



Housing Affordability Forum Meeting

Agenda

Friday, 9th September 2016, 1:15-3:00pm

Beca Office, 32 Harrington Street, Tauranga

1. Apologies	Chair
2. Minutes and Actions (Paper A)	Chair
3. Pilot Project Update including the Position Paper Analysis (Paper B)	Karen Summerhays
4. SmartGrowth website HAF page development	Chair
5. HAF input into other SmartGrowth Actions – esp. Compact City Study	Chair
6. Election of Chairperson – nominations (Paper C)	Karen Summerhays
7. Building Environment Roles and Responsibilities – Joint Hui with Property Developers Forums – Discussion	Karen Summerhays
8. Ageing well papers – Tenure Security for Older Tenants – (Appendix 1) The Housing Older People Would Choose – (Appendix 2)	Karen Summerhays
9. SmartGrowth Thankyou Function – attendance	Megan Rumble
10. General Business	Chair

Paper A

FORUM	Housing Affordability Forum
DATE & TIME	Friday 8 th July 2016, 1:15-3:00pm
LOCATION	Beca, 32 Harrington Street, Tauranga

Present	Karen Summerhays (SmartGrowth - Acting Chair), Peter Malcolm (Closing the Gap), Cr Rick Curach (TCC), Cr Kelvin Clout (TCC), Lisa Hickling (Calibrate Consulting), Megan Rumble (SmartGrowth), Meagan Holmes (TCC), Jo Gravit (TCHT), Phillip Martelli (WBOPDC), Liz Davies (WBOPDC), Jo Wills (Sustainability Options), Jane Denton (TCC), Chris Johnstone (TCHT), Riki Nelson (Master Painters BOP) Karen Marjoribanks (TCC)	
Apologies	Christine Ralph (Chair), Jeff Fletcher (PDF), Margaret Murray-Benge (WBOPDC), Annie Hill (Priority One), Buddy Mikaere, Ian Carter	
Previous minutes and matters arising		The minutes of the previous meeting were approved with no matters arising. Outstanding actions: Christine to pursue Omokoroa Site Plan and then HAF choose site(s) Update - Initial site plan developed, areas suitable identified in a general manner. Have not had a physical site visit yet. Megan is yet to transfer relevant files onto the SmartGrowth Website off the SmartGrowth hard drive. All other actions complete.
	Action	
Pilot Project Update	Update	Liz Davies provided an update - not a lot of progress has been made beyond identifying a potential site. Progress isn't as quick as would have liked. Consent has to be lodged by September so everything does need to be sorted before then. Have talked about the size and roughly where in the development it will occur. Holding initial panel in September. Jo Wills confirmed she has the panel lined up but just needs to provide them with the next steps. Karen S covered off the non-capacity for SmartGrowth to provide resourcing for the project. The other forums have applied a trust to take the action for their projects. Liz confirmed Western Bay are prepared to provide the required support for their land.

		Opal drive update: Kelvin Clout provided an update advising a range of development options for the site have been reviewed. Sitari has had discussions with affordable housing advisors and are speaking to planners about development options and how best to utilize the land. Will be reporting back to Garry Poole in the next month. Have asked for a council report. There was general discussion as to whether the Action 10E3 was still relevant in today's operating climate. KS suggested that the conversation may be helped by a discussion paper at the next meeting and when the Chair was present. Liz Davies, Annie Hill, and Karen S to provide a discussion report providing a number of options for the Forum to discuss.
	Action	The matter of Opal Drive to be high on the agenda for next HAF meeting. KS, AH, LD to write a discussion paper re Action 10E3
Update from Sustainable Housing Summit	Update	Jo Wills and Chris Johnstone provided highlights and observations from the 2016 Auckland Sustainable Housing Summit they attended on 15 June 2016. Stand out themes included – letting the market lead is not the approach if we want to achieve anything. Strong leadership and Community engagement is the key to success.
	Actions	
Discussion and Confirmation of the HAF Position Paper	Discussion	Karen provided an overview on the Position Paper process and introduced Lisa Hickling who SmartGrowth have contracted to compile the position papers alongside the fora. SGIC have chosen to use the forums as their pre public consultation to the SPR. The forum papers will travel forward and inform structure planning and placemaking also. Discussion followed and edits were made to the draft paper. It was agreed that Jo Gravit – in the absence of Chair Christine Ralph would present the papers at the Joint Fora Hui on July 12 and SGIC on July 20.
	Actions	
Update from other forums	Update	Karen advised that the other forums are also focussing on their Position Papers at present getting ready for the joint hui on July 12. The forum refresh process will take place in November with the nominations election of the chairperson. It is also timely to think about organisations who might not be presently represented on the forum but should be. Forum members to let Karen or Christine know if there is additional representation to be added.

	Actions	Forum members to let Karen or Christine know if there is additional representation to be added to the forum.

Meeting ended at 2:42pm. Next meeting 9th September 2016 1:15-3pm Beca Office, Harrington Street, Tauranga.

**Housing Affordability Forum
OUTSTANDING ACTIONS
13th May 2016**

3.	May	MR to copy files on to a USB for analysis as to relevant information to be placed on website
4.	July	- The matter of Opal Drive to be high on the agenda for next HAF meeting. - KS, AH, LD to write a discussion paper re Action 10E3
5.	July	Forum members to let Karen or Christine know if there is additional representation to be added to the forum.



Committee Name	SmartGrowth Housing Affordability Forum
Committee Meeting Date	9th September 2016
Author (s)	Karen Summerhays – Well-Beings Implementation Officer
Purpose	Discussion Paper for Housing Affordability Forum on the viability of continuing with SG13 Action 10E5 - Housing Affordability Pilot Project

Discussion Paper for Housing Affordability Forum (HAF) on the viability of continuing with SG13 Action 10E5 - Housing Affordability Pilot Project

---

Introduction

At the HAF meeting on the 8th July there was general discussion as to whether the Action 10E3 was still achievable in today's operating climate. It was suggested that the conversation and any subsequent decisions may be helped by a discussion paper at the September HAF meeting.

It is prudent that the Forum and SmartGrowth (SG) take this opportunity to reconsider/reconfirm Action 10E3.

SG Strategy 2013 states:

The need to make housing more affordable

While housing is more affordable in many towns across the sub-region such as Katikati, Te Puke and Paengaroa, Tauranga City was rated by Demographia in 2012 as one of the least affordable areas for buying property in New Zealand. Housing Affordability is defined as a situation which reflects accepted United Nations global benchmarks, where no more than 1/3 of total household income is used to pay either rental or ownership costs. The 2012 Demographia survey assessed the average house price at 5.9 times higher than the average annual income.

This has implications for people's social and economic wellbeing and for the local economy in attracting new businesses and employment and housing the sub-regional workforce.

Historically SmartGrowth's role in housing affordability has centred on ensuring sufficient land supply and infrastructure is provided in an efficient and affordable manner. However, during the 2013 strategy update process there was a strong message from the community to increase focus on housing affordability. This included taking a strong advocacy, leadership and facilitation role and actively working with central Government agencies, third-sector groups, the development and construction sector and the financial sector to increase the supply of affordable housing in the sub-region.

Action 10E5 Housing Affordability Pilot Project

Facilitate the delivery of pilot project to provide a practical, best practice example of sustainable, affordable, quality housing to raise awareness amongst the housing sector and the public.

The pilot project will:

- *Establish and agree with partner Councils, a framework for the delivery of affordable housing projects (including potential incentives/benefits to developers).*
- *Provide an opportunity to have a conversation about the levels of intervention councils are prepared to promote housing affordability including the use of Council land.*
- *Include a literature review of interventions that have occurred elsewhere in NZ and internationally.*
- *Include a definition of housing affordability for the western Bay.*

In the strategy the action is deemed *Urgent* and *HAF is identified as the lead agency with support from: SGP, PDF, SSF, Chamber of Commerce, Maori Trustees and JAG*

Measure of Success: Project plan complete, framework agreed and expressions of interest received.

Discussion:

- The purpose of the pilot project is to provide a practical, best practice example of sustainable, affordable, quality housing to raise awareness of good house and section design principles amongst the housing sector and the broader community, and to demonstrate that this type of development is possible and profitable. There is a strong focus on being able to provide a product that is liveable, sustainable and affordable to low and medium income earners across the Western Bay of Plenty sub-region (as rental or ownership).
- In the three years since this specific action was adopted by SmartGrowth, the HAF has researched various components of housing seeking support and incentives for the Pilot Project. There has also been great change in the operating environment of the sub-region's housing construction sector. In the last year alone, house prices in Tauranga have increased by 25 per cent. This cost increase has been contributed to by the cost of land, the cost of building materials and the cost of labour for the actual construction.
- Anecdotally we know that construction costs are continuing to rise. A 2012 report by the Productivity Commission found that building costs were rising faster than inflation, at 4.3% a year versus CPI growth of 3.5%. This was in part due to new health and safety rules requiring additional scaffolding, nets and site fencing. In addition, during housing booms, construction costs grow as there is higher demand for labour and materials. During the last housing boom from 2003 to 2008, construction costs grew at an average annual rate of 5.8% compared with CPI growth of 2.1%.
- When the housing affordability pilot project was first conceived, it was felt there would be an opportunity for the preferred developer involved to leverage their profile in affordable home design and construction and use their involvement as a marketing opportunity. It was hoped that the Pilot Project opportunity, with certain benefits, would incentivise a company to use a more innovative design to set themselves apart from the norm.

- However, with the current high levels of activity in residential construction and development and through my enquiries, I believe it will be more difficult to find developers or builders that would want to leverage their profile in the affordable housing market work, and in turn undertake more innovative, and therefore riskier, designs.
- Additionally, the current market conditions-combined with increasing development costs will also make it more difficult to achieve the project aspirations to produce a best practice design house at an affordable price. However, in the event that there was a Pilot Project undertaken, there would be learnings from such a project which would record where the unaffordable aspects of design and construction lie.
- After discussions in 2015 with the TECT and BayTrust about alternative funding models that they might be able to support the Pilot Project with, it was recommended that the HAF approach the organisations with a request for the more minor aspects of funding the project in the light of funding issues within SmartGrowth. Since the application to TECT/BayTrust for concept designs and a project manager for the project was unsuccessful in early 2016, the management of the process has been reconsidered by the SmartGrowth team and funding in kind and disbursements confirmed this month.
- **Western BOP Land at Omokoroa:** WBOPDC has indicated that should the project be limited to just the Omokoroa site they would be prepared to undertake the project management and report back to HAF and SG. The staff of Western Bay of Plenty District Council have recently advised that the Special Housing Area application for the Council's Omokoroa site is about to be lodged with Council for approval. The latest plans reveal an eight staged subdivision with the margin closest to Omokoroa Road requiring a terraced approach to accommodate a fall in the contour of approximately 6-8 metres. This adversely affects the ability to get a larger site that is reasonably flat without retaining walls for an affordable housing project within the stage one area. Therefore, despite the written agreement between the Council and the developer, to provide for the HAF Pilot project within the stage one area it is now proposed that it be located in later stages where there is flatter land.

HAF is yet to discuss the proposal with the developer. The timing of each stage depends on the uptake of the previous stages and the market acceptance of the dwelling and section sizes. There is a planned meeting of HAF, the Council and Classic Builders at the end of September at which the matter of site selection and timing can be discussed based on detailed contour plans which are yet to be received. It is therefore likely that the HAF Pilot project cannot go the Registration of Interest process within 2016 and more likely to be delayed a good 8-12 months if not longer.

- **Tauranga City Council (TCC) land at Opal Drive:** At the time of writing this report no decision had been made by TCC as to whether this land would be made available. Due to the looming election it would be unlikely that there will be any discussion or decision for a number of months.
- The HAF Position Paper 2016 to the SmartGrowth Settlement Pattern Review has identified potential ways of achieving an increase of affordable housing being built. For example, the development of an integrated strategic level advice paper on housing issues and options in the sub region is required to facilitate a sub-regional housing strategy for the next 25years.

- With regard to the above, the Position Paper suggests the following actions; some of which the Forum could be proactively involved in (noting that some of these actions are already underway):
  - Review all recent housing and relevant planning focused papers addressing local western BOP housing issues.
  - Confirm recent economic and demographic data related to our current and future population.
  - Offer options on long term changes that are required to achieve sustainable positive social impact and a significantly improved range of housing choices, with access to transport, facilities and environmentally sustainable infrastructure.
  - Through SmartGrowth, facilitate stakeholder agreement including social lenders, central and local government policy makers and developers as equity partners to all work co-operatively towards housing solutions within the revised settlement pattern.
  - Be informed by a sub-regional housing needs assessment which would:
    - Develop strategic views of housing demand and need both now and in the future;
    - Develop a sound approach to planning for the mix of housing required and assess the effects of covenants on housing typologies;
    - Assist SmartGrowth to assess the level of affordable housing required in an area and the barriers to this occurring eg consent costs and profit margins;
    - Assist with the assessment of future social housing requirements within a market;
    - Enable greater integration between housing activity and the settlement pattern review;
    - Provide the opportunity to identify the needs of distinctive communities in ways that can influence the design and delivery of housing provided by a range of organisations;
    - Provide a basis for ongoing monitoring of the local housing market and the impact of both general and housing specific policy interventions.
    - Meet National Policy Statement for Urban Development requirements for a housing needs assessment.
    - Achieve Action 21A4 in the Settlement Pattern Implementation plan to: consider future housing needs – undertake research to assess housing needs including supply and demand to cater for changing demographics and the possibility for now including outlying small settlements for future expansion.

In the future, could the Forum time and SG resources be directed to help achieve these things? As a future exercise the Forum would need to establish where its energies would be best directed for maximum outcomes.

SG Resourcing

Approval has been confirmed this month from SG to continue to support HAF as per the funding request outlined until there is an alternative proposal agreed by HAF.

HAF Budget Estimate for 2016 -2018 Years (provided by Christine Ralph to SG 8/8/16)

Note – this is an estimate only and time and disbursements may differ if unforeseen circumstances arise.

Action	SG Admin Time	SG Advisers Time	SG Disbursements	HAF Time
July- December 2016				
SG Implementation Manager briefing		8hrs		1hr
Agreement to SG contract entity in TCC area if necessary – see Cooney's advice. Get Appendix A contract from Cooney Lees		8hrs		1hr
Choose WBOPDC Omokoroa site and developer agreement confirmed				4hrs
Rechecking RoI with WBOPDC and SG staff (and panel)		4hrs (staff only)		4hrs (staff and panel)
RoI advertising in Bay Times, NZ Herald, GETS etc Trying for mid September plus our list	2hrs		\$2000 for two papers, AGREED not sure of GETS costs	1hr(mail list)
Media coverage at launch including SG website		2hrs	SG communications	2hrs
RoI mail out to potential proponents. Receipt of questions and applications	8hrs	1hr		1hr
Circulation of RoI and applications to Panel Members and set venue for panel assembly	8hrs	1hr		1hr
Responses to RoI inquiries (1 comprehensive written response)	2hrs	4hrs		4 hrs
Five Panel members nominal fee-only for architect, master builder, sustainable housing performance ,quantity surveyor, developer not for HAF and WBOPDC	1hr	10hrs	\$5,000 and \$1000 travel for one out of town AGREED	8hr
Compilation of report on panel decision written on the day - also advise SG	1hr	2hrs		2hrs
January – June 2017				
Establish SG website page and load existing material from files and establish a page for the PP progress report	40 hrs	4hrs	SG communications	
Evaluation of final design plans (2) and confirmation of agreement		2hrs	\$2-3000 panel members	8hrs with 2 panel members
Observe progress of the build through bi monthly progress reports from developer and communications with building inspectors and one site visit		12hrs (2 sites)		6hrs
Video of progress taken on site visit, load onto SG site		2hrs	Video expertise SG communications	
Bldg Industry Open Day at pre close in stage (3 hrs)		10hrs (2 sites)		8hrs
TOTAL for 2016-17 year	62 hrs	70hrs		
July- December 2017				
Observe progress of the build through bi monthly progress reports from developer and communications with building inspectors and one site visit		12hrs (2 sites)		
Video of progress taken on site visit, load onto SG site	1hr	2hrs	Video expertise SG communications	
Bldg Industry Open Day (3hrs) advertise through DF etc	8hrs	10hrs (2 sites)	Advertising	8hrs
Report to SG		1hr		1hr
January – July 2018				
Observe progress of the build through bi monthly progress reports from developer and communications with building inspectors and one site visit		12hrs (2 sites)		
Video of progress taken on site visit, load onto SG site	1hr	2hrs	Video expertise SG communications	
Public Open Day (3hrs)	8hrs	10hrs (2 sites)	Advertising	8hrs
Report to SG		1hr		1hr
TOTAL for 2017-18 year	18hrs	50hrs	?	

Options:

1. Do nothing further and recommend to the SmartGrowth Implementation Committee the removal of Action 10E3 from the SmartGrowth Strategy.
2. Do nothing further in the immediate future and recommend to the SmartGrowth Implementation Committee retain the action in the strategy but delete the HAF as a lead in the project and make them a supporter.
3. Wait for the provision of land at Omokoroa possibly late 2017 and proceed with the RoI process.
4. Wait for the TCC decision on the provision of land at Opal Drive and then proceed with the RoI process alongside the Omokoroa land.

Note that in options 3 and 4, at the end of the RoI stage, there is a hold point when the applications are considered. That is a natural point to be able to assess the market response and determine whether the Pilot Project criteria can be met and the project should proceed.

In addition, for options 3 and 4 there is an opportunity for the Pilot Project to be offered to the wider housing market to see if other parties are willing to provide land somewhere in the SmartGrowth sub region, for such a venture.

Clifton's take on the Auckland Unitary Plan's allowing higher density (*Politics*, August 6). Her assertion that Auckland "will morph into an Asian-style city: high-rise, space poor with limited communal green spaces" completely mischaracterises the two- and three-storey suburban housing the plan allows for.

What we are talking about is Auckland becoming more like Barcelona or Paris, rather than the Houston or Los Angeles we're heading for. Which of these cities would you sooner live in or visit – sprawling, car-dominated Houston of the two-hour commute or a vibrant, people-dominated medium-density city such as Barcelona?

Our current rules enforce useless side yards, rather than being able to build up to side boundaries. Playing cricket on your lawn has long been an urban myth – gardens get too damaged for that. We need pocket parks within three minutes of our homes where you really can kick a ball around, sit under a tree with a book and have a picnic on the grass.

By allowing us to build up to side boundaries, we can have much higher density and better outdoor play spaces.

Although some people do want to spend weekends in their gardens, this shouldn't be an enforced lifestyle – many of us have more exciting things to do than mowing lawns and pulling weeds.

To say no to this proposed urban plan, what are you saying yes to? You are saying

---

FIND US ONLINE

VISIT US ONLINE FOR EXTRA CONTENT AND DAILY UPDATES

- listener.co.nz
  - [twitter.com @nzlistener](https://twitter.com/nzlistener)
  - facebook.com/nzlistener
-

yes to sprawl, young people locked out of the housing market and cold, drafty high-maintenance old villas as the only option.

Auckland is tired of old people saying how things should be. Young people want the choice to live close in so they don't need to use a car on a daily basis and to enjoy the city vibe. They favour cities more like Copenhagen than Los Angeles that are higher density, not high-rise, and with pocket parks nearby.

Peter Olorenshaw
(Nelson)

UCKLAND'S CHOICE: PARIS OR LA

I was disappointed to read Jane

Letter from Ian Carter

Hi Annie

Since I have taken voluntary temporary leave from HAF I thought I should relay my thoughts to you to pass onto the current members of HAF. I decided to take leave from HAF because there may be a chance that I may be asked by a developer to design a concept housing scheme once the ROI has been published.

I hope the judging panel when selecting a submission takes into consideration the points raised in the Peter Olorenshaw letter that you sent me. I have underlined the relevant points that he mentioned, however I would like to add a few more important factors as I have lived in Copenhagen for over 2 years. I might add that the accepted design concept in Denmark is many many years ahead of where we are at in NZ. Some years ago two very high rise apartment buildings were built however many apartments remained empty years later. The Danes soon realised that this type of housing was unacceptable they preferred low rise cluster housing that featured concepts that included for the following;

- passive solar design
- separated vehicle manoeuvring and parking spaces
- private outdoor living spaces
- common spaces for all to enjoy, play and plant
- desirable vegetables and flowers as well as
- appropriately designed landscaping.
- flexible plan that allowed for future rearrangement
- and additions to each house without structural interference
- healthy, safe, warm and private

I totally agree with the Dane's attitude to housing which can be achieved at a much lower cost than what we see at Papamoa for instance, where you can look out from your Kitchen and see the bathroom of your neighbour and the only place children can play is the road precinct which in some cases is 20m wide for a cul-de-sac with a two way road two footpaths, wide berms. Roads are for cars not kids no wonder there are 20 kids per year killed in such environments.

Ian K Carter
Tauranga
Ph/Fax: 07 533 3802
email iankcarter@xtra.co.nz

Committee Name	Housing Affordability Forum
Forum Meeting Date	9 September 2016
Author (s)	Karen Summerhays – SG Well-beings Implementation
Purpose	To introduce the Position Paper Analysis Report by consultant Liz Davies and to provide an opportunity for the individual forums to indicate the type of action they could take to contribute to the outcomes sought in their Position Paper.

Next steps – SmartGrowth Forums’ Position Papers Response and Analysis

Consultant Liz Davies has completed an analysis for SmartGrowth of the nine position papers presented to the SmartGrowth Implementation Committee in July. Her full report is attached.

Common ground and recommendations

The report highlights six themes identified by five or more of the forums representing what the forums and the Bay of Plenty District Health Board collectively believe to be essential ingredients to be considered as part of the work of the settlement pattern review. There are also 19 other themes listed that specific to each forum’s areas of interest.

The six most common themes are:

- Community involvement in land use planning,
- Urban design,
- Planning and funding of social infrastructure,
- Compact urban form,
- Housing - affordable, housing choices, energy/resource efficient,
- Active transport options and public transport.

At the SGIC meeting on the 17/8/16 it was agreed that the Liz Davies position paper analysis be circulated to all the SmartGrowth partner councils and forums for their feedback, and with some further advice from the SG then reported back to SGIC; likely to be in December.

NOTE: At that SGIC meeting the Settlement Pattern Review was also endorsed by the Committee; the details of what was endorsed can be found on SGIC August Agenda at:

<https://www.smartgrowthbop.org.nz/media/76034/without-back-page-sgic-agenda-and-papers-17-august-2016.pdf>

The Forum is asked to provide any feedback on the Position Paper Analysis Report. The Forum’s Position Paper is attached for completeness.

SmartGrowth Forums and Bay of Plenty District Health Board

Position Statements – Next Steps

August 2016

Report prepared for SmartGrowth

By

Liz Davies – Working Together

Executive Summary

This report was prepared by Liz Davies – Working Together, at the request of SmartGrowth (SG). This report identifies the themes that arose from the Position Statements prepared by each of the SmartGrowth Forums who represent a range of community interests and the Bay of Plenty District Health Board (BOPDHB). Six themes were identified by five or more of the forums representing what the forums and the BOPDHB collectively believe to be essential ingredients to be considered as part of the work of the settlement pattern review along with 19 other themes specific to each forums areas of interest. The six most common themes are:

- Community involvement in land use planning,
- Urban design,
- Planning and funding of social infrastructure,
- Compact urban form,
- Housing - affordable, housing choices, energy/resource efficient,
- Active transport options and public transport.
- A more detailed analysis of each theme is provided along with suggested actions for the six most common themes.

A more detailed analysis of the six common themes is provided along with possible actions. The 19 other themes are listed in Appendix 1 along with the Forums that identified the theme.

Position Statement Themes

All of the SmartGrowth Forums and the BOPDHB were invited to prepare a position statement to articulate what each of the Forums believe is important and requires consideration as part of the settlement pattern review. Each of the Forums and the BOPDHB presented their position statements to SGIC on 20 July 2016. In total 25 themes were identified in the SG Forum position statements. Six themes were identified by five or more of the Forums. These are listed in no particular order in the table below. A more detailed analysis of each theme is provided along with suggested actions. The remaining 19 themes are listed along with the Forums who identified the theme in Appendix One¹.

Six most common themes	Forums (see below for full Forum names)
Community involvement in land use planning	CTWF, BOPDHB, SSF, PATAG, PDF, SIP, SPF
Urban design	CTWF, SSF, HAF, PATAG, SPF, ESF
Planning and funding of social infrastructure	BOPDHB, HAF, PATAG, PDF, SIP, SPF
Compact urban form	BOPDHB, SSF, HAF, PATAG, ESF, PDF, SIP, SPF
Housing - affordable, housing choices, energy/resource efficient	CTWF, BOPDHB, SSF, HAF, PATAG, SIP, SPF
Active transport options and public transport	BOPDHB, SSF, PATAG, ESF, SPF

---

¹ It is important to note that most position statements supported various other Forum position statements, for example the Environment and Sustainability Forum endorsed the position statements of CTWF, PATAG, HAF, SSF and the BOPDHB. In this respect, a Forum may not have explicitly mentioned a theme because they were aware other Forums were raising the issue.

Forum Names

CTWF -	Combined Tangata Whenua Forum
SSF -	Social Sector Forum
HAF -	Housing Affordability Forum
PATAG -	Population Ageing Technical Advisory Group
ESF -	Environment and Sustainability Forum
PDF -	Property Developers Forum
SIP -	Social Infrastructure Providers Forum
SPF -	Strategic Partners Forum

Community involvement in SmartGrowth planning

The importance of the involvement of communities was reflected very strongly in most of the Forum position statements. It was recognised that involving communities early on in the planning processes significantly reduces the need for regulatory responses at the end of the planning process including reduced community resistance throughout the consenting process. The importance of community engagement is well articulated in Martin Udale's Infill and Intensification report (2015) which states *"Council effectively needs to obtain a 'social licence to operate' an infill and intensification program within existing neighbourhoods and communities. Unless this is achieved communities will resist, political leaders will respond accordingly, and developers will just keep away as being all too hard."*

The following terms reveal the nature of involvement from communities the Forums are seeking:

- Co-creating or designing solutions/community led planning.
- Community as equal partners in planning.
- Coordinated, consistent community and cultural consultation.
- Community empowerment.
- Community led master planning.
- Overall wellbeing of people is paramount in planning.
- Community participation and control.
- Lifetime community planning.
- People focused planning and meaningful engagement of communities.
- Respond to current and future needs of local communities.
- Liveable communities that address social inequity, promote social interaction, access to services and reflect current and future population demographics (i.e. age, income and household sizes).

Overall, the Forums are seeking a deeper involvement of communities in planning than what is generally afforded by 'consultation'. It is useful to consider the International Association of Public Participation spectrum of involvement which is the standard tool for considering levels of public involvement in decision-making.

Increasing impact on decision making

	Inform	Consult	Involve	Collaborate	Empower
Public participation goal	The 'inform' level of public participation does not actually provide the opportunity for public participation at all, but rather provides the public with the information they need to understand the decision-making process.	Ask the public for their opinions and consider the input received when making decisions.	At the 'involve' level, the public is invited into the process, usually from the beginning, and is provided multiple if not ongoing opportunities for input as decision-making progresses. The organisation/s is still the decision-maker and there is no expectation of building consensus or providing the public with any sort of high-level influence over the decision.	To collaborate means to work together. At the 'collaborate' level, the public is directly engaged in decision-making. Collaborate often includes the explicit attempt to find consensus solutions. The organisation/s is still the ultimate decision-maker. The degree to which consensus will be sought and how much decision authority the organisation is willing to share must be made explicit.	Organisations provide the public with the opportunity to make decisions for themselves. The most common activities at this level are public voting or ballots, there are other techniques available as well.
Promise to the public	Keep the public informed.	Consider the public input received and to provide feedback as to how that input influenced the decision.	The public have access to the decision process and decision makers and give input to the process and feedback on how their input influence the decision.	The public engaged in all key activities and decisions, and input incorporated to the maximum possible. Consensus not always sought.	The organisation will implement what the public decides.

Possible actions

SmartGrowth (SG) needs to consider the way in which it wishes to work with communities in the growth planning process. The Forums are clearly wanting to see SG move further to the right of the spectrum and beyond 'consult'².

- That SG progress the 9A1 action in the SG Strategy, with urgency, i.e. to develop evidence-based community partnership and engagement guidelines to provide clarity on ways to engage communities throughout the planning process. Considerations and some examples of what such a guide could include:
  - More targeted input from SG Forums (e.g. appoint two SG Forum representatives to each settlement pattern project team) into the four settlement pattern work streams, in particular structure/master planning. It is recognised that it is not feasible for a range of reasons for a representative for each Forum to participate in each work stream. To ensure that the views of each the forums is captured a checklist be developed that the SG Forum representatives would use to ensure they represent the views of all the Forums.
  - Consider inclusion of Council community development, community engagement and communications staff in supporting community involvement in structure/master planning.
  - For brownfield intensification areas consider allocating Council community matching fund grants to affected communities to develop vision/plan for intensification (e.g. employ an independent local facilitator to work with the community) with support from the relevant territorial local authority to ensure the community plan fits within the statutory planning framework.
  - Provide community led training and mentoring to Council staff and elected members.
  - Engage with CTWF and review the three Council SG partners tangata whenua guidelines to ensure appropriate tangata whenua involvement in the settlement pattern, particularly land use planning.
  - Develop a checklist, based on the Forum position statements, to assist the SG management and governance groups in their decision making.
  - Identify and implement a monitoring and evaluation framework to assess the extent to which the themes identified in the position statements are reflected in the implementation of planning and the extent to which community support (or 'social licence') has been achieved to implement the planning.
- To better reflect the outcome sought from the settlement pattern work streams, change the name of the settlement pattern to 'building/creating communities'.

---

² There are examples of community involvement in growth planning e.g. www.placestogrow.ca that could inform the development of the guidelines. However it is recommended that there is sufficient knowledge and experience within SmartGrowth to develop its own, tailored approach to community involvement in growth planning.

Urban design

The majority of the Forums identified the critical importance of the role of urban design in creating communities. In particular, urban design encapsulated a number of features including:

- Cultural design so tangata whenua can see themselves reflected in the built environment.
- Building on and reflecting cultural heritage.
- Use of crime prevention through environmental design (CPTED) principles to improve the safety of built environments.
- Use of ecological design e.g. permaculture design.
- 'One size does not fit all', urban design enables expression of community identity and prevents homogenisation of communities.

Possible actions

- SG prepare cultural urban design guidelines (which promote and use Te Aranga urban design principles – Auckland Council) to be used by local authorities and developers.
- SG work with local authorities to identify the barriers and enablers to the use of the existing Council urban design guidelines to inform work on how to ensure better use of urban design guidelines e.g. in relation to intensification/infill consider having 'no density' controls and instead driving quality through an urban design programme assessed as a restricted discretionary activity.
- Employ a community planning approach to encourage identity and ownership of any proposed changes.

Planning and funding of social infrastructure (SI)

The importance of social infrastructure was noted by the majority of the Forums, in particular:

- The need to plan for SI with other SI providers, community and developers.
- SI planning undertaken as part of and equal to other infrastructure planning.
- Plan for SI early on in the planning process.
- Ensure the right mix and timing of SI.
- Recognise that SI help creates community identity.
- Under investment in SI needs to be addressed.
- SI contributes to improved social amenity.
- Resource use, recovery and waste minimisation as well as 'green' and 'blue' infrastructure be considered as part of infrastructure planning.
- Importance of high quality public open space for intensified areas.
- Recreation spaces – access to the natural environment, holding events in public spaces, encourage interaction, neighbourhood green space and access to water bodies, ecological corridors and biodiversity preserved, natural view shafts preserved, use of green infrastructure e.g. storm water reserves.
- Cultural infrastructure –including museum, flat floor facility.

Possible actions

- Continue SIP Forum to enable SI providers, the community and developers to plan for SI.
- Integrate SI infrastructure planning with wastewater, stormwater and transport infrastructure planning throughout the planning process from step 1-5 identified in report 'Discussion Paper – Next Steps in progressing future urban growth areas'.

- Take into account the placement of social Infrastructure sub-regionally and locally and how they ‘talk’ to each other and contribute to place making when allocating land for public and private social infrastructure (e.g. transport hubs in relation to schools etc).
- Consider undertaking a Social Return on Investment (SROI) of SI.
- Encourage the review of the Infrastructure Development Code to have flexibility and show innovation including a review of infrastructure requirements and need for public open space in intensified areas.

Compact urban form

The importance of intensification was highlighted by most of the Forums with the Property Developers Forum noting that the question is not ‘whether to intensify’ but ‘how to lead intensification’. Comments made in relation to compact urban form included:

- Intensification needs to occur in both brownfield and greenfield sites.
- Need to monitoring/enforce intensification targets set in the Regional Policy Statement (RPS).
- What are the opportunity costs and benefits of *not* having a compact urban form.
- Requires courageous leadership, the Forums will support such leadership.
- Evidence base for intensification established through community input and consideration of the four well beings.
- Importance of high quality public open space for intensified/infill areas, including consideration of who creates, funds and maintains open spaces is required.

Possible actions

In addition to the position statements, recommendations from Martin Udale’s report ‘Residential Intensification Review – City Living Zone (2015) have been drawn on where they align with the views of the position statements:

- Overt leadership, focus, resources, practices and processes needed to provide an enabling environment for infill and intensification.
- Increase interaction between developers and the community (e.g. Property Developers Forum and the other SG Forums) to enable a better understanding of each other’s views.
- Evidence base for intensification established through community input, consideration of the four well beings and research on healthy urban environments.
- Identify those areas most suitable for infill/intensification taking into account the capacity of existing infrastructure.
- Review regulatory settings to encourage and enable infill/intensification is critical. For example:
  - more permissive rules for intensification including height limits, coverage and remove requirements for parking,
  - introduce urban design controls to ensure good quality development,
  - enable mixed use development particularly in commercial areas i.e. residential development above ground level commercial activities.

- In concert with a review of the planning controls develop a “pattern book”, or design guide, with model solutions for a range of suburban infill solutions providing a range of housing typologies that could either be undertaken as a redevelopment of a single suburban lot or as an infill solution at the rear of an existing dwelling. These model designs could be “pre-approved” by Council so that projects generally in accordance with such solutions could then have an expedited consent path with a lower level of activity status. Such model solutions might deliver between 4 – 6 new dwellings on a standard lot.
- The non-regulatory role of the territorial local authorities is also critical in ensuring good quality intensification i.e. develop a holistic understanding of the quality of amenity that is required to make infill/and intensification housing choices more appealing to developers and end buyers. Considering access to work opportunities, accessibility of the ocean/harbour/recreation areas, infrastructure services, transport and facilities, and the quality of the environment are intrinsic factors in making these types of housing more attractive, and thus more viable, and the role that Council might play in delivering these is important.
- The operation of the consenting programme must focus on enabling efficient processing of quality consents including rewarding good development by way of a smooth, quick and certain consenting process.
- If a development agency was established (in line with a recommendation from Martin Udale’s report to establish a development agency/internal team focusing on infill/intensification staffed by Council to establish partnerships with developers) it is recommended that partnerships are also created with the community.
- Consider whether the SmartGrowth action to undertake an affordable housing project could also become an exemplar for infill/intensification including a range of dwelling sizes, shared facilities etc.
- Develop an appropriate measurement and monitoring framework that can be constantly updated so that things that are working can be expanded upon, those that are not working can be stopped and new ideas and innovations can be tested for effectiveness.

Housing

Providing safe and healthy housing that caters for a range of ages, incomes and household sizes was highlighted by most of the Forums. Terms referred to in the position statements included:

- Shared definition of affordable housing.
- Retaining affordability.
- Catering for the ‘missing middle’.
- Explore different methods to achieve affordable housing provision e.g. licence to occupy, inclusionary zoning.
- A range of housing choices and typologies is available to meet the population composition and incomes.
- Availability and proximity of housing to work, services, retail.
- Energy/resource efficient, safe and warm and dry housing.
- Recognition that the ‘market’ cannot provide housing that meets the needs of everyone, including existing and future communities.
- Social housing provision.
- Papakainga/development of Maori land.
- Emergency housing/homelessness.

- Role of central government in affordable, social and emergency housing.
- Focus on both rental (including security of tenure) and 'own your own' homes.
- Cost of materials contributing to lack of affordable housing.
- Costs of provisions in covenants that contribute to unaffordable housing.
- Ageing in place.
- Mixed housing/co-living.

Possible actions

- Currently SmartGrowth plans for the number of dwellings required to accommodate population growth. For a range of reasons, including there being no statutory requirement, planning for housing that caters for a range of ages, incomes and household sizes that is healthy and safe receives limited attention. For this reason, a long term sub-regional housing strategy, informed by a housing needs assessment, is necessary to plan for the number, type, and quality of housing (including affordable and social housing provision and their location within developments). Successfully planning for the range of housing required would reduce the requirement for emergency or transitional housing and provides a powerful tool to engage with central government, iwi, hapu and the philanthropic sector about their role and investment in housing for future communities e.g. public private partnerships.
- Investigate methods to retain affordability of homes over time, in particular the establishment of a Housing Trust (e.g. Queenstown Lakes Community Housing Trust). This would not necessarily need to be established by local authorities.
- Investigate methods to ensure the provision of affordable housing as part of the settlement pattern, in particular the feasibility of introducing inclusionary zoning which requires developments to build a certain percentage of affordable housing (e.g. Queenstown Lakes District Council district plan inclusionary zone provisions).
- Advocate for standards of new builds to be raised to focus on energy and resource efficiency, orientation, local materials, passive heating/cooling, and thermal performance as per international best practice.

Active transport options and public transport

The importance of creating healthy urban environments that reduce the need for private vehicles and increase cycling and walking opportunities was frequently identified in position statements as critical for successful community building. Comments included:

- Walkable neighbourhoods for good connectivity.
- Public transport nodes linked to and between neighbourhoods/cities/towns, that is reliable and of sufficient frequency and accessible to specific destinations e.g. hospitals.
- Walk and cycle ways which facilitate commuting and recreation.
- Take into account disability access to transport.
- Destination planning.
- Electric vehicles supported.
- Increase proportion of freight volume transported by rail.
- Appropriate infrastructure e.g. cycle racks.
- Shared transport options.

Possible actions

- Cycling, walking and public transport (including rail) afforded the same consideration as roads, vehicular freight transport and private vehicles in all transport planning e.g. completion of the Tauranga urban cycle ways and the Omokoroa – Tauranga cycle way will contribute to increased cycling and walking with subsequent reduced private vehicle use.
- Connectivity within neighbourhoods, between neighbourhoods and across the sub region to be a key principle in transport planning.
- Inclusion of electric vehicle charging points and cycling racks as a consideration of transport planning.
- Procurement of electric vehicles and provision of appropriate infrastructure for cycling (e.g. cycle racks) considered by the three Council SG partners recognising their potential to be role models as major employers in the sub region.
- Targets set for cycling, walking and public transport to increase their share of total travel movements each year with matching targets for a reduction in private passenger vehicle trips.

Conclusion

A total of 25 themes were identified from the position statements produced by the Forums and the BOPDHB.

Six themes were identified by five or more of the forums representing what the forums and the BOPDHB collectively believe to be essential ingredients to be considered as part of the work of the settlement pattern review along with a 19 other themes specific to their areas of interest.

The forums represent a broad range of community interests. They have invested considerable time in articulating what they believe to be important in relation to the settlement pattern review. They look to SmartGrowth for this to be considered and incorporated into future work determining how and where the sub region will accommodate growth and build successful communities.

Appendix 1 – Other Themes identified in the position statements

Other Themes	Forums
The Treaty of Waitangi and the CTWF 2012 Aspirational Plan which articulates the cultural, social, environmental, economic and political aspirations of tangata whenua.	CTWF
Rangatiratanga/mana (leadership, power, authority, control, recognition and self determination) and Whanaungatanga (social connections and networks) principles considered as part of the settlement pattern review.	CTWF
Tipuranga – development of Maori Land considered as an opportunity, not a risk within the settlement pattern.	CTWF, HAF, PATAG
Create healthy urban environments that promote health and well-being for all so everyone has a fair chance of being healthy.	CTWF, BOPDHB, SSF, PATAG
Measures of success includes fair distribution of health, well-being, environmental and social sustainability, not just economic growth.	CTWF, BOPDHB
Address climate change through mitigation and adaptation in land use planning e.g. sea level rise, reduce green house gas emissions.	SSF, ESF
The need for communities to be resilient including enabling local food production, establishment of lifelines and consideration of civil defence (reduce risk, readiness, response and recovery).	SSF, PATAG, ESF
Ensure environmental sustainability/kaitiakitanga is incorporated into land use planning e.g. coastal ecosystems are protected and restored, consideration is given to ecological corridors, water quality and allocation, air quality, marine reserves, natural view shafts.	CTWF, ESF
Productive land is protected for food production	ESF, SPF
Waste minimisation is prioritised throughout the development process and services that minimise waste are established for households and businesses.	ESF
‘Blue’ and ‘green’ infrastructure is actively considered in infrastructure planning.	CTWF, ESF
Infrastructure for the kiwifruit industry is considered in infrastructure planning.	SPF
Population composition considered as part of the settlement pattern e.g. aging ethnic diversity, young people.	SSF, PATAG
Central government, territorial local authorities and communities show courageous leadership and innovation.	SSF

Commercial areas are mixed use and accessible with 'bumping spaces'.	SSF, PATAG, ESR, PDF
Consider how the settlement pattern can reduce income disparity e.g. Provision of adequate social and affordable housing.	BOPDHB, SSF.
Digital infrastructure required that is accessible and affordable e.g. free Wi-Fi in public places.	SSF
Important for SmartGrowth and settlement pattern work streams to collaborate with developers in recognition that developers are responsible for a substantial share of the implementation of the SG strategy.	PDF
The planning process is well resourced and planned including guidance such as best practice examples to provide certainty and consistency in investment.	PDF

SmartGrowth Housing Affordability Forum (HAF) July 2016

---

1. Purpose

To present the position statement of SmartGrowth HAF regarding our requirements for accommodating growth within the western Bay of Plenty sub-region

2. SmartGrowth Implementation Committee (SGIC) recommendations

- That the position of the HAF is noted
- That SmartGrowth and the partner staff respond to the points in all future reporting regarding the SPR
- That the future stages of planning incorporate, where feasible, the outcomes sought and when deemed not appropriate or feasible an explanation provided.

3. Introduction

According to the Governance & Advisory Forums Terms of Reference (2013), the role of the Housing Affordability Forum (HAF) is to provide advice on:

- Identify potential strategy actions across the range of determinants that impact on housing affordability
- Lead the implementation of specific strategy actions as agreed e.g pilot project
- Raise awareness and educate stakeholders and the general public
- Support the delivery of other partners' projects related to housing affordability
- Monitor of all relevant strategy actions
- Develop policies by SmartGrowth partners related to housing affordability
- Make representations/submissions to local, regional, and national Government in relation to Housing Affordability.

The lack of affordable housing is the primary concern of the HAF.

4. Position statements for the settlement pattern review:

- (i) Adequate social and affordable housing is at risk when expected to be provided by the open housing market.
- (ii) Intensification is essential to provide sustainable and diverse housing solutions. The concept of Compact Cities is strongly supported.
- (iii) Affordable and liveable housing (including papakāinga, social and emergency housing) needs to be provided in new growth areas/compact city to ensure adequate housing for families/workforce.
- (iv) The role of central government in contributing towards infrastructure costs such as new roading, services supply etc. and in the incentivisation of affordable houses needs to be recognised.
- (v) Adopt an agreed definition of affordable housing (including initial and life-time costs encompassing both rental and own your own homes)
- (vi) A range of housing typologies is required within each community better reflecting household composition trends i.e. high number of 1-2 person households, ageing population and growing Māori population.
- (vii) Growth areas need to be located to minimise transport costs, access to work and social infrastructure recognising the social and financial costs of low density housing (e.g. underutilised infrastructure, increased vehicle emissions and increased commuting time).
- (viii) Best practice for the following be utilized:
  - a. **Cost of materials:** The cost of building materials and their contribution to housing costs needs to be examined
  - b. **Lifetime cost of building regarding maintenance** ensure quality of construction and materials as well as design to enable houses last longer than 50 years
  - c. **Performance of house:** Designs to maximise energy and resource efficiency, good indoor environmental quality, high thermal performance and passive cross ventilation and solar gain. A house that performs well will reduce operating costs, and provide a healthy living environment which will help to reduce fuel poverty
  - d. sustainable designs that are purpose built e.g. shared community living
- (ix) Recognise the overall costs to households (e.g. transport costs and commuting time and associated impacts on health) of low and high density developments, not just the initial cost of building a dwelling, in this respect intensification is favoured over low density development.
- (x) Ensure lessons are learnt from the construction of commercial buildings that use pre-fabricated materials resulting in significantly cheaper building costs.

- (xi) Location of affordable housing within developments needs to be considered i.e. scattered rather than a concentration in one area.
- (xii) Capacity of Māori land for affordable housing considered in the planning for new growth areas with different solutions including papakainga models being incentivised
- (xiii) Affordability housing needs to be retained over time e.g. shared equity with conditions placed on the title to control future on selling
- (xiv) HAF endorses all the position papers including the one of the DHB as housing is identified in each

5. Specific outcomes HAF is seeking:

- (i) As part of the SmartGrowth Settlement Review, an integrated strategic level advice paper on housing issues and options in the sub region is required to facilitate a sub-regional housing strategy for the next twenty-five years. It needs to:
  - Review all recent housing and relevant planning focused papers addressing local western BOP housing issues
  - Confirm recent economic and demographic data related to our current and future population
  - Offer options on long term changes that are required to achieve sustainable positive social impact and a significantly improved range of housing choices, with access to transport, facilities and environmentally sustainable infrastructure
  - Through SmartGrowth facilitate stakeholder agreement including social lenders, central and local government policy makers and developers as equity partners to all work cooperatively towards housing solutions within the revised settlement pattern.
  - Be informed by a sub-regional housing needs assessment which would¹:
    - Develop strategic views of housing demand and need both now and in the future;
    - Develop a sound approach to planning for the mix of housing required and assess the effects of covenants on housing typologies;
    - Assist SmartGrowth to assess the level of affordable housing required in an area and the barriers to this occurring eg consent costs and profit margins;

---

¹ The Proposed National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity stipulates that local authorities are required to undertake a housing assessment at least every three years.

- Assist with the assessment of future social housing requirements within a market;
  - Enable greater integration between housing activity and the settlement pattern review;
  - Provide the opportunity to identify the needs of distinctive communities in ways that can influence the design and delivery of housing provided by a range of organisations;
  - Provide a basis for ongoing monitoring of the local housing market and the impact of both general and housing specific policy interventions.
  - Meet National Policy Statement for Urban Development requirements for a housing needs assessment.
  - Achieve Action 21A4 in the Settlement Pattern Implementation plan to: consider future housing needs – undertake research to assess housing needs including supply and demand to cater for changing demographics and the possibility for now including outlying small settlements for future expansion.
- (ii) Councils enter into affordable housing development public private partnerships to incentivise and ensure affordable housing outcomes are achieved.
- (iii) Councils must implement Compact City recommendations in a range of locations to facilitate higher densities. Planning incentives or “no density controls” would enable smaller dwellings including duplexes and apartment clusters which offer flexibility of design to suit both greenfields and brownfields development

Councils introduce inclusionary zoning as a means of requiring all developments to provide for affordable housing.

Investigate options such as ‘license to occupy’ or cross lease arrangements as a model to achieve affordable housing.

- (iv) Comprehensive Guarantees and Producer Statements, minimum standards for waste management, and energy efficiency for every new dwelling need to be standard

7. Other very important considerations

- Consideration of timing and type of social infrastructure required to meet the needs of new communities is critical e.g. schools, libraries, reserves, emergency services, hospitals/GP clinics etc.
- Place making/community building is also necessary.
- Strong advocacy by local government, the DHB and community funders is urgently

needed to seek Government led long term policies for well integrated housing solutions in our sub-region

- The responsibility for the funding of adequate supplies of social housing needs to be clarified as there is public recognition that public investment is essential – i.e. do we pay national taxes or local rates
- A culture change is required so that housing is regarded as a right to shelter and not primarily a tradeable investment

Author: HAF/Lisa Hickling



Committee Name	SmartGrowth Housing Affordability Forum
Forum Meeting Date	9th September 2016
Author (s)	Karen Summerhays
Purpose	To outline the election process of the Chairperson and to provide the nomination form.

Chairperson Election Process – Housing Affordability Forum (HAF)

The Housing Affordability Forum Terms of Reference states that the Chairperson will be appointed by the Forum

Note: the PDF Terms of Reference are attached for completeness.

The HAF Chair term is for one year commencing on the 12th of November 2016 and finishing on the 31st October 2017.

Note: The Chair position is supported by a \$5000 annual honoraria, paid quarterly.

Process for 2016 election of Chairperson

- Candidate eligibility: A member of Housing Affordability Forum or any other put forward by the SmartGrowth Independent Chair. If the candidate is a HAF member, they are required to be nominated by one other HAF member. The current Chairperson is eligible to become a candidate.
- In all cases the nominee must have agreed to being nominated.
- Call for nominations: Nominations open 9th September 2016 and must be received at the SmartGrowth office 100 Spring St, Tauranga by 4pm 23rd Sept 2016. Nomination forms can be emailed to Karen.summerhays@smartgrowthbop.org.nz
- Candidates will be asked to provide a short resume to be circulated to the Forum members prior to the Election.
- The election will take place at the HAF meeting of 11th November 2016, by way of private vote and the person who is first past the post will be confirmed as Chair to commence their role on the 12th November 2016

Appendix 1. Nomination Form

Appendix 1.

Housing Affordability Forum Chairperson Nomination Form - 2016

Nominations open 9th September 2016 and must be received at the SmartGrowth office 100 Spring St, Tauranga by 4pm 23rd Sept 2016.

Nomination forms can be emailed to Karen.summerhays@smartgrowthbop.org.nz

Eligibility: A member of Housing Affordability Forum or any other put forward by SmartGrowth Independent Chair. If the candidate is a HAF member, they are required to be nominated by one other HAF member. In all cases the nominee must have agreed to being nominated.

<u>Name of Nominated Candidate</u>
<u>Candidate Signature</u>
<u>Nominated by (name & position)</u>
<u>Signature of Nominator</u>

Appendix 6. Governance & Advisory Forums Terms of Reference (Continued)

6.7

Housing Affordability Forum

Purpose:	The purpose of the Housing Affordability Forum ('the forum') is to provide a mechanism for SmartGrowth to progress initiatives to improve the affordability of housing in the sub-region. The forum will enable direct participation into the implementation, monitoring and review of SmartGrowth, in collaboration with the strategy partners and lead agencies into the range of challenges facing the sub-region in relation to improving the affordability of housing.
Role:	The role of the Housing Affordability Forum ('the forum') is as follows: • Identification of potential strategy actions across the range of key determinants that impact on housing affordability • Leading the implementation of specific strategy actions as agreed e.g. pilot project • Raise awareness and educate stakeholders and the general public • Supporting the delivery of other partner projects relating to housing affordability • Monitoring of all relevant strategy actions. • Development of policies by the SmartGrowth Partners relating to housing affordability • Making representations/submissions to local, regional and national Government in relation to housing affordability
Membership:	The Housing Affordability Forum has representation from the following groups/industries/sectors: • Development community • Local authorities (council officers and elected members) • Economic Development specialists • Planning and urban design specialists • Community Housing Trusts • Real estate sector • PATAG • Tangata whenua • Relevant central Government agency • SmartGrowth Programme/Implementation Manager
Key Principles	The key principles underpinning the establishment of the Housing Affordability Forum are: • The provision of sufficient affordable housing to provide for low to medium income residents as well as support the region's future labour force; • Acceptance that, without intervention, the market will be unable to provide adequate affordable housing; and • Recognition of the different spatial and cultural needs of residents.
Other SmartGrowth Forums and the SmartGrowth Implementation Management Group (IMG) – Linkages and Reporting:	The Chair of the forum will represent the group on the SmartGrowth Strategic Partners Forum and any other SmartGrowth Forums as required. The minutes will be provided to the SmartGrowth IMG for information and for action as required. Meeting minutes and reports for each of the SmartGrowth Partner Forums will be available to the other forums.
SmartGrowth Implementation Committee (SGIC) – Linkages and Reporting:	The forum members are able to present to the SGIC at any of the formal meetings with agreement of SGIC Chair and at any agreed workshops, held between SGIC and the forum. Every six months SGIC has a workshop with the individual forums to discuss a range of matters and issues. The minutes of the forum meetings are provided to SGIC as part of the regular reporting process and any particular issues are drawn out and highlighted in the bi-monthly report presented to SGIC by the Independent Chair, Programme /Implementation Manager and Strategic Adviser.

Appendix 6. Governance & Advisory Forums Terms of Reference *(Continued)*

6.7 Housing Affordability Forum *(Continued)*

Information Provision and Feedback:	Relevant draft reports, ideas, submissions, and proposed initiatives are provided to the Forum for discussion and input prior to matters going to SGIC for decision-making. These may be part of a meeting agenda item, or if between meetings, circulated by email to the Forum Chair, for feedback.
Meetings:	Attendance and Presentations The Independent Chair, Programme/Implementation Manager and Strategic Advisor may attend meetings from time to time, provide written reports, advice and seek input on various matters. SGIC members may also be invited to attend the Forum from time to time. Frequency The Forum will meet as required, prior to the SGIC meeting to provide information and feedback on specific issues directly relating to Strategy implementation. Servicing The Forum will be serviced by SmartGrowth through the Programme/Implementation Manager for matters including venues, agenda circulation, minute-taking and report materials. Chair A chair will be appointed by the Forum



Appendix 6. Governance & Advisory Forums Terms of Reference (Continued)

6.7

Housing Affordability Forum

Purpose:	The purpose of the Housing Affordability Forum ('the forum') is to provide a mechanism for SmartGrowth to progress initiatives to improve the affordability of housing in the sub-region. The forum will enable direct participation into the implementation, monitoring and review of SmartGrowth, in collaboration with the strategy partners and lead agencies into the range of challenges facing the sub-region in relation to improving the affordability of housing.
Role:	The role of the Housing Affordability Forum ('the forum') is as follows: • Identification of potential strategy actions across the range of key determinants that impact on housing affordability • Leading the implementation of specific strategy actions as agreed e.g. pilot project • Raise awareness and educate stakeholders and the general public • Supporting the delivery of other partner projects relating to housing affordability • Monitoring of all relevant strategy actions. • Development of policies by the SmartGrowth Partners relating to housing affordability • Making representations/submissions to local, regional and national Government in relation to housing affordability
Membership:	The Housing Affordability Forum has representation from the following groups/industries/sectors: • Development community • Local authorities (council officers and elected members) • Economic Development specialists • Planning and urban design specialists • Community Housing Trusts • Real estate sector • PATAG • Tangata whenua • Relevant central Government agency • SmartGrowth Programme/Implementation Manager
Key Principles	The key principles underpinning the establishment of the Housing Affordability Forum are: • The provision of sufficient affordable housing to provide for low to medium income residents as well as support the region's future labour force; • Acceptance that, without intervention, the market will be unable to provide adequate affordable housing; and • Recognition of the different spatial and cultural needs of residents.
Other SmartGrowth Forums and the SmartGrowth Implementation Management Group (IMG) – Linkages and Reporting:	The Chair of the forum will represent the group on the SmartGrowth Strategic Partners Forum and any other SmartGrowth Forums as required. The minutes will be provided to the SmartGrowth IMG for information and for action as required. Meeting minutes and reports for each of the SmartGrowth Partner Forums will be available to the other forums.
SmartGrowth Implementation Committee (SGIC) – Linkages and Reporting:	The forum members are able to present to the SGIC at any of the formal meetings with agreement of SGIC Chair and at any agreed workshops, held between SGIC and the forum. Every six months SGIC has a workshop with the individual forums to discuss a range of matters and issues. The minutes of the forum meetings are provided to SGIC as part of the regular reporting process and any particular issues are drawn out and highlighted in the bi-monthly report presented to SGIC by the Independent Chair, Programme /Implementation Manager and Strategic Adviser.

Appendix 6. Governance & Advisory Forums Terms of Reference *(Continued)*

6.7 Housing Affordability Forum *(Continued)*

Information Provision and Feedback:	Relevant draft reports, ideas, submissions, and proposed initiatives are provided to the Forum for discussion and input prior to matters going to SGIC for decision-making. These may be part of a meeting agenda item, or if between meetings, circulated by email to the Forum Chair, for feedback.
Meetings:	Attendance and Presentations The Independent Chair, Programme/Implementation Manager and Strategic Advisor may attend meetings from time to time, provide written reports, advice and seek input on various matters. SGIC members may also be invited to attend the Forum from time to time. Frequency The Forum will meet as required, prior to the SGIC meeting to provide information and feedback on specific issues directly relating to Strategy implementation. Servicing The Forum will be serviced by SmartGrowth through the Programme/Implementation Manager for matters including venues, agenda circulation, minute-taking and report materials. Chair A chair will be appointed by the Forum

