

Locational Framework

Key Drivers/Attributes	High growth, high cost land, good job proximity, Tier 1 social services, poorer affordability			←————→	Low growth, low cost land, limited job proximity, Less access to social services, higher affordability
Problem this presents	We need to help our Public Housing customers access housing supply				
	Main Growth Centres	Regional Centres	Regional Hubs	Small Towns	
Typically	Well Served Main Urban Areas	Well Served Moderate Growth Areas	Moderately Served Moderate Growth Areas	Poorly Served Low Growth Areas	
Locations F=HUD public housing focus area	Christchurch, Greater Wellington, Auckland, Tauranga (F), Hamilton (F), Wellington City, Queenstown Lakes	Dunedin, Napier (F) and Hastings (F), Nelson and Blenheim, New Plymouth, Whangarei (F).	Ashburton, Gisborne (F), Greymouth, Invercargill, Kaitiaki (F), Palmerston North (F), Rotorua (F), Timaru, Whakatane, Whanganui (F)	- Small towns across NZ (incl Rural Northland)	
Long Term Hsing Affordability	Low	Low - Moderate	Moderate	Moderate-High	
Current Hsing Affordability	Low			Moderate	
Demand – Housing Register	High (especially in HUD public housing focus areas)			Low	
KO Housing Presence	Grow in line with Planning and Investment Intentions			Maintain or reduce portfolio size, growth in partnership with local community providers	
State Housing Investment Strategy	Focus investment on housing quality & growth, consider investment to improve long term returns			Focus investment on housing quality and building local partnerships	
Investment Approach	Builds, acquisitions, leases, maintenance, capital improvements, retrofit, community improvement as needed			Maintenance, capital improvements, retrofit, leases and case-by-case builds	
Ability to intensify the land	Significant	Often Limited		Little to None	
Land Release to Market	Active to support housing supply	Consider only in HUD focus areas or in line with agreed urban growth strategy			Nil
Redevelopment	Likely Strong	Likely Moderate		Likely Low	
Land Acquisition	Active to support growth and renewal profile where this offers best value for money			Nil	
KO Land Programme	Likely strong integration required	Case by case opportunity to source new state house land			Likely limited
Leasing	Maintain portfolio as market allows, tactical leasing to support programme objectives		Maintain/Reduce		Likely Exit
Retrofit	Likely Low-Moderate	Likely Moderate	Likely strong		
Replace strategy	Likely Strong	Likely Moderate	Likely Low		Nil
Divestment approach	Dispose all assets that are unsuitable, surplus to demand, not economically viable, or high value				
Divestment programmes	Vacant sales, Tenant Home Ownership		Vacant sales, Tenant, FHOS		
Sales/Replacement rate	As agreed in annual budgets				
Replace Sales?	Yes			Ideally in closest main centre or regional hub	
Utilisation/Mismatch	Actively resolve housing mismatches – especially overcrowding			Underutilise homes where prudent	
High value sales	Where > 120% market median	n/a			
Value Based Behaviours	Effectively managing change, innovative and cost efficient solutions, valuable partner for Māori, responding to climatic change, financially affordable and fully funded pathways				
Prioritise Interventions	Best value mix of interventions to achieve strategic outcomes required.				
Outcome	Ensuring a quality public and supported housing supply.				