










## International Desktop Review for Social Housing

Social housing is housing provided for people who are most in need. Affordable housing is generally defined as housing that is affordable to those at or below a median income (as determined by Government) using a housing affordability index. The focus of this review is to provide case studies of social housing, but as does include affordable housing examples as it intendeds to display a broad variety supply lines. It includes examples of policy and operational frameworks that inform social (and in some cases affordable housing) responses. Initiatives are organised into two tables as follows:

- Table 1 clearly displays data for each country identified in Table 2, including gross domestic product (GDP) and population. Comparison shows the scale and characteristics of the subject country and New Zealand.
- Table 2 contains specific information about ten housing initiatives, including;
  - Whether the initiative is policy based, operational, or both. Policy initiatives describe mechanisms (eg tax incentives) or strategies to deliver social housing. Also included are ‘on-the-ground’ initiatives that have delivered housing stock.
  - Sector groups (ie metropolitan, provincial and rural).
  - Advantages and disadvantages of housing solutions.
  - Implications of local government initiatives, including interface between central and local government.
  - Where the mechanism may fit within the LGNZ's supply tools included in LGNZ's Social Housing Toolkit.

**Table 1: Country characteristics**

Country	2018 GDP (USDm) <i>(OECD.org, 2018a)</i>	Subnational Governance System <i>(Allain-Dupré, 2016)</i>	Total Population, million persons <i>(2014) (OECD.org, 2018b)</i>	Population Distribution, % of national population (in 2014) <i>(OECD.org, 2018c)</i>		
				Urban Regions	Intermediate Regions	Rural Regions
Australia 	\$1,351,727.0m	Federation: two levels	23.5m	70.0%	10.1%	19.9%
Canada 	\$1,776,117.8m	Federation: two levels	35.5m	56.4%	16.0%	27.6%
Finland 	\$268,375.0m	Unitary: one level	5.5m	28.9%	12.0%	59.1%
Ireland 	\$408,031.7m	Unitary: one level	4.6m	27.5%	0.0%	72.5%
Netherlands 	\$978,239.8m	Unitary: two levels	16.8m	85.1%	14.9%	0.0%
New Zealand 	\$203,737.7m	Unitary: two levels	4.5m	44.6%	55.4%	0.0%
Spain 	\$1,865,002.0m	Federation: three levels	46m	48.7%	38.0%	13.3%
Sweden 	\$536,910.0m	Unitary: two levels	9.65m	22.3%	30.0%	47.8%
United Kingdom 	\$3,074,431.9m	Unitary: three levels <sup>1</sup>	63.7m	70.1%	27.9%	2.0%

<sup>1</sup> There is an intermediary level only in part of England.






Table 2: International local government responses to stimulate social housing supply







Key:

 Policy    
  Operational    
  Both policy and operational







 S1. Social Housing Strategy    
  S2. Partnerships    
  S3. Advocacy    
  S4. Land disposal    
  S5. Regulatory settings





 S6. Rebates & remissions    
  S7. Grants    
  S8. Council-owned housing    
  S9. Council-owned/ 3rd party managed    
  S10. Asset transfer






Ref	Initiative profile	Initiative detail	Initiative in practice	Advantages/disadvantages	Implications for NZ local government	Relevant LGNZ Supply Tool/s
1	<p><b>Initiative Name:</b> <a href="#">Y Foundation and Housing First</a> (2014)</p> <p><b>Location:</b> Various towns and cities, Finland</p> <p><b>Comparative LGNZ Sector:</b> Metropolitan and Provincial</p> <p><b>Type of initiative:</b></p> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Y Foundation is a social enterprise (est. 1985) specialising in housing homeless people. It was an early adopter of Finland’s national Housing First policy that gives homeless people permanent housing and needs-based support as soon as they become homeless (Foster, 2017) rather than progressing them through the housing continuum (Kaakinen, 2016).</li> <li>The underpinning philosophy of Housing First is that it is always more cost effective to try to end homelessness than to manage it (Kaakinen, 2016).</li> <li>An important part of the programme has been the conversion of temporary solutions, like hostels, into permanent homes. The last big hostel for homeless people in Helsinki with 250 bed places run by the Salvation Army was renovated and now consists of 80 independent apartments with on-site staff (Kaakinen, 2016).</li> <li>Finland is the only EU country where the number of homeless people has declined in recent years (Foster, 2017).</li> <li>The Y Foundation builds, renovates and leases buildings in 52 Finnish towns and cities using the Housing First model through partnerships with municipalities and non-governmental organisations (World Habitat, 2017c).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most of the Y Foundation’s 6,675 apartments are in central city locations (Y-Foundation, 2019), enabling residents to be close to employment opportunities, amenities and support services (World Habitat, 2017c).</li> <li>Only some of the Y Foundation dwellings are rented directly to tenants. Most are rented to its partners, organisations and municipalities, who then sublet to those most in need of housing (Y-Foundation, 2019).</li> <li>The Y-Foundation has stuck to core business as a housing association that specialises in housing homeless people and vulnerable groups during a time where, in Europe, many housing associations have diversified into offering housing to wider groups of people (World Habitat, 2017c).</li> <li>Y Foundation’s income is from rents and grants, which is used to cover the organisation’s running costs, loan repayments and housing maintenance. Bank and other loans enable new housing to be built or purchased.</li> <li>The business model generates significant surpluses, which are reinvested into new homes to enable the foundation to continue to grow (World Habitat, 2017c).</li> </ul>	<p><b>Advantages:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>By addressing homelessness, the need for social housing could be eliminated.</li> <li>Expensive, but the evidence indicates that it is more cost-effective to aim to end homelessness instead of simply trying to manage it (Kaakinen, 2016).</li> <li>Partnership approach effective where local authority resources to tackle housing supply are reduced or scarce, and where there is increasing demand on housing stock.</li> <li>Disrupts the housing continuum model - national policy direction has changed the attitude of Finnish society towards housing provision for homeless people and vulnerable groups, with a number of private housing companies involved in construction now trying to replicate Y-Foundation’s business model (World Habitat, 2017c).</li> </ul> <p><b>Disadvantages:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Initially expensive, but potentially more cost effective in the long-term.</li> <li>Inconsistent with NZ’s current housing continuum model. Would require structural change at central and local government level, and within the broader social housing sector.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Housing First is a policy formulated at the national level in Finland and delivered at the local level by local councils (municipalities) and NGOs.</li> <li>Example of a strong national policy setting delivered at the local level by local partnerships.</li> <li>Demonstrates disruption of the <a href="#">current housing continuum</a> by providing permanent housing as a first response to homelessness, in theory eliminating the need for social housing.</li> <li>Illustrates a model where 3<sup>rd</sup> party provides the housing stock and local authority functions as landlord.</li> <li>Aligns with the Government’s commitment to ending homelessness and strategic partnering approach (Ministry of Social Development, 2018).</li> <li>This initiative could be undertaken in metropolitan, provincial and/or rural areas in New Zealand. It is scalable to the level of social housing demand experienced in a particular area and does not appear to be dependent on population density.</li> </ul>	 S2. Partnerships   S3. Advocacy
2	<p><b>Initiative Name:</b> <a href="#">New Community of Vallastaden</a> (2017)</p> <p><b>Location:</b> <a href="#">Vallastaden</a>, Sweden</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The City Municipality set up a company to plan and build Vallastaden, a large-scale mixed use development.</li> <li>Utilised a co-creation approach involving 40 partners, including 5 municipal companies.</li> <li>Used council-owned land.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vallastaden contains more than 1,024 homes in eight blocks with a variety of ownership types. It has a total area of 20 acres; 8 acres of which are developed (Vallastaden2017.se, 2019).</li> <li>The development also includes 2,200m<sup>2</sup> office space, a preschool, care home,</li> </ul>	<p><b>Advantages:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Example of how a high volume of housing can be developed at pace; the development company was formed in 2011 and development commenced in 2013, with the first dwellings occupied in 2015.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Initiative driven by local municipality; no direct interface between local and central government.</li> <li>Opportunity to identify barriers to initiating a scheme of this scale in New Zealand, and ways to overcome them.</li> </ul>	 S2. Partnerships   S4. Land disposal

Ref	Initiative profile	Initiative detail	Initiative in practice	Advantages/disadvantages	Implications for NZ local government	Relevant LGNZ Supply Tool/s
	<p><b>Comparative LGNZ Sector:</b> Metropolitan</p> <p><b>Type of initiative:</b></p> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Embodied a flexible planning approach.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>seven community spaces, a multi-use building with 315 parking spaces, and a school (<a href="#">Vallastaden2017.se, 2019</a>).</li> <li>44% of the dwellings are rental apartments; and 200 units are for students.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Example of council-led co-creation involving a high number of partners working successfully.</li> <li>Clear masterplan and overall vision allowed for planning flexibility and diversity in terms of building design and appearance.</li> <li>High profile development that encouraged innovation and big-picture thinking; was able to attract international building, architectural and engineering expertise from across Europe.</li> </ul> <p><b>Disadvantages:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No social housing provision (except for students) but acknowledged by municipal architect as something that should be considered for future developments of this scale and nature (<a href="#">Vallastaden2017.se, 2019</a>).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Government’s strategic partnering model could potentially be adapted to incorporate social housing into developments. The Government’s principal funding mechanism is IRRS, from which local government is currently excluded. Upfront funding paid during or immediately after completion of a new build is also available, but only in very limited circumstances (<a href="#">Ministry of Social Development, 2018</a>).</li> <li>Opportunities for local government to consider how planning frameworks can be adapted or utilised to allow for flexibility and facilitate innovation, competitiveness and the timely delivery of developments of this nature.</li> </ul>	 <p>S5. Regulatory settings</p>
3	<p><b>Initiative Name:</b> Public Private Partnership (2019)</p> <p><b>Location:</b> Dublin, Ireland</p> <p><b>Comparative LGNZ Sector:</b> Metropolitan</p> <p><b>Type of initiative:</b></p> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ireland’s Social Housing Strategy 2020, released in 2014, proposed PPPs as an off-balance sheet mechanism to provide housing for local authority tenants (<a href="#">Kelly, 2018</a>).</li> <li>The overall programme seeks to invest €300 million in social housing and comprises 1,500 housing units, provision of services to the project for 25 years including maintenance and upkeep, and return of the asset after that period in prime condition (<a href="#">Ministry for the Environment, Community and Local Government, 2014</a>)</li> <li>The model is an ‘availability-based’ PPP model, typically used to build roads and schools, which is where the sites stay in State ownership and the developer is given the license to build and payments from the State for a 25-year period. After this period the housing units are returned to the State (<a href="#">Kelly, 2018</a>).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Investment company Comhar Housing will build and operate the 534 homes in Dublin, Louth, Wicklow and Kildare in the initial phase of this PPP following agreement for €120 million of new investment (<a href="#">European Investment Bank, 2019</a>).</li> <li>The first half of funding has been supplied by the European Investment Bank, the Bank of Ireland, Macquarie Capital and Korea Development Bank (<a href="#">European Investment Bank, 2019</a>).</li> <li>The State will pay €301 million for the construction and management of the properties (<a href="#">Byrne, 2019</a>), which equates to the State paying €1m a month for 25 years to the developer, Comhar Housing, an average monthly payment of €1,900 per unit. At the end of the 25 year contract the homes are handed over to the relevant local authority (<a href="#">Byrne, 2019</a>).</li> <li>Tenants will be allocated from local authority housing lists (<a href="#">Byrne, 2019</a>).</li> <li>Construction company, Sisk will build the first tranche of the PPP bundle while non-profit organisation Choice Housing will provide facilities management services, and its Oaklee Housing</li> </ul>	<p><b>Advantages:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PPP model can deliver specific, targeted development. In this example, the project will deliver only social housing, providing a clear contribution to the Irish Government’s target to deliver an additional 50,000 social housing units in the period to 2021 (<a href="#">Rebuilding Ireland, n.d.</a>).</li> <li>PPPs can be an advantage in terms of cost certainty and keeping money off the Government balance sheet.</li> <li>Can deliver development at scale and quickly.</li> <li>Provides a degree of certainty for all involved in terms of costs, expectations, delivery outcomes.</li> <li>Allows land and assets to remain in public ownership.</li> </ul> <p><b>Disadvantages:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Of the eight current PPP projects in NZ, none have been for housing (<a href="#">Treasury.govt.nz, 2018</a>). This indicates a potential lack of capacity to implement this type of scheme in NZ.</li> <li>Irish politicians argued that the PPP model was 6 times more expensive than a not-for-profit structure such as an Approved Housing Body (AHB), which is Ireland’s</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In this example, the PPP model is endorsed within a national social housing strategy with local authorities as partner in delivery. This is not the case in NZ currently.</li> <li>Some larger councils have experience with PPP projects for infrastructure. However, opportunity exists to explore potential lack of capacity currently within local government sector to develop and design social housing PPP and ways to overcome them.</li> <li>LGNZ has expressed support for public-private partnerships as a financing option in respect of three waters infrastructure but acknowledged that such tools require careful outcomes and service level design (<a href="#">Alexander, 2018</a>). Opportunity for LGNZ to consider its role in building capacity to consider the PPP tool in social housing context.</li> <li>In this model, tenants are allocated from local authority housing lists. NZ local authorities generally do not have comprehensive waiting lists for social housing, as people in housing</li> </ul>	 <p>S1. Social Housing Strategy</p>  <p>S2. Partnerships</p>  <p>S9. Council-owned/3rd party managed</p>













Ref	Initiative profile	Initiative detail	Initiative in practice	Advantages/disadvantages	Implications for NZ local government	Relevant LGNZ Supply Tool/s
			subsidiary will act as tenancy management provider ( <a href="#">Byrne, 2019</a> ).	<p>traditional social housing model (<a href="#">Byrne, 2019</a>). However, spokespersons for the project advised that the PPP figure accommodates costs that would not feature in an AHB operational cost, such as capital costs of build, capital financing costs, projected inflation and ancillary works such as community facilities over the 25-year period (<a href="#">Byrne, 2019</a>).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Low trust in the model; elsewhere PPPs have a bad reputation for high costs, poor produce and insolvency (<a href="#">Byrne, 2019</a>).</li> <li>• Considered a poor method by some for delivering the most houses with the money available (<a href="#">Byrne, 2019</a>).</li> </ul>	<p>need may not always present to council for housing solutions. If such a model were considered, NZ local authorities would need to improve waiting list data collection and administration. (Refer to LGNZ Social Housing Toolkit <a href="#">Demand tool 1: Waiting Lists</a>).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This initiative may be more appropriate for metropolitan areas, as opposed to provincial or rural areas in New Zealand. This is because a critical mass (minimum number) of houses would be required to achieve efficiencies of scale for construction work.</li> </ul>	
4	<p><b>Initiative Name:</b> <a href="#">Empty Homes Tax</a> (2018)</p> <p><b>Location:</b> Vancouver, Canada</p> <p><b>Comparative LGNZ Sector:</b> Metropolitan</p> <p><b>Type of initiative:</b></p> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vancouver has one of the lowest rental vacancy rates and the highest rental costs in Canada (<a href="#">Vancouver.ca, 2019</a>).</li> <li>• Tax designed to motivate homeowners to return empty or under-utilised properties to use as long-term rental homes for people who live and work in Vancouver, to help relieve pressure on the rental housing market (<a href="#">Vancouver.ca, 2019</a>).</li> <li>• Properties deemed empty will be subject to a tax of 1% of the property's 2018 assessed taxable value (<a href="#">Vancouver.ca, 2019</a>).</li> <li>• Most homes will not be subject to the tax, as it does not apply to principal residences or homes rented for at least six months of the year; however, all homeowners are required to submit a declaration (<a href="#">Vancouver.ca, 2019</a>).</li> <li>• Net revenues from the Empty Homes Tax are reinvested into affordable housing initiatives (<a href="#">Vancouver.ca, 2019</a>).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The city predicted it would generate \$30 million in 2018 but revised that figure to \$38 million.</li> <li>• Part of the funds are used for implementation and operating costs (\$10 million), while the rest are dedicated to affordable housing initiatives, \$8 million of which has already been allocated (<a href="#">Vancouver Courier, 2019</a>).</li> <li>• Revenue will be used to provide land and resources for affordable non-profit and co-op housing; investment in co-op housing grants to update and improve existing co-ops and build new co-ops; contribute to the purchase of buildings and/or to provide assistance toward improved living conditions in private housing; support vulnerable renters facing eviction; and matching empty/underutilised homes and rooms with renters looking for housing (<a href="#">Vancouver Courier, 2019</a>).</li> </ul>	<p><b>Advantages:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Effective as a source of revenue.</li> <li>• Revenue can be invested in a broad range of social and affordable housing solutions.</li> </ul> <p><b>Disadvantages:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Did not necessarily motivate landlords with empty homes to rent them out. This is evidenced by the higher than expected revenue collected (landlords paid the empty homes tax rather than renting out empty homes).</li> <li>• In the NZ context, would require central government support.</li> <li>• Unlikely to be the dominant driver in housing markets in NZ.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No direct interface between local and central government.</li> <li>• Central government appetite for such a tax is currently lacking. Housing Minister Twyford recently ruled out an empty homes tax to tackle homelessness in Auckland (<a href="#">Stuff, 2018</a>).</li> <li>• Local government could continue to consider the role of taxes to achieve social housing outcomes, such as targeted rates.</li> <li>• This initiative may be more appropriate for metropolitan areas, as opposed to provincial or rural areas. This is because in rural areas in New Zealand, empty homes may be appropriate on farms (i.e. to accommodate future farm workers) or due to the inaccessibility of some rural and provincial areas (would require car ownership).</li> </ul>	<p> S2. Partnerships</p> <p> S8. Council-owned housing</p> <p> S9. Council-owned/3rd party managed</p>
5	<p><b>Initiative Name:</b> <a href="#">De Dichterlijke Vrijheid</a> (DDV) (2008)</p> <p><b>Location:</b> Rotterdam, Netherlands</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This initiative relates to the dilapidated Wallisblok building in Rotterdam.</li> <li>• Wallisblok originally contained 96 individually owned apartments, which were purchased by the City incrementally over time as they fell into disrepair (<a href="#">World Habitat, 2017</a>).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The total cost to the City was €4,700,000 (US\$6,904,000), of which 79% was for the acquisition of the building and the remainder of the cost was for the repairs to the existing foundations and relocation expenses for tenants who were provided with alternative accommodation (<a href="#">World Habitat, 2017</a>).</li> </ul>	<p><b>Advantages:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provided an alternative mechanism for achieving housing ownership; through 'working in kind' (undertaking renovations) as opposed to monetary payment.</li> <li>• Successfully encouraged strong social cohesion and diversity amongst residents involved.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opportunity for LGNZ and local authorities to explore how Collective Private Commissions might be adapted within the NZ social housing landscape, e.g. as CHP acting as recipient/renovator of dwellings.</li> </ul>	<p> S7. Grants</p> <p></p>

Ref	Initiative profile	Initiative detail	Initiative in practice	Advantages/disadvantages	Implications for NZ local government	Relevant LGNZ Supply Tool/s
	<p><b>Comparative LGNZ Sector:</b> Metropolitan</p> <p><b>Type of initiative:</b></p> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Prior to the City purchasing all of the apartments, owner-occupiers were given the option of becoming part of the DDV project, and six chose to do so (<a href="#">World Habitat, 2017</a>).</li> <li>Given its heritage value, renovation of Wallisblok was preferred to demolition. However, renovation was too expensive for the City to undertake by itself. (<a href="#">World Habitat, 2017</a>).</li> <li>In order to renovate Wallisblok, the City therefore gave away the apartments for free on the condition that the new owners met the cost of renovation. These new owners had to agree to undertake the renovations together, renovations had to be of a high quality, and were required to live in the area for two years. Young professionals who could not afford to buy a house were given priority (<a href="#">World Habitat, 2017</a>).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The cost of renovation, €5,000,000 (US\$7,320,000), was shared amongst the 40 apartment owners who participated, thereby making it affordable at an average cost of €125,000 (US\$183,000) (<a href="#">World Habitat, 2017</a>).</li> <li>Costs were allocated under a legal mechanism known as a Collective Private Assignment (also known as Collective Private Commission) (<a href="#">Explore Lab, 2015</a>). This is a comparatively new legal mechanism in the Netherlands, facilitating collective renovation (<a href="#">World Habitat, 2017</a>).</li> <li>City authorities also provided assistance in the form of grants to achieve high insulation standards (<a href="#">World Habitat, 2017</a>).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Resulted in engaged and committed residents.</li> <li>Can stimulate broad-ranging renovation and economic activity in an area.</li> <li>Can be applied to renovation and new build projects.</li> </ul> <p><b>Disadvantages:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No available examples of Collective Private Commissions being used as a social housing supply tool in Europe; more used to address supply of affordable housing.</li> <li>Ensuring a range of housing provision is important to maintain diversity of tenure and community, and stall or prevent rapid gentrification of an area.</li> <li>Relies on Council having an asset to dispose of.</li> <li>Requires understanding of long-term cost/benefit of asset disposal.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Example of radical divestment of council-owned housing assets (see also <a href="#">Granby Four Streets</a>).</li> <li>Interesting example of how community involvement can be activated to complete an ambitious housing project.</li> <li>Local response; no direct interface between central and local government.</li> <li>This initiative may be more appropriate for metropolitan areas, as opposed to provincial or rural areas. This is because renovation costs in provincial and rural areas can be higher than in metropolitan areas, due to the lack of proximity to supplies and tradespeople.</li> </ul>	S10. Asset transfer
6	<p><b>Initiative Name:</b> <a href="#">Municipal Project for Intergenerational Housing and Community Services</a> (2012)</p> <p><b>Location:</b> Alicante, Spain</p> <p><b>Comparative LGNZ Sector:</b> Metropolitan</p> <p><b>Type of initiative:</b></p> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PMV, the Municipal Housing Board of Alicante, has responsibility for addressing housing problems in the district, including the provision of rental housing for marginalised groups (<a href="#">World Habitat, 2017b</a>).</li> <li>PMV became aware that residents in a housing complex for older people felt vulnerable and unable to integrate into society, even though their housing was of a high quality (<a href="#">World Habitat, 2017b</a>).</li> <li>In response, when vacancies in the housing complex arose, they were filled with young people (&lt;35yrs) needing housing (<a href="#">World Habitat, 2017b</a>).</li> <li>The positive impacts of the trial included increased well-being for all residents, the development of meaningful intergenerational relationships, the creation of safe and renewed communities (<a href="#">World Habitat, 2017b</a>).</li> <li>The trial led to the development of a more ambitious city-wide intergenerational housing project, with a total investment of €50 million (<a href="#">World Habitat, 2017b</a>).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Key objectives of the project were to provide affordable housing for older persons and low-income young people (<a href="#">World Habitat, 2017b</a>).</li> <li>This initiative also sought to revitalise the surrounding urban area and provide a range of services to the community (<a href="#">World Habitat, 2017b</a>).</li> <li>Included provision of 244 affordable, intergenerational housing units on three sites in the central urban area owned by the municipality and reserved for public use. The units are rented as social dwellings (<a href="#">World Habitat, 2017b</a>).</li> <li>Funding for the project was obtained from the Ministry of Housing (in the form of subsidised public rental housing), the local council, public grants, and mortgage loans.</li> <li>Land for the development was donated by the municipality (<a href="#">World Habitat, 2017b</a>).</li> </ul>	<p><b>Advantages:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Generated additional social housing supply.</li> <li>Positive social impact, with post occupancy surveys showing a high level of satisfaction amongst older residents, and a reduction in feelings of isolation and loneliness.</li> <li>The project was financially sustainable, with income received from rents sufficient to cover the mortgage loan repayments, including interest, and have generated an annual surplus (<a href="#">World Habitat, 2017b</a>).</li> </ul> <p><b>Disadvantages:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Government structure involved in facilitating the development does not exist in NZ.</li> <li>Age-specific housing is generally provided in NZ via retirement villages, through 'license to occupy' or similar models requiring substantial private equity investment by older person(s). This model may not be compatible with intergenerational living, as younger people are unlikely to have similar equity levels.</li> <li>Some providers are exploring developments that better provide for intergenerational</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The main points of contact are between regional government and local government (or municipality) organisations.</li> <li>Potential for LGNZ to consider the role of intergenerational living arrangements to overcome housing challenges and social issues.</li> <li>Encouraging intergenerational contact and understanding is supported in the Government's draft Better Later Life   He Oranga Kaumātua 2019-2034 Strategy (<a href="#">The Office for Seniors, 2019</a>).</li> <li>This example may be attractive to those local authorities that consider they have a mandate for housing and perceive gaps in public housing supply for elderly people.</li> <li>This initiative may be more appropriate for metropolitan areas, as opposed to provincial or rural areas. This is because a critical mass of elderly and younger people requiring social housing is needed, which is more likely to occur in</li> </ul>	 S2. Partnerships   S7. Grants   S10. Asset transfer

Ref	Initiative profile	Initiative detail	Initiative in practice	Advantages/disadvantages	Implications for NZ local government	Relevant LGNZ Supply Tool/s
7	<p><b>Initiative Name:</b> <a href="#">Granby Four Street, Community Led Housing Project</a> (2015)</p> <p><b>Location:</b> Liverpool, United Kingdom</p> <p><b>Comparative LGNZ Sector:</b> Metropolitan</p> <p><b>Type of initiative:</b></p> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Community led housing (CLH) involves local communities playing a role in solving housing problems, and can involve building new homes, returning empty homes to use, and/or managing existing homes.</li> <li>CLH comprises four different concepts: cohousing; housing co-operatives; community land trusts (CLTs) and self-help housing.</li> <li>CLH is supported in the UK by a comprehensive web-based toolkit comprising five toolboxes providing technical and non-technical information on housing, communities, legal, planning and finance and designed to help housing professionals scale up the supply of community-led homes to contribute to the UK's housing problems (<a href="#">Communities CAN, 2019</a>).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Granby, Liverpool, is an inner-city location characterised by decades of decline and underinvestment.</li> <li>Granby Four Streets CLT was established as a vehicle for involving local people in a regeneration project and acted as a catalyst, encouraging other organisations to commit to the area.</li> <li>Liverpool City Council (LCC) supported the Granby Four Streets CLH as it aligned with the Council's strategic priorities of increasing housing choice, creating more sustainable neighbourhoods, and reducing vacancy rates.</li> <li>LCC, in partnership with other stakeholders, embarked on a £14 million regeneration project in 2014 to bring 110 empty properties back into use.</li> <li>LCC also supported the CLH by providing advice and support, transferring five properties to the CLH for £1, and dedicating £650,000 to street frontage improvement works (CCIN Housing Commission, n.d.).</li> <li>The project attracted worldwide recognition, culminating in the award of the Turner Prize in 2015.</li> </ul>	<p>living, but a social housing model in these contexts may not be popular (<a href="#">Harris, 2019</a>).</p> <p><b>Advantages:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Local authority was able to respond in a range of different ways, from providing actual housing stock at low cost, to providing support and guidance.</li> <li>Multi-partner approach.</li> <li>Strong buy-in and leadership from local community.</li> <li>Strong central government support for overarching CLH approach, set out in bills of parliament and national planning policy frameworks.</li> <li>Innovative use of asset transfer by local authority.</li> <li>Approach tackled three strategic priorities – increase housing choice, creation of more sustainable neighbourhoods and reduction of vacancy rates.</li> <li>Refurbishment offered employment opportunities for local residents.</li> </ul> <p><b>Disadvantages:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Liverpool City Council, in common with many local authorities in the UK, is a major property owner and social housing landlord, and therefore had housing stock to contribute to the initiative. This is generally not the case in New Zealand.</li> <li>The relationship between community and Council was poor at the time of CLT being initiated and took considerable time to heal and for trust between parties to build (<a href="#">Cooperativecity.org, 2016</a>).</li> </ul>	<p>denser metropolitan areas in New Zealand.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No direct interface between central and local government, though overarching central government support for CLH provided impetus and a policy framework.</li> <li>Example offers opportunities to explore the role of radical divestment of council owned properties in achieving significant social housing and community development outcomes.</li> <li>Granby Four Streets provides opportunities for NZ local government to explore how a broad range of strategic outcomes can be achieved through housing-based projects.</li> <li>Opportunity to explore direct involvement of community members as development partners in the refurbishment and repurposing of social housing stock.</li> <li>This model relies on a high degree of trust and good relationships between all parties. Councils would need to reflect on existing relationships in order to understand opportunities and barriers to progress a project of this nature.</li> <li>This initiative may be more appropriate for metropolitan areas, as opposed to provincial or rural areas. This is because of the large scale of community involvement and organisational support required; being more relevant to areas with higher population density.</li> </ul>	<p> S2. Partnerships</p> <p> S10. Asset transfer</p>
8	<p><b>Initiative Name:</b> <a href="#">Harris Transportable Housing Project</a> (2017)</p> <p><b>Location:</b> Victoria, Australia</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planned social housing development led by Launch Housing, a Melbourne based, secular and independent community agency formed in July 2015 (<a href="#">Launch Housing, n.d.</a>).</li> <li>Uses vacant land owned by VicRoads, the State's transport agency (<a href="#">Launch Housing, n.d.</a>).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planned development of 57 transportable units on multiple sites of vacant land in the Melbourne inner western suburbs of Footscray and Maidstone (<a href="#">Millar, 2017</a>).</li> <li>Harris Capital donated \$4 million; Victoria Property Fund donated \$3 million; VicRoads subleased the land to</li> </ul>	<p><b>Advantages:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Innovative use of vacant government land and of new house build methods (e.g. transportable homes and energy efficiency measures) to create safe and secure housing.</li> <li>Housing model can adapt to change in circumstances regarding land ownership and future use.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Interface is between State Government and local organisations.</li> <li>Opportunities to explore use of vacant land not traditionally considered for housing, and to encourage partnerships between local government and crown entities not typically considered housing partners (e.g. NZTA and KiwiRail).</li> </ul>	<p> S2. Partnerships</p> <p> S5. Regulatory settings</p>



Ref	Initiative profile	Initiative detail	Initiative in practice	Advantages/disadvantages	Implications for NZ local government	Relevant LGNZ Supply Tool/s
	<p><b>Comparative LGNZ Sector:</b> Metropolitan</p> <p><b>Type of initiative:</b></p> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Described as 'first-of-its-kind' initiative in Victoria to increase housing for those experiencing or at risk of homelessness (<a href="#">Launch Housing, n.d.</a>).</li> <li>Partnership approach amongst Launch Housing, philanthropic donor Harris Capital, the Victoria Property Fund, VicRoads (landowner) and the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS).</li> <li>The units provide safe, secure and affordable housing for low-income tenants with low support needs who have been priced out of the private rental market. (<a href="#">Launch Housing, n.d.</a>).</li> <li>Launch Housing match tenants to this accommodation based on income and relatively low need for wrap-around support services (<a href="#">Launch Housing, n.d.</a>).</li> <li>Units will be made available to people currently on the social housing waiting list, where the wait can be up to 25 years (<a href="#">Launch Housing, n.d.</a>).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DHHS, which is the primary lease holder (<a href="#">Launch Housing, n.d.</a>).</li> <li>The units are situated on land owned by VicRoads and set aside for future road widening. VicRoads has leased the land to DHHS on a peppercorn lease of \$1 per year. DHHS has then subleased the land to Launch Housing (<a href="#">Launch Housing, n.d.</a>).</li> <li>The initial five-year lease agreement has no end date and provides assurance that VicRoads will identify other land they own that could be suitable for the transportable units to be relocated, if the subject land is ultimately required for road widening (<a href="#">Launch Housing, n.d.</a>).</li> <li>There is also a provision requiring VicRoads to give a minimum of 12 months' notice should they need to terminate the lease (<a href="#">Launch Housing, n.d.</a>).</li> <li>VicRoads is unlikely to require the sites for road widening for at least 10 years. Launch anticipate the housing to be available in these locations for at least a decade or more.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>High degree of security of tenure for Launch and occupants.</li> <li>Partnership approach.</li> <li>Good use of philanthropic funding.</li> <li>Delivered actual increase in social housing supply.</li> </ul> <p><b>Disadvantages:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Met with setbacks at the planning stage due to opposition from local residents (<a href="#">Millar, 2017</a>).</li> <li>Landowner may require land in the future – lack of absolute certainty.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Opportunities to explore the role of philanthropy in the provision of social housing in New Zealand.</li> <li>This initiative could be undertaken in metropolitan, provincial and/or rural areas in New Zealand, wherever there is available government-owned land. It is scalable to the level of social housing demand evident in a particular location.</li> </ul>	 <p>S10. Asset transfer</p>
9	<p><b>Initiative Name:</b> <a href="#">Navan Social Housing (2019)</a></p> <p><b>Location:</b> County Meath, Ireland</p> <p><b>Comparative LGNZ Sector:</b> Provincial</p> <p><b>Type of initiative:</b></p> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Staged delivery of 86 social housing units across two developments in Navan; a provincial town (population 30,000) in County Meath.</li> <li>Developed in partnership between <a href="#">Túath Housing</a> (a not-for-profit, registered charity), Meath County Council, developers, the Dept. of Housing, Planning and Local Government, and Ireland's <a href="#">Housing Finance Agency (HFA)</a>.</li> <li>The first development site (Commons Road) has 20 units due for completion in August 2019, followed by 40 more over the next 12 months. This includes a mix of two-bed apartments and two or three-bed houses (<a href="#">Rebuilding Ireland, n.d.</a>).</li> <li>The second development site (Slane Road) contains 26 units which have been completed and tenanted. This includes a mix of townhouses, duplexes and apartments (<a href="#">Rebuilding Ireland, n.d.</a>).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Many of the units incorporated universal access features, making them suitable for elderly or disabled tenants (<a href="#">Rebuilding Ireland, n.d.</a>).</li> <li>Providing social housing in a semi-rural area empowered people to stay in their area of choice, strengthening community networks (<a href="#">Rebuilding Ireland, n.d.</a>).</li> <li>Physical work was completed by developers contracted to Túath Housing (<a href="#">Túath Housing, n.d.</a>).</li> <li>90% of the Slane Road units were constructed offsite in a factory in Cavan, before being transported to and finished on site (<a href="#">Túath Housing, n.d.</a>).</li> <li>Capital funding was provided by the Dept. of Housing, Planning and Local Government via Meath County Council, in conjunction with private finance from the HFA (<a href="#">Túath Housing, n.d.</a>).</li> </ul>	<p><b>Advantages:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Relatively quick delivery timeframe. For the Commons Road site, the developer started onsite in June 2018 and units were ready in August 2019 (<a href="#">Túath Housing, n.d.</a>).</li> <li>Allowed tenants to remain in their area of choice.</li> <li>Example of a successful partnership approach between central and local government, a housing charity, and developers.</li> <li>Delivered an actual increase in social housing supply in a semi-rural area.</li> <li>Delivered high quality, A-rated homes (<a href="#">Túath Housing, n.d.</a>).</li> <li>Achieved time and cost efficiencies for the Slane Road site using offsite manufacturing (<a href="#">Túath Housing, n.d.</a>).</li> <li>Shows what can be achieved via agencies such as the HFA, who advance loan finance</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This type of arrangement requires strong relationships, partnerships, and legal mechanisms (such as service level agreements) between central and local government, community housing providers and developers.</li> <li>Opportunities to explore the possibility of a finance agency such as the HFA in New Zealand to lend funds to local government for housing and infrastructure projects. In Ireland, the HFA is self-financing.</li> <li>Illustrates the usefulness of having a clear social housing delivery programme, such as that articulated by Meath County Council. Such clarity demonstrates need and can attract funding from external agencies for housing projects.</li> </ul>	 <p>S1. Social Housing Strategy</p>  <p>S2. Partnerships</p>  <p>S9. Council-owned/3rd party managed</p>

Ref	Initiative profile	Initiative detail	Initiative in practice	Advantages/disadvantages	Implications for NZ local government	Relevant LGNZ Supply Tool/s
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meath County Council has an ambitious social housing delivery programme, with 413 new social homes delivered in 2018 and funding approval in place for a further 634 homes to be delivered over the next two years, across both Approved Housing Body sector provision and Meath County Council's own direct construction projects (<a href="#">Túath Housing, n.d.</a>).</li> </ul>	<p>to local authorities and the voluntary housing sector to support the development or purchase of social housing (<a href="#">DHPLG, n.d.</a>).</p> <p><b>Disadvantages:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requires service level agreements between funding parties to clarify and legitimise funding arrangements.</li> <li>New Zealand local government does not currently have access to capital funding for social housing projects such as that provided by the HFA.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Highlights the different needs of provincial and rural councils, who may have land, but limited social housing supply. And the desire for people in need of social housing to stay within rural communities.</li> <li>Illustrates that offsite (prefabricated) manufacturing can achieve time and cost savings for social housing developments.</li> <li>This initiative could be undertaken in metropolitan, provincial and/or rural areas in New Zealand. It is scalable to the level of social housing demand evident in an area.</li> </ul>	
10	<p><b>Initiative Name:</b> <a href="#">Public Practice</a> (ongoing)</p> <p><b>Location:</b> London, United Kingdom</p> <p><b>Comparative LGNZ Sector:</b> Metropolitan</p> <p><b>Type of initiative:</b></p> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New social enterprise that brokers one-year professional development placements for planners and place-making practitioners.</li> <li>Cross-subsidised through public and private sector support; and developed in conjunction with the Local Government Association, Future Cities Catapult, British Land, Berkeley Group and Peabody.</li> <li>Aims to build the public sector's capacity to deliver homes and growth; support collaborative planning; and develop a new generation of planning professionals.</li> <li>Associated with the London Housing Strategy's Policy 5.1 to achieve well-designed, safe, and good quality homes (Mayor of London, 2018).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There are Public Practice placements in 23 local authorities in London.</li> <li>Public Practice planners are deployed at Councils requiring specific skills and/or assistance with specific projects, including housing delivery projects.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Advantages:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Upskills planners and place-making practitioners through placements in housing delivery organisations.</li> <li>Cost-effective way of matching planning practitioners to skills shortages in local government, to help facilitate new housing supply.</li> <li><a href="#">The New Zealand Planning Institute</a> (NZPI) may offer a means of establishing this type of skills brokerage network.</li> </ul> <p><b>Disadvantages:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is no equivalent social enterprise currently in operation in New Zealand.</li> <li>Would require upskilling of NZPI and local authorities on the benefits of such a service.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Opportunities exist for LGNZ to work with local authorities and NZPI to identify: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The role of urban planning capacity and expertise issues in the delivery of social housing,</li> <li>The current challenges associated with planning in this area, and</li> <li>Opportunities to increase the supply of planning expertise to public and private organisations involved in delivering housing.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Could be rolled out across New Zealand; in metropolitan, provincial and rural areas (wherever there is housing demand and/or capacity issues within local government).</li> </ul>	 <p>S1. Social Housing Strategy</p>  <p>S2. Partnerships</p>  <p>S5. Regulatory settings</p>