

BEFORE THE INVERCARGILL CITY COUNCIL

IN THE MATTER of the Resource Management Act 1991

AND

IN THE MATTER an application for land use consent to demolish
the Briscoes Building at 104-106 Dee Street
Invercargill, a Category 2 Historic Place on the
New Zealand Heritage List / Rārangī Kōrero.

BY **104 Dee Street Partnership**
Applicant

“WILL SAY” BRIEF OF EVIDENCE OF: LINDA ANNE LEE
August 31 2026

Counsel acting for Applicant:

Clare Lenihan, Barrister

80 Layard Street, Invercargill 9810

Tel: (03) 214 1674; 027 577 6823

clare.lenihan@environmentallawyer.co.nz

1. My full name is Linda Anne Lee.
2. I am a co-owner representing the 104 Dee Street Partnership.
3. I am 66 years old and retired.
4. In the past I worked for a media monitoring company for over twenty-five years in various roles including Account Management and Operations. I have rental properties in Wellington and one in Timaru. For the sake of transparency, I acknowledge that I have property to fund my retirement and secure my personal housing.
5. The purpose of this evidence is to explain the background to the resource consent application and reasons for it.
6. My evidence covers the following: (a) Background; (b) The fire and its immediate aftermath; (c) The Dangerous and Insanitary Building Notice; (d) Insurance; (e) The timeline of investigations; (f) Funding; (g) Attempts to sell; (h) Financial capacity; (i) Weatherproofing; (j) Holding costs and the ongoing burden; (k) Effects on neighbours and the street; (l) Plans for the site.

(a) Background

7. I first saw the Briscoes Building in Dee Street, Invercargill, advertised by Cutlers Real Estate in Dunedin in 2009 and was wowed by the grand character and scale of it.
8. The opportunity offered was to enter into a partnership with three others, which made it financially affordable to purchase such a building. The initial four way partnership consisted of Linda Lee, Tony Watts, Noel Stafford and Brad Inwood, with each partner holding a 25% shareholding. The building had good tenants and was a viable proposition in my eyes since Tony Watts had a business already in Invercargill and could be hands on to help locally. Noel Stafford also lived in Dunedin not too far away. Brad Inwood, though based in Sydney, is a Chartered Architect with experience in renovations and heritage buildings, so the partnership brought together a good mix of experience.
9. In all our correspondence and meetings with Council, Brad's role was made quite clear through his email signatures and professional input.
10. We purchased the building on 23 October 2009. The building has had a large number of tenancies over the years. Prior to the fire we had a mix of residential and commercial tenants across the two floors, including a long-standing boxing gym and residential apartments upstairs and shopfronts and an arcade at ground level.
11. I actively tried to organise tenancies and would do this myself by phoning potential tenants and also engaged Harcourts in Invercargill to list the lease spaces. To lower the barrier to entry during an economic downturn I routinely made rents attractive, offered free rent periods to help tenants set up, funded fit-out works such as new flooring, and reduced rents to reflect improvements tenants made. I managed tenancies actively and generously throughout our ownership.

12. We operated the Dee Street City Markets once a month to try and breathe life into the building's retail arcade, to encourage more businesses to open in the Mall and build community.

13. Retail conditions in the CBD were difficult over this period, which affected foot traffic to the arcade and the wider block.

Building Maintenance

14. We endeavoured to attend to any maintenance we could as quickly as possible, working alongside local tradespeople to address issues as they arose. Upon first purchasing the building, the four partners immediately invested \$25,000 to have the exterior painted. While there were obviously many other ongoing maintenance tasks of lesser amounts over the years, we funded several significant capital works early on to maintain and improve the building.

15. In 2010, roughly a year after our purchase, we faced a severe spring snowstorm, the same extreme weather event that caused the roof of Stadium Southland to collapse. This storm caused water damage to our property, resulting in an insurance claim. Insurance covered some of the cost but not all, and we covered the extra costs ourselves. Following the storm, we paid a sum of over \$25,000 for repairs to the roof and plumbing works to upgrade the building.

16. In 2020, we proactively engaged an engineer to complete an Initial Evaluation Procedure (IEP) report for the property. This was done to formally assess the building's seismic strength and establish a baseline for its structural future. To fund this, we applied for and received assistance from the Invercargill City Council's Heritage Fund, which paid towards the cost of the report. This was done as part of a joint application with a group of other heritage building owners. Shannon Baxter was instrumental in facilitating this coordination.

17. We engaged Fire Compliance Services to do our annual Building Warrant of Fitness (BWof) and standard safety checks. Whenever specific hazard mitigation requests were issued by our insurance provider, such as comprehensive thermal imaging of the electrical systems, that was done promptly.

Relationship with Council staff

18. I maintained very positive working relationships with various council staff, particularly Shannon Baxter, who was exceptionally supportive of what we were trying to achieve. I was successful in getting a couple of grants, one to help with the restoration of the verandah. The Council heritage grant contributed \$16,250 and the partners matched it with \$16,250 from our own capital.

(b) The fire and its immediate aftermath

19. The fire occurred in the early hours of 6 September 2023. I was contacted by Delwyn Perkins, our residential tenant, who informed me what had happened. Later that day I was contacted by Lyndon Paul of the Invercargill City Council. I responded immediately. That evening I gave Lyndon Paul my insurer details (Crombie Lockwood), I agreed to fund the FENZ-requested structural engineer from Kensington Consulting because of the roof-

collapse risk, and I phoned all our tenants to let them know there had been a fire and to offer any assistance I could.

20. I booked flights to Invercargill and flew down for 13 September 2023, to attend an urgent meeting with the Council representatives, our insurers, our structural engineer, and Ryal Bush Contracting. The purpose was to establish an immediate action plan for the building. We discussed the state of the building, mitigation measures that might be needed and the strong possibility of demolition if the building became too dangerous. I cooperated with the agreed action-plan framework: Ryal Bush Contracting was to provide cost estimates, Kensington Consulting to conduct structural assessments by 19 September, and immediate contingency measures to be identified if site conditions escalated. Council also established a decision deadline regarding a potential Dangerous and Insanitary Building notice.

21. The structural assessment was done by Kensington Consulting on 20 September 2023. The report identified it as an unreinforced brick masonry (URM) building dating from the 1880s. It concluded the building was Dangerous and Insanitary and summarised that the most practical and cost-effective solution would be demolition unless substantial finance was available.

22. I also met with Council staff and the risk adjuster on 20 September 2023, where the above Kensington Consulting conclusion regarding demolition was noted.

23. A second updated Structural Review was done by Kensington Consulting on 30 October 2023 which further defined the Dangerous and Insanitary building aspects.

24. I contacted Southern Insulation and through Ryal Bush Contracting engaged them to carry out on-site asbestos assessments on Friday 22 and Monday 25 September, with the formal report expected by Thursday 28 September 2023.

25. Heritage considerations were outlined by the Council (Morgan Smith) regarding the future resource consent application, noting that a heritage assessment and the asbestos assessment would need to be included.

26. Due to high winds on 20 September, planned tenant access had to be cancelled and postponed to the following week to ensure public and tenant safety. Tenants were able to gain access over the coming weeks to retrieve what they wanted.

27. On 20 September 2023, communication was established regarding the ongoing costs of road diversions, with instruction for the owners to contact South Roads regarding Waka Kotahi requirements.

28. The Council Traffic Management Division documented that the northbound traffic lane on Dee Street was inside the predicted collapse fall zone and pedestrians could not safely be routed under the verandah.

29. Council granted the owners an extension of time until Friday 22 September at 1:00 PM to confirm intended actions. Active contact was maintained with Peter Patton (Manager for Building, Planning and Quality) and Lyndon Paul to coordinate next steps.

30. The timeline was very tight and the extension allowed us to wait for the quantity surveyor report to see what realistic options we had. We were genuinely hoping to save the building

and were exploring all possibilities, while conscious of our obligation to deal with the building urgently if mitigation was needed.

31. Before Christmas I looked to purchase containers, mooted as a good option to keep pedestrians away from the building. I was fortunate to find some locally and purchased these; arranged for delivery, painting, and putting ramps in. It required considerable co-ordination, including traffic management, so the containers could be placed on site safely.

32. Braziers Fencing was given the task of putting up the proper fencing to site and it is still there to date.

33. Throughout this period I communicated openly with Council. Lyndon Paul of ICC acknowledged that I proactively responded to Council's requests.

(c) The Dangerous and Insanitary Building Notice

34. The Dangerous and Insanitary Building notice was issued on 16 November 2023. The notice required: (a) immediately secure loose roofing material and make the building weathertight; (b) cease any occupation; (c) consult with a structural engineer to monitor the fire-affected façade; (d) make the building weathertight as soon as reasonably practical; (e) monitor the fire-affected façade to prevent collapse; (f) maintain the hoardings to protect the public; and (g) the pedestrian walkway and road reserve to be opened to the public with suitable protection by 5pm, 15 December 2023.

35. The notice was about urgent public safety and mitigating risk. The Council did not state whether the building should be repaired or demolished.

36. We tried to comply as quickly as possible. Tenants had a small window to retrieve items under strict safety protocols. Occupation of the building ceased. Darryl Kensington did the ongoing monitoring of the building.

37. I then got recommendations for builders/roofers to get the roofing iron made safe and keep it as practically weatherproof. It was not easy to get someone to do this under urgency. Nigel Hicks, a previous tenant who worked for Ryder Roofing, managed to get that company to do the work. The windows were boarded and the roofing iron secured promptly, followed by netting.

(d) Insurance

38. We purchased the Briscoes Building in 2009 prior to the Christchurch earthquake. While we had full replacement insurance in the first couple of years at reasonable premiums, after the Christchurch earthquake reinsurers had very little appetite for large unreinforced masonry heritage buildings and we could only get indemnity cover. Our insurance bill instantly multiplied by more than three and a half times, and although it later dropped it never returned to its original level.

39. We used our broker PJ Taylor and Associates, and later Crombie Lockwood, to go to market for the best cover possible. We were fortunate to get insurance at all, on an indemnity basis only. Both companies have been excellent to work with.

40. Following the fire in September 2023, a claim was lodged under this indemnity policy. The insurers assessed the damage and took the position that the building was a total loss.

They agreed to pay out the indemnity value. However, once their quantity surveyor and specialists assessed its value, they deemed it a net negative asset value due to the overwhelming liabilities on the site.

41. I also had the right under the policy to funds for demolition, and this allowance was substantially more than the building's indemnity value. The insurers agreed to pay this demolition fund out in increments to cover our actual costs for reports and immediate site safety measures. They made it clear they would not pay for personal expenses or ongoing operational costs, and imposed no requirement to rebuild.

42. An indemnity policy covers only the depreciated value of the building, leaving a large gap between the payout and the cost of safely rebuilding a heritage building.

(e)The timeline of investigations

43. The process of our investigations went as follows.

44. Kensington Consulting: we started with the initial engineer's report from Darryl Kensington, followed by a second, updated Structural Review on 30 October 2023.

45. Bonisch Consultants: I contacted Bonisch and formally engaged them for their expertise in resource management on 8 March 2024, having been in contact since January 2024, and I have dealt with Christine McMillan throughout.

46. NZ Heritage Properties: they were engaged next to prepare a formal heritage report for the application.

47. Heritage New Zealand: during our discussions, Susan Irvine suggested that I organise a second engineer to give an opinion on the building. I acted on that suggestion, which shows I was testing rather than assuming the demolition conclusion.

48. Lewis Bradford: I engaged Robert Lane at Lewis Bradford, who had dealt with many buildings post the Christchurch earthquake, as a second engineering opinion. They are based in Christchurch and had good knowledge of heritage buildings.

49. Rhodes + Associates: they were brought in right after Lewis Bradford had viewed the building to prepare quantity surveying estimates for the various options.

50. Ryal Bush Contracting and Ceres NZ: I formally obtained demolition quotes from both (Ryal Bush Contracting \$609,129 2 February 2024 and Ceres NZ \$777,300 13 May 2024). I will provide an updated quote from Ryal Bush as soon as obtained.

51. BI Architects: Brad helped organise a concept design for a new building that could go on the site.

(f) Funding

52. I applied to the National Heritage Preservation Incentive Fund in August 2024, seeking around \$20,700 towards the cost of the engineering assessment and design work post the fire damage.

53. The Fund has a limited national pool, typically funding 50% of a project up to around \$100,000–\$150,000 in a fortunate case.

54. My application was carefully considered but declined. They did not suggest reapplying and wished me luck with my project.

55. I also spoke with the Lottery Grants Board, which advised I would not meet their criteria as they do not fund private owners of buildings.

56. The Southland Heritage and Preservation Fund was being wound up but had only limited funds, of around \$20,000 to \$30,000. There was no possibility of the amount of funding we needed.

(g) Attempts to sell

57. I initially met with Michael Frecklington of Bayleys Real Estate in October 2023 regarding selling the building. Following conversations with Brad, we moved forward with a sole agency agreement, signed in December 2023. Once listed, Bayleys marketed the property across Trade Me, realestate.co.nz and the Bayleys website from January 2024. Casual enquiries dissipated once buyers understood the situation, resulting in zero written offers.

58. Alongside the formal marketing, I made direct approaches to local property investors and developers. I also reached out to Hayden Cawte in Dunedin, who asked around but found no interest. One developer, HWR group, sent a letter declining the purchase.

59. The only tangible interest came from a local developer who owns property on the western boundary of the site, conditional on a cleared and clean site, for use as carparking. The discussions indicated they were only prepared to offer a minimal amount of \$250k – \$300k + GST.

(h) Financial capacity

60. As of the last 16 years the partnership consists solely of Mr Brad Inwood and myself. The other two partners sold their shares for financial and personal reasons within a couple of years. There are no corporate backings, development funds, or institutional shareholders. The financial liability rests solely on two private individuals.

61. At 66 years old, my borrowing capacity is effectively non-existent for a project of this scale. Retail banks will not extend multi-million-dollar commercial debt to an individual of my age, and would require a viable, income-generating asset to service a loan, which a standalone façade retention project does not provide.

62. The quantity surveyor set out these pathways. The full rebuild pathways range from \$6,695,000 to \$10,237,000 plus GST for a new two-level skeleton structure. Net of a potential maximum \$150,000 heritage grant and our indemnity insurance (confidential, but covers at most 1% of this scope), the out-of-pocket shortfall ranges from over \$6.5 million to over \$10.7 million.

63. The temporary stabilisation / empty shell pathway was estimated at \$4,458,000 plus GST just to retain the façades under a temporary roof, leaving a personal shortfall exceeding \$4,300,000 even with a \$150,000 grant.

64. The partial façade retention pathway was estimated at \$2,239,000 plus GST to retain only the Dee Street façade.

65. Given the issues raised by Origin and in the s42A report, we had these options re-assessed, focussing on short-term stabilisation, propping, weatherproofing, partial retention, façade retention and earthquake strengthening. Phil Griffiths has set out the revised costs in a table which I include here. The costs have also been updated.

Option	Scope (short form)	Capital cost (incl. escalation where applicable)	10-year monitoring / maintenance	Total
1	Retain Dee St + Spey St façades; replacement two-level base-build	\$10,730,851	Nil (not required)	\$10,730,851
2	Retain Dee St façade only; replacement two-level base-build	\$7,978,396	Nil (not required)	\$7,978,396
3	Full demolition; replacement base-build with replica façades	\$7,017,229	Nil (not required)	\$7,017,229
4	Retain/stabilise Dee St façade; demolish behind	\$2,346,588	\$83,000	\$2,429,588
5	Retain both façades; temporary protective roof	\$4,672,933	\$123,700	\$4,796,633
6 (Engineer Option A)	Retain rear western portion + both façades; remove eastern portion; temporary securing, propping, weatherproofing	\$2,739,790	\$231,400	\$2,971,190
7 (Engineer Option B)	Retain/temporarily stabilise Dee St façade only; demolish behind	\$2,160,533	\$118,700	\$2,279,233

All figures are in New Zealand dollars and exclude GST.

66. The Our insurance framework is heavily weighted toward site clearance rather than structural preservation. Total demolition unlocks an insurance payout designated for site clearing, allowing us to eliminate the public safety hazard, fulfil our duties and clear the site.

(i) Weatherproofing

67. The overarching barrier to weatherproofing was both financial and safety-related. The September 2023 fire destroyed the internal roof and floor structures, leaving the brick façades on Dee and Spey Streets unsupported from the first floor up to the parapet. The expert advice was that they were acting as unbraced, free-standing walls, so heavy weatherproofing tarpaulins would act like a sail in high winds, creating a risk of street-side collapse.

68. I made proactive efforts to find cheaper stabilisation alternatives. I sent Heritage NZ's propping advice to structural engineer John Goble to explore cheaper alternatives like timber strong-backs. I personally phoned three or four local builders; two were too busy and a couple refused because they felt the building was too unsafe to work on. The insurer would not fund temporary measures on a building deemed a total economic loss.

(j) Holding costs and the ongoing burden

69. Since the fire in September 2023, the building has brought in no rent and has become a major ongoing financial drain. In the first few months we faced massive costs for full road and traffic management, and shipping containers were placed on site as a solid protective barrier.

70. Following a letter I received from the Council on Thursday 11 July 2024 about the condition of the walkway, I organised the repairs urgently so it would be safe for all pedestrians. About a week later I organised thicker, 500kg aluminium ramps at each end to ensure the walkway was completely safe, durable and large enough for all members of the public. Other measures to keep the site safe and clean were dealt with promptly.

71. Current operations have scaled down to ongoing security fencing hire; full road and traffic management has ceased. Site compliance and monitoring inspections remain active and billable. Total expenditure to date includes approximately new two-levelskeleton in non-reimbursable personal funds, plus a \$172,000 allowance from the insurer, a combined total of \$322,000. Should the demolition permit fail to clear, we anticipate unquantified cost escalations. Substantial additional costs are also anticipated as our legal team and consultants finalise the outstanding reports and evidence for the hearing, anticipated between late September and early October.

72. The insurer's funds helped keep the site safe but did not cover our ongoing overheads — rates, mortgage, accountant fees and maintenance after vandalism. The site makes no income and the partners lose money every month.

(k) Effects on neighbours and the street

73. The wider community impact was highlighted in local media. The Southland Tribune on Wednesday 10 July 2024 reported that ICC Chief Executive Michael Day documented the financial unviability regarding our fire-damaged Dee Street building during a Southland Business Chamber panel addressing the negative impact of the safety barricades on local trade.

74. In the Southland Tribune of 20 May 2025, former Mayor Nobby Clark acknowledged the economic reality, stating that "someone would have to have very deep pockets to repair the building, they won't get a return on it," and using our property as an example of a building that should be granted an exemption to allow demolition.

75. The shipping containers and safety fencing have severely disrupted pedestrian access along this section of Dee Street, forcing pedestrians to divert and reducing the foot traffic neighbouring businesses rely on. This corroborates the submission made by the Halligans in support of our application.

(l) Plans for the site

76. Both Brad and I have discussed what we envisage post-demolition. Because our intention is to sell, our primary goal is to generate active interest in the site once cleared. We want to sell to a developer who will create a new building that acts as a genuine asset to the CBD.

77. Given our intention to sell, we cannot commit to funding or executing a long-term redevelopment ourselves. However, we are fully prepared to volunteer the following practical, interim conditions: (a) Interim Site Treatment: following total demolition, we commit to leaving the site in a clean, level, and safe condition. (b) Site Security and Aesthetics: we volunteer a condition to keep the site securely fenced off, and are prepared to install attractive hoardings around the perimeter, which may display historical images of the Briscoes Building or information about the CBD's growth. (c) Design Principles for Future Reconstruction: we are prepared to volunteer a condition or enter a legal covenant binding any future purchaser so the design of any replacement building remains sympathetic to the surrounding heritage precinct guidelines.

78. We believe these volunteered conditions strike the right balance: they protect the immediate safety and look of the Spey and Dee Street intersection, while ensuring a future purchaser has a viable, cleared platform to invest in a high-quality development that aligns with the Council's long-term vision.

Conclusion

79. The loss of the Briscoes Building is personally devastating, but the compounding costs to rebuild and restore this extensively fire-damaged structure are economically non-viable.

Dated 31st day of August 2026

Linda Anne Lee

Appendix — Detailed Chronology of Actions and Communications

The following chronology is provided as a schedule to this brief.

Date	Action / event	Who Linda dealt with / spoke to	Source
23 October 2009	Purchase of the Briscoes Building.	Linda Lee; original partnership (Watts, Stafford, Inwood)	Brief of Evidence of Linda Lee
2010	Severe spring snowstorm; over \$25,000 spent on roof and plumbing repairs.	Insurer; local tradespeople	Brief of Evidence of Linda Lee
May 2020	Initial Seismic Assessment / IEP commissioned (34% NBS, Grade C); part-funded via ICC Heritage Fund.	Ralf Schruba, Hadley & Robinson; Shannon Baxter (ICC)	Hadley & Robinson ISA Report, 20 May 2020
6 September 2023 (early hours)	Fire; tenant notifies Linda; ICC makes contact; Linda supplies Crombie Lockwood insurer details that evening; agrees to fund FENZ-requested engineer; phones all tenants.	Delwyn Perkins (tenant); Lyndon Paul (ICC)	Email Linda Lee to Lyndon Paul, 5/6 Sept 2023
8 September 2023	Books flights and confirms 13 September meeting.	Lyndon Paul (ICC)	Email Linda Lee to Lyndon Paul, 8 Sept 2023
12 September 2023	Emails arranging meeting time and attendees.	Lyndon Paul (ICC)	Emails 104-106 Dee, 12 Sept 2023
13 September 2023	On-site / ICC meeting; agreed actions (Ryal Bush estimates; Kensington assessment by 19 Sept).	Lyndon Paul, Peter Patton, Darryl Kensington, Peter Ballantyne (loss adjuster), Quintin Winsloe (Ryal Bush)	ICC Meeting minutes, 13 Sept 2023
19 September 2023	Kensington Consulting Fire Damage Structural Review.	Darryl Kensington, Kensington Consulting	Kensington fire damage report, 19 Sept 2023
20 September 2023	ICC meeting; tenant access cancelled (high winds); road diversion / South Roads instructed; asbestos assessment via Southern Insulation (through Ryal Bush) 22 & 25 Sept.	Peter Patton, Peter Ballantyne, Morgan Smith, Lyndon Paul	ICC meeting minutes, 20 Sept 2023
22 September 2023	Extension of time to confirm intended actions.	Peter Patton (ICC)	Fri 22 Sept Update email
28 September 2023	Asbestos survey report expected.	Southern Insulation via Ryal Bush	ICC meeting minutes, 20 Sept 2023
5 October 2023	Linda emails asbestos report to Council.	Lyndon Paul (ICC)	Email Linda Lee to Lyndon Paul, 5 Oct 2023
30 October 2023	Kensington updated Structural Assessment (Dangerous s121 /	Darryl Kensington, Kensington Consulting	Kensington Structural

Date	Action / event	Who Linda dealt with / spoke to	Source
	Insanitary s123).		Assessment, 30 Oct 2023
1 November 2023	Linda updates Council on quotes to board windows / make roof safe and on marketing; Council commends proactive response.	Lyndon Paul (ICC)	Emails, 1 Nov 2023
16 November 2023	ICC issues Dangerous and Insanitary Building Notice.	Anne Duncan (ICC)	Notice & cover letter, 16 Nov 2023
23 November 2023	HWR declines purchase.	Sue Hill (HWR) via Quintin Winsloe (Ryal Bush)	Email, 23 Nov 2023
October–December 2023	Engages Bayleys; sole agency signed 8 Dec 2023; marketing from January 2024.	Michael Frecklington (Bayleys)	Bayleys agency contract, 8 Dec 2023
November–December 2023	Sources and purchases containers; Braziers fencing; makes roof safe via Nigel Hicks (Ryder Roofing); netting installed.	Nigel Hicks (Ryder Roofing); Braziers; Emma Hill (South Roads)	Container update emails, Dec 2023
20 December 2023	ICC requests container / net update.	Lyndon Paul (ICC)	Email 'Containers', 20 Dec 2023
January 2024	Contacts Bonisch re consent; pedestrian access coordination; Kensington monitoring proposal (17 Jan 2024).	Christine McMillan (Bonisch); Emma Hill (South Roads); Kyleigh Jeffcoat (ICC); Darryl Kensington	Pedestrian access emails; wall observation email, 17 Jan 2024
February 2024	Ryal Bush demolition quote received.	Ryal Bush Contracting	AEE Applicant Actions chronology
8 March 2024	Formally engages Bonisch Consultants.	Christine McMillan (Bonisch)	Brief of Evidence of Linda Lee
May–June 2024	NZ Heritage Properties engaged; site visit 12 June 2024; Susan Irvine suggests a second engineer.	Susan Irvine (NZ Heritage Properties)	Emails re Briscoes visit, June 2024
11 July 2024	ICC letter re walkway condition; Linda organises urgent repairs and 500kg aluminium ramps.	Invercargill City Council	Brief of Evidence of Linda Lee
29 July 2024	ICC re container access / ramp damage.	Lyndon Paul (ICC)	Email 'Briscoes Building', 29 July 2024
August 2024	NHPIF application (~\$20,700); engages Lewis Bradford; HIA provided.	Robert Lane (Lewis Bradford); Susan Irvine (NZHP)	NHPIF Application; HIA, Aug 2024
September 2024	On-site meeting; Southland Heritage & Preservation Fund considered, not applied for.	Lewis Bradford; Bonisch; Rhodes + Associates; ICC	AEE Applicant Actions chronology
November 2024	Updates ICC on report progress.	Jonathan Shaw (ICC)	Emails 'Checking on

Date	Action / event	Who Linda dealt with / spoke to	Source
			progress', Nov 2024
6 December 2024	Rhodes + Associates Options Report (Options 1–5).	Phil Griffiths (Rhodes + Associates)	Rhodes Options Report, 6 Dec 2024
13 January 2025	Lewis Bradford Structural Review Memorandum (five options).	Robert Lane (Lewis Bradford)	Lewis Bradford Memorandum, 13 Jan 2025
April 2025	BI Architects concept design.	Brad Inwood (BI Architects)	BI Architects Design Statement, Apr 2025
May 2025	Ryal Bush draft Demolition Management Plan.	Ryal Bush Contracting	Draft DMP, May 2025
25 July 2025	AEE / consent application lodged (RMA/2025/115).	Christine McMillan (Bonisch)	AEE, 25 July 2025
September 2025 / June 2026	Origin Heritage peer reviews; HNZPT submissions (8 Oct 2025; 3 June 2026).	Andrew Barsby (Origin Heritage); HNZPT	Origin Heritage reviews; HNZPT submissions
23 July 2026	Section 42A report recommends decline.	Joanne Skuse	s42A Report, 23 July 2026
29 July 2026	Suspension of processing requested.	Christine McMillan (Bonisch) to ICC	Email, 29 July 2026
31 July 2026	Commissioner's Direction 1; hearing date vacated.	Paula Costello (Independent Hearing Commissioner)	Direction 1, 31 July 2026
5 & 25 August 2026	QS and engineer evidence prepared/updated; hearing anticipated late Sept/early Oct 2026.	Phil Griffiths (Rhodes); Robert Lane (Lewis Bradford)	Griffiths letter 24 Aug 2026; Lane draft, 25 Aug 2026