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Memo

To: Environment and Community Committee

Subject: Tripartite Economic Alliance

From: Global Partnerships and Strategy (GPS)

Action: For information only

19 November 2018

Purpose

In July 2018, we undertook to update the Committee further on outcomes and survey results associated with the Tripartite Economic Alliance activity in Guangzhou (November 2017) and Los Angeles (May 2018). This memo provides that update and proposed plans for the Auckland Tripartite activity in 2019.

Update: 2017 Tripartite Summit, Guangzhou

As reported earlier, of those surveyed, on average six business leads per delegate were made and these businesses are expecting an average of NZ$4.37 million business growth and the addition of five staff for China during the next three years. We note that these are optimistic forecasts from the delegates surveyed and it is too early to specifically quantify the long term economic benefits. However, their forecasts demonstrate the value and expectations placed on the Tripartite by participants.

Approximately 100 delegates from 70 businesses made up Auckland’s delegation.

The Tripartite Business Programme received a bronze award at the International Economic Development Council’s (IEDC) Awards in Atlanta, USA, in October 2018. This recognised the value of economic intervention developed by ATEED alongside Auckland Council.

The same programme was awarded the Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment’s (MBIE) 2018 Premier Award and Economic Development New Zealand’s Best Practice Integrated Strategic Planning Award.

A follow-up survey in August 2018 indicated that nearly all surveyed companies are eager to partake in further Tripartite activity and acknowledged they have benefited from participating.

2018 Tripartite Business Delegation to Los Angeles

The Deputy Mayor led a targeted 13-member delegation to LA which included representatives from the screen, social enterprise, transport, health and technology sectors. The LA visit was timed to align with the 2018 Select LA Investment Summit. A key outcome was a reported NZ$20m joint-investment deal between New Zealand’s HMI Technologies and the Sino-European Innovation Centre of Heshan Industrial City in Guangdong Province.
Tripartite 2019 – Techweek19

Tripartite-related activity in 2019 will be held in Auckland 19-21 May. In the new model agreed by the three Mayors, Tripartite activity will be aligned to existing trade/innovation events in each city and will no longer have standalone summits.

The 2019 programme will form part of Techweek19 (20-26 May), New Zealand’s largest tech event. The Tripartite will enhance Techweek19 by providing an additional international audience comprising many tech companies and investors thereby boosting its international profile.

Tripartite delegates’ participation in Techweek19 activities provides an opportunity to showcase Auckland’s tech sectors to our key partner cities and their businesses; share Auckland’s technological and innovation ideas with those of Guangzhou and LA; and increase opportunities to build international connections across the three cities. There will also be opportunities during this time for city-to-city dialogue.

During this visit, Council will also take the opportunity to recognise the 30th anniversary of the Auckland - Guangzhou relationship. This is both a practical and unique time to celebrate this partnership.

ATEED plans to visit Los Angeles in March 2019 along with a BNZ delegation, and will use this opportunity to further promote Techweek19 and Auckland’s hosting of Tripartite 2019.

Background

- In October 2014, the Regional Strategy and Policy Committee approved Auckland’s participation and engagement in the Tripartite Economic Alliance (REG/2014/125).

- In July 2017, the Environment and Community Committee approved Auckland’s participation and engagement in the Tripartite for another three years (ENV/2017/94). The Committee also acknowledged that the Tripartite has enhanced Auckland’s political, economic and trade relationship with two of Auckland’s most strategically relevant partner cities (Guangzhou and Los Angeles).

- At the Guangzhou Tripartite Summit in November 2017, a Memorandum of Understanding was signed renewing the Tripartite Economic Alliance for a further three years, acknowledging the importance of city-to-city relationships, understanding commonalities and cooperation. Under the terms of the renewal, annual Tripartite Summits were replaced with Tripartite-related activity aligned to significant international events in each of the three cities.

- In February 2018, the Environment and Community Committee received the report on the Tripartite Economic Alliance Summit 2017 held in Guangzhou (ENV/2018/19). GPS undertook to report back to the Environment and Community Committee by December 2018 on Tripartite initiatives, trade/innovation events aligned to Tripartite-related activities, and any other business outcomes from the 2017 Guangzhou Tripartite Summit.

About Techweek (techweek.co.nz)

- In 2012, technology industry association NZTech began a Tech Innovation Week to coincide with the Hi-Tech Awards in order to build enthusiasm around new technologies being developed in New Zealand. In 2016 they joined ATEED to produce TechweekAKL – a week-long festival of innovation ecosystem events.

- In 2017, TechweekAKL became TechweekNZ: a nationwide initiative with a curated programme focused on ‘finding local answers to global questions’. Techweek’17 included 287 events in 24 locations, and hosted more than 20,000 New Zealanders and visitors over 9 days.

- In 2018, it continued to grow in scale and in participation of new cities and companies, with 94 events in Auckland alone (540 across New Zealand) and over 20,000 attendees.

- Techweek’s official 2019 programme will be released in March next year, ATEED is working closely with the Techweek team to ensure Tripartite activities will enhance Techweek19.

GPS will report back to the Environment and Community Committee by September 2019 on outcomes from Tripartite 2019.

Global Partnerships & Strategy
Auckland Council
November 2019
Memorandum

16 November 2018

To: Chairperson and Members of the Environment and Community Committee

Subject: Information regarding community leases with gambling machines

From: Paul Marriott-Lloyd, Senior Policy Manager, Community and Social Policy

Purpose

1. To respond to questions raised at the Environment and Community Committee meeting on 13 November 2018, regarding community leases with onsite gambling machines.

Key messages

- An evaluation of the Community Occupancy Guidelines (2012) found three community leaseholders, out of a sample of 70 sport and recreation leases, have onsite gambling machines.
- These leases are held by:
  - Mangere Bowling Club Incorporated
  - Onehunga and Districts Bowling Club Incorporated
  - Blockhouse Bay Bowls Incorporated.
- Further investigation found five additional sport and recreation leaseholders and three Royal New Zealand Returned and Services Association (RNSA) leaseholders with gambling machines. These leases were granted by legacy councils and pre-date the guidelines.

Evaluation of the Community Occupancy Guidelines

2. Staff presented the results of an evaluation of the Community Occupancy Guidelines to the Environment and Community Committee on 13 November 2018 [CP2018/21265].

3. During the discussion of this item, Councillor Daniel Newman requested information about community leases with onsite gambling machines.

4. In response, staff note that three leaseholders, of the 70 leases reviewed as part of the evaluation, have gambling machines. They are:
   - Mangere Bowling Club Incorporated
   - Onehunga and Districts Bowling Club Incorporated
   - Blockhouse Bay Bowls Incorporated.

5. All three community organisations also have licences to sell alcohol in the leased area.

6. Appendix A provides more detailed information about these leases.
Other gambling machines

7. Staff have undertaken further research to find out how many other community leaseholders have gambling machines (outside the sample of 70 leases considered as part of the evaluation).

8. By matching the names of organisations with gambling licences on the Department of Internal Affairs website, staff found a further eight leaseholders with gambling licences. They are:
   - Mt Wellington Bowling Club
   - Clarks Beach Golf Club
   - Bridge Park Bowling Club
   - Pakuranga Rugby League Community Sports Club
   - Orewa Surf Lifesaving Club
   - Te Atatu Memorial RSA
   - Waiheke RSA
   - Titirangi RSA.

9. These leases were granted by legacy councils and pre-date the guidelines.

Data limitations

10. The actual number of community leaseholders with gambling licences could differ slightly.

11. Council currently has over 1400 community leases.

12. Council does not currently collect detailed information regarding the type of activities carried out by leaseholders.

Next steps

13. The Environment and Community Committee approved recommendations to:
   - improve and standardising leasing processes and record keeping
   - collect further information from leaseholders on:
     - site utilisation
     - community outcomes
     - benefits for Māori
     - financial information, particularly revenue generated
   - improve annual reporting and monitoring
   - review the council’s approach to commercial activities, particularly regarding compliance with the council’s internal strategies and policies for alcohol sales and gambling.

14. These recommendations will be implemented over the next 18-months.
## Appendix A – Community leases with onsite gambling machines issued under the Community Occupancy Guidelines (2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Blockhouse Bay Bowls Incorporated</th>
<th>Onehunga and Districts Bowling Club Incorporated</th>
<th>Mangere Bowling Club Incorporated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Address</strong></td>
<td>33 Tenny Street, Blockhouse Bay</td>
<td>59 Princes Street, Onehunga</td>
<td>372R Massey Road, Māngere East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local board area</strong></td>
<td>Whau</td>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tāmaki</td>
<td>Māngere-Ōtāhuhu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land size</strong></td>
<td>10,250 m²</td>
<td>2278 m²</td>
<td>c. 660 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Term</strong></td>
<td>10 years, with one right of renewal of 10 years</td>
<td>10 years, with one right of renewal of 10 years</td>
<td>10 years, with one right of renewal of 10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Start date</strong></td>
<td>1/09/2012</td>
<td>1/07/2013</td>
<td>1/08/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Building ownership</strong></td>
<td>The club</td>
<td>Auckland Council</td>
<td>The club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sport</strong></td>
<td>Bowling</td>
<td>Bowling</td>
<td>Bowling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rent</strong></td>
<td>$1 plus GST per annum (if requested)</td>
<td>$1 plus GST per annum (if requested)</td>
<td>$1 plus GST per annum (if requested)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Membership</strong></td>
<td>234 members</td>
<td>129 members</td>
<td>73 members</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From: Mara Bebich On Behalf Of kauri  
Sent: Thursday, 22 November 2018 10:05 AM  
To: Environment and Community Committee; Waitakere Ranges Local Board  

Subject: Update on Waitakere Ranges and Kauri Dieback

Dear Environment and Community Committee Members and Waitakere Ranges Local Board Members,

This is a short update on the Waitakere Ranges Regional Park track closures and kauri dieback for your information.

Since the closures in May 2018 Auckland Council has been working closely with the Department of Conservation and Te Kawerau ā Maki to confirm the approach needed to bring tracks in the Waitakere Ranges to a standard where they meet national best practice for kauri and support broader forest health.

In recent months our staff have been working on the Kitekite tracks in Piha which are hugely popular and need to be able to support high visitor numbers. This work has been mainly focussed on bringing them to all weather dry foot standard. There is still some further work to do including installation of some boardwalks and geotextile matting on the track sections that are near kauri.

Last week, following a blessing from Te Kawerau ā Maki, work began on the Kitekite track to bring it to the agreed standard, and provided we aren’t held up by weather delays, should be completed and re-opened prior to Christmas.

Staff and contractors are currently working on several other tracks in the Waitakere Ranges and with additional tracks expected to be opened throughout summer.

We are also currently working on a track re-opening plan for the Waitakere Ranges Regional Park, with Te Kawerau ā Maki, which identifies the tracks that will be the focus for improvement work and re-opening over the next couple of years. We are planning to take this out to park users and local communities in December and will have a range of ways that feedback can be provided through until the end of February 2019.

We’ll be growing our presence over the summer months with an increased team of 20 ambassadors working alongside our compliance officers and boosting our communications to ensure that Aucklanders know what to do when in kauri areas.

We know that there are a number of community queries coming in and we are working to respond to these as best we can as we work through the track re-opening plan with Te Kawerau ā Maki. If you have any community queries please do send them through to kauri@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz

We will continue to keep you updated over the coming weeks.

Nga mihi,

Mara Bebich
Attachment D
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Maea Petherick

From: Mace Ward
Sent: Thursday, 22 November 2018 5:47 PM
To: Waitakere Ranges Local Board; Environment and Community Committee

Subject: RE: Update on Waitakere Ranges and Kauri Dieback

Kia ora e Sandra

The response to re-open Kitekite Track, among others, is consistent with the Council’s public engagement earlier this year and our ongoing engagement with Te Kawerau ā Maki to re-open tracks.

In February 2018 the Environment and Community Committee proposed to ‘close the forested areas of the Waitakere Ranges Regional Park, with exceptions, by 1 May 2018’ subject to working with Te Kawerau ā Maki, consultation with the Waitakere Ranges Local Board and targeted engagement with groups who use and benefit from the regional park.

As this was a significant decision for Aucklanders a public engagement process was undertaken, using a range of channels, and over 800 pieces of feedback on the Waitakere proposal. This was reported on at the Committee on 10 April 2018 – refer link to the Agenda/Report below.

"In summary, respondents expressed despair over the potential impact of the disease on kauri and the ranges. Approximately 24 per cent of submitters felt that the proposal was about right and 25 per cent thought it did not propose enough closures, suggesting that more track closures were needed to either support the principle of the rāhui or do the right thing.

Conversely 43 per cent of respondents felt there are too many track closures proposed and that the impact on the community would be too severe. Many mentioned specific tracks they would like to stay open. Feedback also suggested a lack of understanding about the science and the need to invest more into research and development, public education, cleaning stations and increasing knowledge about the disease.”

Visitor monitoring shows that over 160,000 visitors entered the regional park at Kitekite tracks in 2017/18. The prioritisation of this track is in response to the popularity of the destination, public demand to visit the Waitakere parklands and ensuring that there is a proactive approach taken to managing the risk of disease spread.

An update on the work we have been doing to prioritise track re-opening was recently presented to and discussed with the Waitakere Ranges Local Board.

Finally, in terms of the flood risk – this is something we manage across our natural environments and use the New Zealand standard for assessing and managing water safety and risks of sudden rises in stream levels.

The track re-opening plan is complemented by an awareness programme, including by our Rangers and Kauri Dieback Ambassadors.

Nga mihi nui
Mace

Mace Ward
General Manager
Parks, Sports & Recreation | Community Services
Resolution number ENV/2018/44 (April 2018)
MOVED by Deputy Charperson A Filipaina, seconded by Deputy Mayor BC Cashmore:

That the Environment and Community Committee:

a) approve the track closure proposals in the Hunua Ranges Regional Park to prevent the introduction of Kauri Dieback disease in the park, by 1 May 2018 as detailed in Attachments B and C of the agenda report.

b) approve the proposal to close the forested areas of the Waitakere Ranges Regional Park with exceptions (such as beaches, pastures and a limited number of tracks with track surface conditions to a standard that will support the requirements of the proposed controlled area notice), by 1 May 2018 as detailed in Attachments D and E of the agenda report.

c) subject to b) direct staff to work with Te Kawerau a Maki and jointly agree any further potential openings in the Waitakere Ranges Regional Park (that is tracks marked with an asterisk in Attachment E of the agenda report). Noting that this will occur through planned site visits and will be based on meeting controlled area notice requirements.

d) direct staff to prioritise initial track upgrades and improvements in the Waitakere Ranges Regional Park to re-establish coastal connectivity and multi-day walking opportunities, as suggested during feedback, to mitigate the impact on park users and operators.

e) direct staff to work with mana whenua on kauri dieback management and wider regional parks matters of significance to mana whenua.

f) direct staff to work with relevant local boards on implementation of these recommendations.

g) note that there are significant technical risks relating to the understanding of kauri dieback disease and the impact the proposed closure approaches may have, and request staff to report back on the effectiveness of the closures, controlled area notices and additional measures within one year of commencement.

h) note that expenditure associated with the recommended approach to manage kauri dieback is not budgeted for in 2017/18 and recommend that Finance and Performance Committee approve unbudgeted expenditure up to a maximum of $740,000 in 2017/2018.

i) note that staff required to implement the recommended approach to manage kauri dieback are additional to current approved staff numbers and approve an increase in 2 full time equivalents to deliver on this activity.

j) note the regional update on kauri dieback spread, management approaches, as well as the proposed Long-term Plan environmental protection options provide for this challenge.

k) note that if either of the proposed Long-term Plan environmental protection options are adopted that any additional expenditure to give effect to these closures from 2018/2019 onwards will need to be prioritised. This will need to be prioritised above previously planned activities for kauri dieback work such as: track improvements, upgrades, landowner support, hygiene station upgrades and washdown facilities.

l) note that the status and continuance of the closures, and council’s management strategy, may be considered when the Regional Parks Management Plan 2010 comes up for review in 2020, or when the proposed National Pest Management Plan is developed, without limiting any other review.

CARRIED

Note: Pursuant to Standing Order 1.8.6 the following councillors requested that their dissenting votes be recorded, as follows:

- Cr M Lee against clause c)
Attachment E
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Memorandum

To: Environment and Community Committee

Subject: Statistics New Zealand submission on a definition for housing quality

From: Sophie Heighway, Sustainability Initiatives Group Manager, Environmental Services

21 November 2018

Purpose

1. To note that a submission was provided by Auckland Council staff to Statistics New Zealand on 14 November 2018 regarding a definition and conceptual framework for housing quality.

Summary

- Statistics New Zealand is leading the development of a definition and conceptual framework for housing quality in partnership with the Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment and BRANZ (a consultancy with expertise in building and construction).
- Currently there is no single agreed definition of housing quality nationally or internationally.
- Statistics New Zealand developed a proposed definition that includes a framework to help collate, describe and define all the different aspects of housing quality. They then requested feedback from potential stakeholders and the wider public.
- A submission was provided by staff on behalf of Auckland Council and is shown in Attachment A for the Environment and Community Committee’s information.
- The submission supports the development of a definition and framework for housing quality. It also makes several additional comments about how the framework could be widened to include consideration of the natural environment, sustainability and housing affordability.
- No further action is required by councillors.

Context/Background

2. Housing quality is important for all New Zealanders. Everyone should have access to healthy, safe and secure housing and basic services. Poor housing quality has been linked with poor physical and mental health.

3. Housing should also support cultural and spiritual needs, reduce the limitations of disabilities, enable access to social support networks, and adapt to changing living needs.

4. Currently there is no single agreed definition of housing quality nationally or internationally.

5. Statistics New Zealand is leading the development of a definition and conceptual framework for housing quality in partnership with the Ministry of Business Innovation and Employment and BRANZ (an independent organisation which provides research, testing and consultancy services for the building and construction industry).

6. They developed a proposed definition of housing quality for use in New Zealand’s data system. The proposed definition includes a framework to help collate, describe, and define all the different aspects of housing quality.

7. The framework brings together and defines four interrelated elements of housing quality:
   - housing habitability
   - housing functionality
   - environmental sustainability
   - social and cultural sustainability.
8. Statistics New Zealand sought feedback from potential stakeholders and the wider public so the definition could be refined and developed.

9. Public submissions on the topic were open from 17 October 2018 to 19 November 2018, during which period council staff lodged a submission (see Attachment A).

Discussion

10. Staff considered that the submission did not need to be approved by Environment and Community Committee before it was provided to Statistics New Zealand given its low risk.

11. In general, the submission supported the development of a definition for housing quality. However, the submission did not fully support the proposed definition and suggested some minor changes. These were:

   - The consultation document proposes the following definition of housing quality: “Housing quality refers to the degree that housing provides a healthy, safe, secure, and resilient environment for individuals, families, and whānau to live in and to participate within their kāinga and communities.” The council submitted that this definition be extended to include sustainability and mention the natural environment.

   - The consultation document asks if the four elements in the proposal (as mentioned above) are the right ones. The submission suggested that housing quality should be a pre-requisite to quality, as it includes materials, location and design.

   - The submission suggested that indoor air quality, carbon emissions and housing functionality should be added to the definition and discussed how housing will need have a greater restorative impact on people and the environment.

12. Council welcomes this proposal to set a definition of housing quality and recognises that this will support previous submissions made regarding housing affordability and quality.

Māori Impact Statement

13. The Ministry of Housing and Urban Development consultation document on healthy homes states that Māori are more likely to ‘live in, or feel the effects of, cold and damp rental homes’.

14. As such, the development of a definition and conceptual framework for housing quality is likely to have more positive impacts for Māori than other Aucklanders.

15. The framework is also aligned with the Auckland Plan’s direction to advance ‘Māori wellbeing through improving the specific needs of vulnerable tamariki and whānau, particularly whānau who are experiencing substandard housing…”

Next steps/implementation

16. The submission was submitted via an online submission form to Statistics New Zealand on 14 November 2018, as per Attachment A to this memo.

17. No further steps are required by council. If you have any questions about this memo or the accompanying submission please contact Sophie Heighway on Sophie.heighway@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz

Attachments

a) Submission by Auckland Council to Statistics New Zealand on “Developing a definition for housing quality: Consultation”
Developing a definition and conceptual framework for housing quality: Submission form
Please return your completed submission form by 9am Wednesday 14 November 2018
to: housingqualityframework@stats.govt.nz

Section 1: Your details
Name of person making this submission:
Sophie Heighway

This submission is made:
☐ by an individual
☐ on behalf of an iwi or Māori authority or group
☐ on behalf of a business or organisation
☑ on behalf of a government agency
☐ other

Please specify:
Auckland Council

Your contact details:
Email: sophie.heighway@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz
Daytime phone number: 021530212

Are you happy for us to contact you?
☑ Yes
☐ No
Section 2: Completing the form

We are consulting on a proposed definition and conceptual framework for housing quality.

Please answer the following questions. Question 1 asks for feedback on the proposed definition of housing quality and our proposed framework. Questions 2–5 ask for feedback on the proposed definitions of each of the four framework elements.

The final question is for additional comments or thoughts on this topic.

Question 1: Proposed definition and framework for housing quality

The proposed framework below brings together the elements and definitions identified that relate to housing quality.

**Housing quality definition**

Housing quality refers to the degree that housing provides a healthy, safe, secure, and resilient environment for individuals, families, and whānau to live in and to participate within their kāinga and communities.

**Conceptual framework elements and their definitions**

- **Habitability**: the degree to which housing provides secure shelter that supports an individual’s, family’s and whānau’s physical, health and safety. It covers the primary function of housing as providing shelter, focusing on the condition of the home’s physical structure and the facilities within it.

- **Functionality**: the degree to which the design, construction and location of housing support the specific physical, cultural and social needs of individuals, families and whānau, in their kāinga and communities.

- **Environmental sustainability**: the resource efficiency, durability, and resilience of housing. It refers to the degree to which housing design, construction and materials interact with and impact on the natural environment to support habitability now and in the future.

- **Social & cultural sustainability**: the degree to which housing design is flexible enough to respond to changes in the specific social, cultural and social needs of individuals, families and whānau thereby supporting functionality over time.
1.1 Do you agree with the proposed definition for housing quality outlined above?

☐ Yes
☐ No

If ‘no’ please explain. ____________________________________________________________

The proposed definition for housing quality does not adequately refer to the elements in the environmental sustainability conceptual framework, in particular the impact on the natural environment. A suggested alternative might be: “Housing quality refers to the degree that housing provides a healthy, safe, secure, sustainable and resilient environment for individuals, families, and whānau to live in and to participate within their kāinga, natural environment and communities.”

1.2 Do you agree with the four elements in the housing quality framework – housing habitability, housing functionality, environmental sustainability, and social and cultural sustainability?

☐ Yes
☐ No

If ‘no’ please explain. ____________________________________________________________

Housing affordability should be a prerequisite to housing quality. Building materials, location and design all impact on affordability, which has a significant bearing on equitable access to housing. ____________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________
Question 2: Framework element – housing habitability

2.1 Looking at the proposed definition of housing habitability and its subcomponents in the consultation document, do they adequately cover the meaning of each term?

Housing habitability: The degree to which housing and its location provide a physically safe, physically secure, and physically healthy environment. It relates to the design, construction, materials, and service provision of a house and to how well it has been built and maintained. Habitability covers the primary function of housing as providing shelter, focusing on the condition of the house’s physical structure and the facilities within it.

Housing provides a physically safe environment when it has a sound structure reasonably resilient to natural hazards (such as extreme weather), is free from material hazards or hazards that may cause accidents. This includes adequate smoke alarms and escape routes. The location of the house should be free from avoidable hazards such as frequent flooding.

Housing provides a physically secure environment if it offers reasonable protection from intruders.

Housing provides a physically healthy environment if it has drinkable water, including hot and cold water supplies; facilities for personal hygiene and laundering, food preparation and prevention of contamination, and waste water treatment; a safe source of energy; access to natural and artificial light; protection from noise transmission; protection from cold, dampness and mould, and excess heat (including the provision of weathertight structures, insulation, ventilation, a safe heat source, and drainage).

☐ Yes
☐ No

If ‘no’ please explain. ____________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________

2.2 Are there any other aspects of housing habitability you would include in the definition?

☐ Yes
☐ No

If ‘yes’ please explain. ____________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________

Indoor air quality, as relating to the off-gassing of VOCs, carcinogens and other particulates, of the physical infrastructure should be included within habitability.
Attachment F

Question 3: Framework element – housing functionality

3.1 Looking at the proposed definitions of housing functionality and its subcomponents, do they adequately cover the meaning of each term?

**Housing functionality:** The degree to which the design, construction, and location of housing support the specific physical, cultural, and social needs of individuals, families, and whānau in their kāinga and communities.

**Specific cultural and spiritual participation** refers to the extent to which housing supports cultural and spiritual needs. This can include the design of the house, such as the ability to have flexible spaces to accommodate visitors. It can also include the extent to which the location allows for cultural connection.

**Social participation** refers to the extent to which housing and its location enable access to social support networks.

**Economic participation** is about how the location allows for access to employment.

**Connectivity** is about access to transport, services, and the environment, including green spaces, parks, and beaches. Connection with the environment is important for mental and physical wellbeing. For Māori this can also refer to access to traditional food sources and other aspects of culture that relate to the physical environment.

**Specific physical, sensory, and cognitive needs** concern the extent to which housing design supports individual physical needs.

**Specific emotional and mental health needs** concern the extent to which housing supports and provides for emotional and physical wellbeing. This is closely tied to housing habitability and social and cultural participation, and connectivity.

- Yes
- No

If ‘no’ please explain. __________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________

3.2 Are there any other aspects of housing functionality you would include in the definition?

- Yes
- No

If ‘yes’ please explain. __________________________________________

Housing functionality should include the degree to which design, construction and location support the environmental needs of individual, families and whanau in their kainga, natural environment and communities. ____________
Question 4: Framework element – environmental sustainability

4.1 Looking at the proposed definition of environmental sustainability, does it adequately cover the meaning of the term?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

If ‘no’ please explain.

______________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________

4.2 Are there any other aspects of environmental sustainability you would include in the definition?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

If ‘yes’ please explain.

*Carbon should be added to the definition, for example, "Environmental sustainability focuses on the resource efficiency, durability, carbon emissions and resilience of housing."*
Question 5: Framework element – social and cultural sustainability

5.1 Looking at the proposed definition of social and cultural sustainability, does it adequately cover the meaning of the term?

Social and cultural sustainability: The degree to which housing design is flexible enough to respond to changes in the specific physical, cultural, and social needs of individuals, families, and whānau, thereby supporting functionality across time.

☐ Yes
☐ No

If ‘no’ please explain. 

__________________________________________

__________________________________________

5.2 Are there any other aspects of social and cultural sustainability you would include in the definition?

☐ Yes
☐ No

If ‘yes’ please explain. 

__________________________________________

__________________________________________

__________________________________________
Question 6: Further information you would like to share

Is there any other information that would help us develop the conceptual framework for housing quality?

Given the significant role housing plays now and in the future in relation to impact on the natural environment, housing will need to play a greater restorative role.

The definition of housing should look to include the life cycle analysis of building materials and services, and in particular, consider how housing can fit into a wider conversation about resource management and ecosystem restoration.

Housing in the future will bring together communication, transportation, water, energy generation, community and work. Housing quality definitions should reflect the convergence of these areas and how housing presents opportunities to address a number of current and future challenges.

Thank you for your submission.

Once the submission period has closed on 14 November 2018, we will analyse all the submissions, to help us further develop the conceptual framework for housing quality.