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INCLUSIONARY ZONING PHILOSOPHY

➢ Sharing the value uplift created through the rezoning of land, to facilitate more affordable housing.

➢ Enabled by Council planning processes - PCs, SHAs.

➢ Delivered in land or $, eg 5-10% of titled sections.

➢ Land (or $ value) retained on behalf of community in perpetuity by NFP trust.
Attachment A

**Item 5.1**

**QLCHT SOURCES OF FUNDING**

- $1,650,000 Developers
- $4,790,000 Crown Grants
- $19,632,094 QLDC

**COMPLETED 2013**

**Nerin Square, Lake Hayes Estate**

- 27 homes - mixed tenure
- Land purchased from IZ contributions
- Crown contributed $1m
Item 5.1
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**Completed 2016**

**Shotover Country**

Developer contributed land
44 houses built in 2016 by 3 building firms
75% = 3 bedrooms and 25% = 2 bedrooms
Mixed tenures including 11 rentals

---

**Completed 2019**

**Cherwell Lane**

Developer contributed land
6 homes into Secure Home programme
QLCHT INCLUSIONARY ZONING PIPELINE

- Hikwai, Wanaka = 6
- Onslow Road, LHE = 13
- Bullendale SHA, Arthurs Point = 9
- Hawea SHA = 50
- Jopp St, Arrowtown *(Tewa Banks)* = 70
- Coneburn SHA = 60
- Plus many more through 17 existing IZ Deeds through Wanaka and Queenstown – totalling approx. 300 sections.

ALL LAND RETAINED IN PERPETUITY
Auckland Council and the Right to Home

Community Housing Aotearoa is the peak body for New Zealand’s community housing sector (housing 25,000 people nationally across 13,000 homes).

Our Vision is to make sure every New Zealander is well-housed in a warm, safe, dry and affordable home.

This is a basic human right.

The Shift Aotearoa aims to implement the right to housing in Aotearoa. This is pursued via systems intervention, and as a way to build collaboration around the right to housing in Aotearoa. We promote the role of housing and the right to housing in reducing and mitigating the effects of poverty.

The Shift | Aotearoa

HOUSING | SYSTEM | STRATEGY | RIGHTS
• **Proposed workshop[s]:** that Auckland Council work with the community housing sector and others to ensure adequate opportunities for elected members and staff to explore the human right to adequate housing and build a working knowledge of how the right to housing supports strategic planning and engagement on housing matters.

• **Proposed workshop[s]:** that Auckland Council work with the community housing sector and others to ensure adequate opportunities to build a shared understanding of inclusionary zoning as a strategic intervention, and surface the wider strategic suite of tools.

• **Proposed resolution:** the Planning Committee recognize the trending impact of short-term rental activity on city level rental housing stock globally & the need for action in many cities, & directs council officers to build on existing Auckland research & insights to propose [if a risk is identified & action required] effective risk mitigation.
the Right to Home

Leilani Farha, Special rapporteur on the right to housing: NZ End of Mission Statement, Feb 2020
"Under international human rights law, the right to housing means much more than four walls and a roof. It is the right to live in peace, security and dignity, and to equality and non-discrimination with respect to housing."
the Right to Home

[ ... the Te Tiriti right to kainga ... ]

[ ... the Human Right to Adequate Housing ... ]
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the Right to Home

[ ... the Te Tiriti right to kāinga ... ]

“... ka whakarite ka wakaae ki nga Rangatira ki nga hapu – ki nga tangata katoa o Nu Tirani te tino rangatiratanga o o ratou wenua o ratou kainga...”
the Right to Home

[ ... the Te Tiriti right to kāinga ... ]

The Te Tiriti right to home is different and complimentary to the human right to adequate housing; it recognises and establishes Crown knowledge of Māori ownership in accordance with Māori practice; it codifies Māori ownership of land and home.
the Right to Home

[ ... the Te Tiriti right to kāinga ... ]

Te Tiriti provides a constitutional recognition of the value and function of home, and promotes it as something worth protecting.
[... the Te Tiriti right to kainga ...]

Leilani Farha, Special rapporteur: “This is a dark shadow that hangs over the country - a shadow which I consider mostly shared between Māori and non-Māori which cannot be lifted without a significant shift in relations between the Crown and Māori.”
the Right to Home
[ ... the Human Right to Adequate Housing ... ]

New Zealand [ ... that means us! ... ] is party to agreements including the right to adequate housing; there are seven elements to the right
the Right to Home
[ ... the Human Right to Adequate Housing ... ]

Seven elements to the right to home: security of tenure, affordability, access to services and infrastructure, habitability, accessibility, location and cultural adequacy
the Right to Home
[ ... the Human Right to Adequate Housing ... ]

Current international guidance suggests [A] the development of local domestic guidance on the right to housing; and [B] the development of human rights-based housing strategies in order to secure the right to adequate housing and mitigate increasing risks of financialisation.
the Right to Home

[ ... the Human Right to Adequate Housing ... ]

... financialization

is the code-word for our collective forgetting that family wellbeing @ home

is the most important function of a house.
Globally, local authorities are promoting the right to home by:

- Implementing inclusionary zoning
- Curbing the trend to short term gig economy rental
- Protecting tenants from eviction
- Re-doubling service and facilities access for people who are homeless
Globally, local authorities are promoting the right to home by:

- Implementing inclusionary zoning and other value uplift tools | Auckland Council can implement this tool to build revenue to support affordable housing
- Curbing the trend to short-term gig economy rental | Auckland Council has the opportunity and authority to mitigate any risk to rental supply
- Protecting tenants from eviction | Auckland Council must lead for Auckland in ensuring COVID-19 does not leave a legacy of homelessness
- Re-doubling service and facilities access for people who are homeless | Auckland Council needs to keep pace with changing demand
Auckland Council
[ ... and the right to home...

- build revenue to support affordable housing
- mitigate any risk to rental supply
- ensuring COVID-19 does not leave a legacy of homelessness
- keep pace with changing demand

- project@theshiftaotearoa.org
- @shiftaotearoa, https://theshiftaotearoa.wordpress.com/
Cohousing: what is it?

- Owner developed multi-unit housing with shared spaces and assets
Cohousing : Why?

- Clear demand
- Community Focussed Housing (CFH) development model that prioritises community creation
- Private sector - does not require direct financial support
- Produces high quality sustainable housing stock
- Hyper-local
- Built projects are often design exemplars and add diversity to the urban environment
- Shares characteristics with papakainga
- Ideal for elder housing and inter-generational support
Cohaus: Location
Cohaus : Design

- 2405m² site with one existing house used as a care facility
- Site development capacity = 5 detached houses under UDP
- Cohaus provides 20 dwellings
  - 14 walk-up apartments
  - 5 terrace houses
  - 1 historic villa
- Mix of units - 1 to 5 bedrooms
  Forecast cost range $500 K - $2.1 M
- Shared amenities
  - Landscaped gardens
  - Common house
  - Guest flat
  - Cycle store
  - Car parks
  - Shared cars
  - Common laundry
- Total project cost $20 M
- Completion April 2021
  Overall time frame 5 years

GREY LYNN COHAUS | STUDIO NORD
Cohaus : Construction
Cohaus : Costs : Feasibility vs Current

GREY LYNN COHAUS | STUDIO NORD
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- Legal complexity
  - Where to start
  - What ownership model works in NZ context
  - Acceptability to banks, purchasing residents, IRD, Kiwisaver
  - Ambiguous tax status; no category for not-for-profit multi-unit housing
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Cohaus: Challenges

- Legal complexity
  - Where to start
  - What ownership model works in NZ context
  - Acceptability to banks, purchasing residents, IRD, Kiwisaver
  - Ambiguous tax status; no category for not-for-profit multi-unit housing

- Land availability
  - Difficult to buy suitable urban site on the open market - we tried for 2 years
  - Cohaus succeeded because the 2 lead families were able to resource the initial phase and assume all the risk

- Resource Consent
  - No certainty of outcome in preliminary stage
  - Arbitary notification of application

- Valuation
  - Standard market valuation does not price social capital
  - Low $ value on common property
  - Carparking valued too highly

- Funding
  - The dominant model of retail bank funding is high risk for Community Focussed Housing (CFH)
  - All-or-nothing approval
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  - Panuku lots
  - Long term leasehold
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How Council could help

- Land availability for cohousing
  - Inclusionary Zoning
  - Panuku lots
  - Long term leasehold
  - Low-cost, time limited option to buy Council land

- Be an active partner in multi-unit cohousing projects
  - Apply Council Affordable Housing Programme Action 23 with prioritisation
  - Information resources and free advice for groups interested in starting a cohousing project
  - Multi-unit housing specialists in Consent processing

- Development funding sources outside retail banking sector
  - Housing bonds
  - Loan guarantees
Cohaus : Community

Thanks for your time.

GREY LYNN COHAUS | STUDIO NORD
Affordable housing: Work programme approach

- Cross council team:
  - Community and Social Policy, Development Programme Office, Plans and Places, Regulatory Services, Auckland Plan Strategy and Research, RIMU, Chief Economist's Unit, Panuku, Ngā Mātārae, Māori Housing Unit.
- Used research, modelling, qualitative assessment and targeted engagement.

Key findings

- Strong growth forecast in the 'intermediate housing market': More professionals, families with children, older people and key workers
- People using different strategies: leaving Auckland, government, family support and Community Housing Providers
- Won’t be solved by a potential recession due to COVID-19
- Government policy creates opportunities e.g. complementary
- Council can make a further contribution using its key levers, building on current work.
Forward work programme

Key strengths and weaknesses

Strengths
- Adaptive and leverages existing budgets
- Focus on key levers and priority groups
- Mix of ‘quick wins’ and longer-term improvements
- Better measurement, monitoring, reporting on progress / effectiveness
- Platform for more partnerships with government and sector
- Future focused - including research on new models / policies.
Weaknesses

- No ‘magic bullet’, small incremental improvements – sum of the parts
- Uncertain outcomes for some initiatives – depends on sector uptake, government policy.

Qualitative assessment

Attachment C - Summary

Attachment D – Full

Interventions/Regulatory changes - Existing Business Improvement Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Key drivers</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Performance indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: This table is a summary of the interventions and regulatory changes that have been proposed. The table outlines the key drivers, implementation details, timeline, resources required, and performance indicators for each intervention.

3/09/2020
Planning Changes - Inclusionary zoning (IZ)

- The statutory context has not changed significantly
- The work programme explored both mandatory and voluntary IZ
  - High risk of mandatory IZ not being successful through a plan change
  - Incentives for voluntary IZ are no longer available
- Preference to progress a consistent approach across NZ
- Support for LGNZ remit seeking direct intervention by central government to enable councils to introduce IZ and other tools
- IZ and other tools as part of a comprehensive approach to affordable housing
Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in Part) – Request to make operative Plan Change 34 (Special Character Statement for Special Character Areas Overlay – Howick Business)

3 September 2020, Planning Committee: Item 10 - Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in Part) – Request to make operative Plan Change 34 (Special Character Statement for Special Character Areas Overlay – Howick Business), Presentation
Proposed Changes to the Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in Part) Temporary Activity Standards and the Pukekohe Park Precinct
Events in Public Places Bylaw 2015.

The Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in Part) (AUP) and the Trading and\n
Unitty activities are managed under both the Auckland\n
Temporary activities are managed under both the Auckland\n
Temporary activities are managed under both the Auckland\n
parades, sporting events and timing.

Temporary activities include festivals and events, concerts,
Temporary Activities

The AUP seeks to enable temporary activities so that they can contribute to a vibrant city and enhance the well-being of communities.
Temporary Activities

At the same time, the AUP seeks to mitigate adverse effects on amenity values, communities, the natural environment, historic heritage and sites and places of significance to Mana Whenua.

The proposed plan change does not alter these objectives and policies.
Issues Raised

Four issues have been raised by different council departments and ATEED:

1. Temporary activity standards

1. Temporary activities (including filming) on Sites and Places of Significance to Mana Whenua

3. A gap in the coastal temporary activities and noise from activities that are not defined in the AUP as “noise events”

4. Provision for temporary emergency works over and above that provided for under the emergency works sections of the Resource Management Act
Proposed Changes

Two changes have been identified to the temporary activity standards and one change to the Pukekohe Park precinct:

a) requiring a traffic management plan (as a permitted activity standard) for an event in a rural or Future Urban zone where more than 500 vehicle movements per day on adjacent roads are generated;
Proposed Changes

b) increasing the duration of those temporary activities that are defined as noise events (i.e. they exceed the noise standards for the zone) from six to eight hours;

c) aligning Anzac Day in the Pukekohe Park precinct to the definition under the Anzac Day Act 1966.
d) Two additional minor changes are proposed to address anomalies - a gap in the coastal temporary activities and the temporary activities Activity Table.
No Change
No changes are recommended to:

• Temporary activities (including filming) on Sites and Places of Significance to Mana Whenua; or

• The provision for temporary emergency works over and above that provided for under emergency works sections of the Resource Management Act