

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 /
Rārangi Kōrero.

BY **104 Dee Street Partnership**
Applicant

SUPPLEMENTARY EVIDENCE OF: LINDA LEE

15 October 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

Introduction

1. My full name is Linda Anne Lee.
2. I am a co-owner representing the 104 Dee Street Partnership.
3. My background is set out in my evidence dated 31 August 2026 (executed today, 14 October).
4. Firstly, this situation has been personally and financially devastating for us. Every single month this site sits empty, we have absolutely zero income coming in from it, but the costs do not stop. We still have a mortgage to pay, council rates, ongoing business overheads, and unforeseen bills. We have personally spent a significant amount of our own money—well over \$120,000 in holding costs, alongside \$229,000 from our insurers. We have spent three long years since the 2023 fire pouring money into compliance requirements and expert reports and trying to find a way forward. Even Heritage New Zealand formally acknowledges the extensive range of options we have exhausted.
5. Secondly, this is a severe and escalating safety issue. The 2023 fire gutted the internal structures. Our engineers advise that the walls are standing entirely unbraced. I want to directly address Mr Barsby's (from Origin Heritage) evidence on this point. In paragraph 16 of his report, he suggests that I should simply "temporarily prop" the facades just to get the Dangerous and Insanitary Building Notice lifted. This building was declared Dangerous and Insanitary back in November 2023—nearly three years ago. Leaving a failing structure propped up over a major public street indefinitely is a massive safety hazard. A temporary prop does not fix a structurally compromised building; it just hides the problem and kicks the can down the road at massive ongoing expense.
6. Furthermore, that proposal completely ignores the active public safety crisis happening at this site right now. The building has been illegally broken into more than five times in the last year alone. Most recently, a group of youths were apprehended by the police inside the building and are now going before the Youth Court. To gain entry, they didn't just walk in—they actively ripped off the corrugated iron and the thick plywood hoarding that we constructed specifically to keep people safe and out. Every time this happens, my handyman has to go back in to repair the breaches.
7. I have people regularly checking the site, but we are reaching a dangerous tipping point. This building is structurally compromised. It is incredibly dangerous for trespassers to enter, it is dangerous for my workers who have

to constantly re-board it, and it poses a terrifying risk to emergency services or police if a tragedy occurs inside.

Weatherproofing.

8. We couldn't completely weatherproof the building because it was too dangerous and too expensive. We did have the windows boarded and the roofing iron secured, followed by netting. But the fire destroyed the inside roof and floors. This left the brick walls facing Dee Street and Spey Street standing completely on their own. This is backed up by the Kensington Consulting Engineer's report and Lewis Bradford Review, which both state these walls are now unbraced, freestanding structures with no internal support. We couldn't safely install massive structural propping needed to hold them steady.
9. If we put up tarpaulins to keep the rain out without propping they would have acted like giant sails in the wind. This would have then risked the blowing heavy bricks down onto the public street.
10. I personally phoned three or four local builders to see if they could price the work. They mentioned it would be highly expensive, dangerous, and a couple said they also had plenty of other work on and simply didn't need to take on a complicated project like mine.
11. On top of that, because the insurance company had already written the building off as a total financial loss, they refused to give me any money to pay for temporary weatherproofing or stabilisation.

Future

12. Looking to the Future, we know this site is an eyesore to the community and a barrier for our neighbouring businesses right now. We want to fix this. While our ultimate goal is to sell the site to a developer who can revitalize it, we accept that the site must be left safe, level and clear following demolition, and we support appropriate conditions to ensure this happens.
13. This has been a personally devastating experience, but full demolition is the only safe and economically viable path forward for us and the wider CBD.