



Ōhoka Residential Subdivision FTA231

From [Redacted]
Date Mon 12/10/2026 12:02 PM
To FastTrack Substantive <substantive@fasttrack.govt.nz>

2 attachments (768 KB)
Ohoka_Comment_Form.docx ;

Hi Please accept our submission Ōhoka Residential Subdivision FTA231

1. Contact Details			
Please ensure that you have authority to comment on the application on behalf of those named on this form.			
Organization name (if relevant)			
First name	Sonya & Peter		
Last name	Brooks & Pritchard		
Postal address	[Redacted]		
Home phone / Mobile phone	[Redacted]	Work phone	Use mobiles
Email (a valid email address enables us to communicate efficiently with you)	[Redacted]		

2. We will email you draft conditions of consent for your comment			
x	I can receive emails and my email address is correct	☐	I cannot receive emails and my postal address is correct

ABOUT US
We live at [Redacted] Peter & myself. We have lived there for 5 years, moving back out to ohoka after some time in town wanting the quieter rural life and land again. We have 2 horses, cats, dogs

and handreared parrots.

I wanted to be able to ride my horses down the road and on our property, relax in a rural setting and enjoy the rural community we have in Ohoka.

CONCERNS:

1. Flooding – in the time we have lived at this address, we have witnessed the extensive flooding and swamping of the land proposed for the development. We also are directly affected as we have a stream running the length of our property. When it heavy rains this increases the flow, paddocks drain into the stream and it causes it to flood on to our land, particularly down the back of the property. This will be even worse for the neighbours at the back. After heavy rain our paddocks pond for a number of days. We understand that the applicant claims this area is outside

2. Rural Life – As mentioned we moved into back to the area after returning to Christchurch city. We missed the quiet rural life, having our horses on our own property. We like the relaxed environment, the quiet nights, the beautiful sky.

We purchased this house for its view we face the southern alps– which we will lose if this development goes through.

Our house is very close to the road, so we face the very real risk of having disrupted sleep with the increase of traffic. If they add street lighting that will absolutely affect us too.

Our animals will be affected; it will no longer be safe to ride/walk the roads. Also the children who bike out street.

We love the wildlife – this again is at risk if the development goes again.

We understand progression and development but this proposal is skipping so many steps and jumping years ahead of its time. Going from rural minimum of 4 hectares to 450-500 sqm!

As a tenant legally they are entitled to quiet enjoyment – what about us? We have invested in the area, bought a house we envisioned this lifestyle to decades ahead to move in and discover this plan not long after arriving. It is very concerning a developer's proposal which conflicts with the district plan can keep pushing despite losing twice, that they can be so ignorant to the voice of the community. This move effectively and permanently changes our community and directly impacts residents.

There will be year of dust.

The whites road, roadside drains are an issue with erosion and get dug out regularly.

3. Infrastructure

We rely on septic for wastewater and our own bore for drinking water. This all could be affected by large-scale earthworks and stormwater. This could have a very real and lasting affect.

Roading – we have narrow roads, no street lighting, grass areas for people and animals to walk – all this is at risk. These roads were not designed to cater to the 850+ proposed houses. Getting to and from work will be a nightmare, long delays, impatient driver – these things are just not factored into their submission.

There is no public transport plan so it is a car-reliant plan. As mentioned, our house is close to the road, the trucks and traffic could have a very real and damaging effect on our lives and property. The roads aren't stable enough to handle increased trucks for the construction; when the odd truck goes down the road it vibrates the road. I can only imagine how bad it would be if this proceeds with the amount of heavy trucks needs to excavate etc. This will impact the roads, which means more council cost, then that likely is passed on in increased rates.

4. Risk – as mentioned above about the flooding risk. If you allow this to proceed and my land gets directly affected with flooding who is liable? The direct cause would be Insurance will become challenging, premium have risen greatly, we are seeing increasing questions around flooding. There are direct financial costs this development will cause us to incur. Please seriously consider this as a high adverse impact.

I have seen some report they have done, but they lack depth and don't look into the direct effect and impact to us.

Dust – the dust is a real risk and ourselves our land and animals could be impacted for years. It could affect our water too. Are there negative health implications from that?

5. Economic Benefits – Where is the national significance of this development? The claims for improved economic benefit can be achieved in other projects in the district—ideally ones with better planned infrastructure.

The polo field – is ambitious at best. I love polo and have friends who play, but realistically there are only a limited number of teams, from memory, less than 15 in the South Island...

Housing - there is ample development in other areas already. The council is not in favour of this proposal and has already turned it down.

In our view, there is no genuinely significant economic benefit; it seems it creates more problems than it claims to fix. We as the panel to carefully consider the adverse impact on the community and its residents and the environment.

There are so many issues in this submission, and the adverse effects greatly outnumber any benefits. We ask the panel to consider the community and residents' views carefully as we are directly affected. No conditions being add will solve this or lessen it those adverse impacts. This proposal has been declined twice for valid reason we ask the panel to review this matter carefully and decline it.

Kindest Regards

Sonya Brooks & Peter Pritchard

