

**Respondent No:** 4**Login:** Anonymous**Email:** n/a**Responded At:** Jan 21, 2026 14:54:41 pm**Last Seen:** Jan 21, 2026 14:54:41 pm**IP Address:** n/a

Q1. Full Name	Janet
---------------	-------

Q2. Organisation	not answered
------------------	--------------

Q3. Contact Person (if different from above)	not answered
--	--------------

Q4. Email Address	thefrediz@xtra.co.nz
-------------------	----------------------

Q5. Postal Address	N/A
--------------------	-----

Q6. Telephone Number	027
----------------------	-----

Q7. Could you gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission?	No
---	----

Q8. If you have selected Yes, please answer the question below: Are you directly affected by an effect of the subject matter that,a) adversely affect the environment; andb) does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.	not answered
--	--------------

Q9. The specific provisions of the proposal that my submission relates to are as follows:

The submitter does not support the proposed provisions of Plan Change 2. The submitter considers that the specific provisions of the proposal are inappropriate for Invercargill's local context and may result in unintended adverse effects. The submitter is concerned that the proposed approach does not adequately reflect local character, infrastructure capacity, development feasibility, or community outcomes, and that the provisions may impose unnecessary costs and constraints. Accordingly, the submitter opposes the specific provisions of the proposal, except where amendments are made as outlined in this submission.

Q10.I support/oppose these provisions:(include whether you support or oppose in full or in part)

I oppose these provisions in full.

Q11.The reason(s) for my submission are:(state in summary your reasons, and whether you seek any amendments)

The reasons for my submission are as follows: The proposed provisions are not appropriately tailored to Invercargill's local context, including existing neighbourhood character, infrastructure capacity, and growth patterns. The Housing provisions and Code of Practice, as drafted, may impose unnecessary and disproportionate development requirements that increase costs without delivering clear environmental or community benefits. There is insufficient flexibility within the provisions to allow for practical, site-specific solutions that can manage effects while still enabling appropriate development. The proposed approach risks unintended consequences for housing affordability and development viability within Invercargill. The provisions may create uncertainty by operating the Code of Practice as an additional regulatory layer rather than as enabling guidance. The submitter seeks that Plan Change 2 be declined, or alternatively amended to: Better reflect Invercargill's local character and infrastructure constraints Provide greater flexibility and clarity in the application of standards and the Code of Practice Remove or revise provisions that add cost without demonstrable benefit

Q12. I seek the following decision from the Invercargill City Council: (give precise details)

The submitter seeks that the Invercargill City Council decline Plan Change 2 in its entirety. Alternatively, if the Council is not prepared to decline the plan change, the submitter seeks that the Council amend Plan Change 2 to: Better reflect Invercargill's local character and infrastructure constraints Provide flexibility and clarity in the application of standards and the Code of Practice Remove or revise provisions that add cost without demonstrable benefit

Q13. I wish to be heard in support of my submission No

Q14. If others make a similar submission, I would be prepared to consider presenting a joint case with them at any hearing. No
