise in future. For these reasons, I do not support this proposal and do not wish to see it proceed.
