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Chapter 1: Introduction

Housing not only provides a site for individuals, families and other household groups to meet, eat, and sleep, but it also plays a central role in the on-going expression of social structures and culture through providing a place for meetings, traditions, rituals, and other cultural expressions. The design of housing, from the broader urban planning level (eg: the way houses are clustered at neighbourhood and street level) through to the design and use of space at the unit or dwelling level impacts and influences these activities.

The housing stock of the Auckland region is predominantly a reflection of the European tradition of living in nuclear families, of the importance of ‘privacy’ and the concept of individual land ownership. As at the 2006 census, three-quarters of the housing stock in the region was separate stand-alone houses, and the majority of these houses were two or three bedroomed. However, the region’s population is increasingly ethnically and culturally diverse, through natural increase as well as in-migration, and the current housing stock is not always appropriate.

This report investigates the literature to date around housing design needs of two of the largest non-European ethnic groups in the Auckland region - Maori and Pacific peoples. While it is acknowledged that these two broad ethnic groupings are not exclusive (that is at the individual level, a persons identity with Maori or Pacific ethnicity will vary) and they are not necessarily homogenous this analysis has attempted to trace commonalities of experience that can lead to an understanding of housing design needs in these broader groups.
Chapter 2: Maori and Housing

2.1 Demographic Overview of Maori in the Auckland Region

In 2006, a total of 565,329 persons in New Zealand identified as Maori. The majority (84.4%) of Maori lived in urban areas, with a quarter (24.3% or 137,136 persons) living in the Auckland region. Within the region, the largest numbers live in Manukau city (33%), Auckland city (21.3%), followed by Waitakere city (16.4%), in line with the overall spread of population. Papakura district had the highest proportion of the local population who identified as Maori, at 26.5%.

The current high concentration of Maori in urban areas (and Auckland in particular) has not always been the case. Prior to World War II nearly 90% of Maori lived in rural areas and in most cases within their tribal domains (Meredith, 2002: 164). It was not until the end of World War II that the Maori population began to migrate to urban areas. The growth of manufacturing and industrial sectors in urban areas resulted in a growing demand for labour. The availability of jobs in these areas together with “complicit State policies that discouraged tribal association, provided relocation programmes, facilitated Maori land alienation and produced high rural unemployment” resulted in a significant demographic shift (Meredith 2002: 163). By 1961, a third (33%) of New Zealand’s Maori population lived in urban areas (Brookes, 1997: 244) and in 1970 this figure had increased to 80%. This demographic shift has had particular implications on the housing status and conditions for Maori – a topic that will be discussed in the following sections.

It is interesting to note that while the number of Maori living in the Auckland region has steadily increased over time, the proportion of the total population who identify as Maori has remained relatively stable – the proportion of Maori in 1991 was 11.1%, increased to 11.6% in 2001 and returned to 11.1% in 2006. This is a result of dramatic increases in numbers of other ethnic groups such as Asian and Pacific peoples in the region.

Maori have a relatively young age structure, with a third (35%) aged under 15 years, compared to 22% of the total population. (A similar pattern is found among Pacific peoples also as discussed later in this report).
2.2 Tenure Status among Maori

Home ownership rates among Maori have fallen since the 1950s in New Zealand – a trend that corresponds with the shift from rural to urban localities during the 1950s and 1960s. Prior to this transition, many rural Maori had owned their own home or land however, few retained their ownership status once they settled in urban areas. For example, in 1951 approximately 54% of the Maori population owned their own home but by 1981 this figure had dropped to 45% (FCSPRU et al 2006: 23-24).1 Even today, home ownership rates among Maori living in rural areas are higher than those living in urban areas.

As at the 2006 Census, the proportion of Maori aged 15 years and over who own or part own the home they live in (25.8%) is lower than the total regional population aged 15 years and over (47.5%). This means that a large number of Maori are renting the home in which they live.

Research suggests that while most Maori aspire to owning their own home, affordability has been the main barrier to achieving ownership. A report published in 2006 by the Family Centre Social Policy Research Unit (FCSPRU) and Research Centre for Maori Health and Development (RCMHD) investigated the housing trends and aspirations of Maori, and found that some Maori experience a trade off between living in better accommodation and being able to afford necessities such as food. Other barriers that were mentioned in the report include a lack of knowledge about home ownership, the inability to access services and information, difficulties fulfilling the criteria of lending institutions, high bureaucratic costs, low motivation and discrimination.

2.3 Maori Concepts of Housing – A Historical Overview

Within traditional Maori society the extended family (whanau), as well as hapu and iwi are centrally important and the marae (which is an important carrier of group and personal identity) has traditionally received greater architectural emphasis than individual dwellings, which hold a lower status. On the other hand Pakeha society tends to be centred on the nuclear family and therefore, more emphasis is placed on private dwellings – an important carrier of individual identity and place in society (Armitage, 1986). This is further expressed in the statement below:

---

1 This decline in home ownership rates was not experienced by all population groups. In fact, ownership rates for non-Maori increased from 70.8% to 72.9% between 1976 and 1981 (FCSPRU and RCMHD 2006: 24).
For, if “home” means to the Pakeha the focus of family life, the basis of self-esteem, a base for political action, a place of love, a source of authority and discipline, the location of people to whom one belongs, a place of refuge, of sleep, of nourishment, of attention, discussion, disagreement, caring, shelter, accommodation of guests, approval and rejection, then for the Maori this has not been provided by the house but rather by the marae. (Austin 1976: 199 cited in FCSPRU and RCMHD, 2006: 23)

When European settlers first arrived in New Zealand they had limited understanding of (or inclination towards) Maori values with regard to land and housing. As a result, Eurocentric notions of housing became imposed as a mechanism for ‘civilizing’ and assimilating Maori. The nature of this process is discussed in Wanhalla’s (2006) article as she shows how the poor health outcomes of Maori were often viewed as a manifestation of unhealthy customs and unsanitary living conditions. Many believed that by adopting western-style houses, Maori social and cultural practices could be transformed and better work habits, living conditions and health outcomes would result. Thus, housing became “a key site of official intervention and reform, and a point from which progress was judged in the adoption of western modes of living” (Wanhalla, 2006: 117).

Wanhalla (2006) also explored the differences between traditional Maori dwellings and western-style houses which caused design issues from the very start of colonialism. The Maori sleeping house (wharepuni) was a single-room dwelling built on the ground in which extended family slept together. The imposition of small, individual, two-bedroom houses by officials was considered “‘insufficient for the needs of the people’ at a time when Maori families were large and inter-generational in structure. The state and its officials, however, had little regard for the extended family model, with its agents often labelling it as ‘overcrowding’” (Wanhalla, 2006: 115).

Furthermore, officials did not adequately understand the Maori concept of tapu (restricted) and noa (accessible) which hold cultural significance to where activities and belongings are located (Wanhalla, 2006). For example, in traditional Maori culture, separate structures were built for sleeping, storing food, clothes and other belongings as well as separate sites for preparing food and communal outdoor cooking (Kohere, 2004). Western-style houses tended to ignore these traditional Maori values with all activities taking place under one roof (Kohere, 2004).

These housing differences were further emphasised when Maori urbanisation took place. Housing policy at that time enforced Maori households to be “pepper-potted” among Pakeha households as a means of integrating and conforming Maori to Pakeha social norms (Brookes, 1997: 246). One of the main

---

2 During the late half of the nineteenth century and the early twentieth century tuberculosis, whooping cough, measles and typhoid fever became a common problem for New Zealand’s population (Wanhalla, 2006). This caused rapid depopulation among the Maori population which enforced the belief that Maori were a “dying race” (Wanhalla, 2006: 101) and was used to further justify European superiority (Armitage, 1986).
challenges that Maori experienced during this transition was the absence of marae which had implications for how they functioned both socially and culturally (FCSPRU and RCMHD, 2006). Their ability to hold community gatherings, especially funerals became limited and adaptations had to be made. As a result, houses often became a “little marae” – living areas were cleared to make room for tangi (funeral) or for visiting guests to sleep, cooking facilities would be set up outside and carports or garages were used as eating spaces. (FCSPRU and RCMHD, 2006).

While considering the more traditional Maori concept of housing within the broader context of this report, it is important to note that the extent to which these attitudes hold true today varies. As the report by FCSPRU and RCMHD (2006) found, there are different conceptions of land and housing among Maori that range from a more traditional view where land and housing are associated with whakapa (genealogy) to views where land and housing are seen as providing security, status and economic needs. Regardless of these differences, FCSPRU and RCMHD (2006) argue that housing models that do not value the social, spiritual, cultural, historical and economic aspects of housing will probably be inadequate in addressing issues for Maori housing expectations and aspirations.

2.4 Housing Design Needs and Preferences of Maori

A number of studies have been conducted in recent years that explore the specific housing design needs and preferences of Maori (and as discussed later, Pacific people).³

The most comprehensive publication was undertaken by Hoskins et al. (2002) entitled Kit e Hau Kainga: New Perspectives on Maori Housing Solutions. This ‘design guide’ was prepared for Housing New Zealand Corporation (HNZC) to be used by planners and developers as they consider the diverse needs of Maori. It includes a number of design layouts for both the individual home as well as papakainga (community owned Maori land block or village). This was based primarily on discussions with reference group members and key informants. The design guide suggested two main housing solutions for Maori living in urban areas. These are:

- Urban/suburban whanau houses – individual houses that are planned to allow for a range of cultural and social dynamics within urban Maori society. These houses may include, for example, a whare tapiri (connected bedroom wing or sleep-out) or an extended family unit. Examples of these whanau houses can be seen in the Kit e Hau Kainga: New Perspectives on Maori Housing Solutions (page 19 and 20) which has been included in the appendix.

³ Some of them address broader issues of which housing design needs and preferences are only a small section.
• Urban/suburban Papakainga – infill or new housing developments with shared communal facilities that still maintain the privacy of individual dwellings. These development projects would need to take into account whanau, hapu and iwi requirements. For examples of urban/suburban papakainga, see Kit e Hau Kainga: New Perspectives on Maori Housing Solutions (page 5 and 6) in the appendix.

A second report comes from the Otara Housing Hui that was held in March 2001. Under the organisation of Otara Health Inc. and Housing Reference Group, discussions took place with approximately 50 community members to consider how housing in the Otara area might be changed to meet the local needs of the people. The hui did not intend to discuss how old houses could be adapted but rather how new housing stock could be designed more effectively to meet the cultural needs of those who will be living in them. Approximately 90% of the participants were either Maori or Pacific and while it focuses on the Otara area, it is applicable to all areas with Maori and Pacific communities.

The third report by FCSPRU and RCMHD (2006) also includes sections on design issues by providing a brief literature review on the topic and conducting interviews and focus group discussions with key informants and individuals. These three studies were reviewed and in general their findings are quite similar. The relevant design elements are discussed below.

**Housing Layout**

In general, housing designed for whanau should be open plan and adaptable to the changing needs of the whanau and fluctuating occupancies (FCSPRU and RCMHD, 2000; Hoskins *et al.*, 2002 and Otara Health Inc., 2001). This might involve the inclusion of a sleep out, multi purpose rooms or removable walls in bedrooms and living rooms. The following quote from one of the participants from the FCSPRU and RCMHD (2006) report emphasised this need for flexibility:

> We have been thinking the exact same thing, but it is not even split up into bedrooms, just reduces the cost factor, if they want to divide it up later themselves. Have one big bedroom with dividing walls between them, that sort of thing. If we can get them into that home, with a kitchen and a bathroom and they can get on OK there, if they want to split it up then they can do that. (FCSPRU and RCMHD 2006: 69)

**Outdoor Space**

Transitional indoor/outdoor living environments have a number of benefits including relieving pressure on internal areas and promoting healthy living as well as providing an area for large whanau gatherings and a covered area for children to play (Hoskins *et al.*, 2002 and Otara Health Inc., 2001).

---

* A summary of the results from this hui are included as a table in the appendix.
The Hoskins *et al.* (2002) guide and Otara Health Inc. (2001) also mentioned the provision of multiple outdoor connections including low windows and French doors in bedrooms and living rooms.

Outdoor cooking and dining is an important part of Maori culture and a covered area, preparation bench, large washing trough and a hangi site is needed for this (Hoskins *et al.*, 2002).

A number of outdoor communal spaces were mentioned in all three reports including a play area where children can be monitored by more than one whanau home and a communal vegetable garden with small plots for individual whanau houses to maintain ancestral gardening skills and promote healthy activity and healthy eating.

**Living Space**

The living room is used for a variety of purposes including a space where guests are welcomed and sleep, meetings and celebrations take place and where a deceased family member (tupapaku) will lie. As such, the living room should be large (approximately 5m x 6m) and able to accommodate up to 20 people (Hoskins *et al.*, 2002).

A secondary living space may also be appropriate especially when the main living room is being occupied by guests. This secondary space could be used by teenagers and children during whanau gatherings or as a spare bedroom for whanau who stay for an extended period of time (Hoskins *et al.*, 2002).

**Kitchen and Dining Area**

The kitchen should be large enough to accommodate two or more people which is particularly important when catering for large gatherings. The kitchen should have adequate storage space for bulk food and large pots. The dining room should be large and connected to both the kitchen and living room (Hoskins *et al.*, 2002).

**Bathrooms, Toilets and Laundry**

There should be at least two toilets in a house and they should be separate from the bathroom/s (FCSPRU and RCMHD, 2006 and Hoskins *et al.*, 2002). The bathrooms, toilets and laundry rooms should be separate from the kitchen area as having them located within close proximity is considered tapu (Hoskins *et al.*, 2002).

---

5 In accordance with Local Territorial Authority requirements.
Passageways
These are often seen as wasted space and instead, bedrooms could be located off the main living room area (FCSPRU and RCMHD, 2006).

Bedrooms
The bedrooms should be large enough for two or more children or two adults with a study space. While the maximum number of bedrooms will depend on the site, most can have a maximum of five bedrooms (Hoskins et al., 2002).
Chapter 3: Pacific Peoples and Housing

3.1 Demographic Overview of Pacific Peoples in the Auckland Region

During the 1950s and 1960s New Zealand experienced an economic boom. The rapid development of new industries and manufacturing sites resulted in a shortage of unskilled and semi-skilled labour. The neighbouring Pacific Islands were seen as an ideal source for this labour shortage and by 1972, there were over 50,000 Pacific people in New Zealand. The majority of these first generation migrants settled in the Auckland region, particularly in inner-city Auckland areas such as Grey Lynn, Ponsonby and Herne Bay. This concentration was not only due to cheap housing and the work opportunities available in nearby areas but also the establishment of the first Pacific ethnic church in New Zealand, Newton PIPC Church, which played an important role in the lives of these new immigrants (Anae, 2004).

However, the government’s restructuring of the 1980s and 1990s, together with the rapid increase in house prices in the inner-city, resulted in the displacement of many Pacific people from these central areas (Friesen, 2006). This process of displacement had further accelerated in the mid 1990s as house prices in the area began to exceed that of the average house in the Auckland metropolitan area (Latham, 2003). The majority of the displaced Pacific population resettled in the southern and western parts of the region where communities have become well established.

As at the 2006 Census, two thirds of all Pacific peoples in New Zealand lived in the Auckland region. The largest groups were Samoan (87,834 people) followed by Tongan (40,140), Cook Islands Maori (34,368) and Niuean (17,667). Almost half of Pacific people in the Auckland region (86,620 or 49%) live in Manukau city, 28% in Auckland city and 15% in Waitakere city. It is also interesting to note that Manukau City is the only major city in New Zealand where the majority of the population is non-European (Friesen, 2006).

The age structure of Pacific population in the region is relatively young, due to high fertility rates and larger family sizes. In 2006, over a third (37%) of Pacific peoples in the region were children aged less than 15 years old compared with 22% of the total population. Put another way, about one fifth (22%) of all children aged under 15 years in the region has at least one Pacific ethnicity.

As the Pacific population settles into the region from generation to generation, an increasing proportion is born in New Zealand. By 2006, over half (56.8%) of all Pacific peoples in the region were born in New Zealand – this proportion varies within specific Pacific groups.
3.2 Tenure Status and Housing Aspirations among Pacific Peoples

Rates of home ownership among Pacific peoples in the Auckland region are low. As at the 2006 Census, less than a quarter of all Pacific groups owned, or partly owned, the residence in which they lived, compared with 43.9% of the regional population. This means that large proportions of the Pacific population are renting.

A study by Koloto and Associates Ltd. *et al.* (2007) on housing experiences of Pacific people showed that in 2006, 67% of the Pacific population were renting – a rate that has steadily increased since 1991 and is well above the national average (2007: 25). Of the 67% approximately 43% are private rentals while 37% are from Housing New Zealand (Koloto and Associates Ltd. *et al.*, 2007: 3).

The study also found that while many Pacific people desire to own their own home they experience a number of barriers to achieving this. These barriers include financial barriers (for example, lower than average incomes), cultural barriers (in terms of financial obligations) and information barriers (a lack of accessible and culturally appropriate information on housing). The report also suggested that achieving these aspirations were not only subject to personal constraints but also to what the market is willing to supply. There appear to be matching problems regarding what is affordable and what is being supplied by the market. This discrepancy has also been observed in studies elsewhere, for example, ‘Alatini (2004) and Macpherson (1997).

3.3 Pacific Culture and Housing

The Pacific population living in Auckland have retained strong ties to their culture which in turn has had implications for their housing needs and tenure status. Some of these cultural factors include larger-sized families, extended family living, frequent gatherings and certain cultural obligations (Koloto and Associates Ltd. *et al.* (2006)). These are discussed in some more detail below.

**Larger Family Sizes and Extended Family Living**

As mentioned previously, Pacific people tend to have larger family sizes and live in extended family households. Many Pacific households are not fixed in terms of numbers of people and numbers are continuously changing (Otara Health Inc., 2001). For example, it is not uncommon for households to accommodate multiple generations (Grey, 2001) or to host overseas guests for both short and extended periods of time (Koloto and Associates Ltd. *et al.*, 2006).
There are a few reasons behind this. For many, the decision to live with extended family is based on the desire to provide mutual support for each other and to manage migration by family members (Koloto and Associates Ltd. *et al.* 2006). Cheer *et al.* (2002) discovered during their research among Pacific people that asking participants why they lived with extended family was a very Palangi (European) oriented question because for many Pacific people, this was considered a very ‘natural’ aspect of family life.

Other studies have pointed to quite different results. Poland *et al.* (2007) discussed some of the results gathered from the first year of the *Pacific Islands Families: The First Two Years of Life (PIF) Study* in relation to extended family living. Part of the study looked at the reasons why participants chose to live with their extended family and the most common response were financial reasons for the nuclear family (38%) followed by the need to take care of extended family (21%) and financial reasons for the extended family (16%). Only 3% of respondents said they lived with their extended family for cultural reasons.

As such many have argued (see Cheer *et al.*, 2002 and Grey, 2001) that extended family living arrangements do not always occur out of choice but rather out of necessity due to affordability issues and constrained housing options. Family obligations and financial constraints have often limited Pacific people’s ability to move to larger houses or modify their existing house and this is particularly true among low-income households (Grey, 2001 and Koloto and Associates Ltd. *et al.*, 2006).

**Frequent Gatherings**

Pacific people often use their home to host large family gatherings and a range of community activities such as funerals and meetings. In many cases, these gatherings are expected regardless of whether a house is small or not appropriately designed for such an occasion (Otara Health Inc., 2001) and as much of the literature shows, most of the homes occupied by Pacific people are not designed to host such large gatherings. Furthermore, the large numbers of people who live and pass though these homes have put pressure on the physical facilities of the house which has sometimes resulted in overworked cooking and hot water systems leading to failures (Macpherson, 1997).

While certain occasions could potentially be held at another venue (away from the home), ‘Alatini (2004) notes the difficulties of finding an appropriate site for these events in terms of size, price and location. Added to these difficulties is the fact that often these venues do not take into account the “Pacific notion of time, commonly known as ‘Island time’” (‘Alatini, 2004: 93).

---

* The PIF study was a longitudinal investigation of 1,398 infants born in the year 2000 at Middlemore Hospital, South Auckland with at least one parent who identified themselves as being of a Pacific ethnicity and with New Zealand permanent residency. Interviews were conducted with the primary caregiver of the child.
Financial Obligations

Three main financial costs associated with cultural obligations were identified in Cheer \textit{et al.} (2002) and include funeral costs, church donations and remittances. In their study it was found that many Pacific people would go to extremes in order to fulfil these cultural obligations even if the needed finances were not available. In some cases, meeting cultural obligations resulted in taking out loans with interest rates of up to 40\% or ‘discounting’ food and utility bills (Cheer \textit{et al.}, 2002).\footnote{The term ‘discounting’ was used in Cheer \textit{et al.} (2002) to imply the practice of foregoing or substituting one good or service for another.} These cultural obligations, combined with households experiencing lower incomes means that tenure status as well as the quality of the house they dwell in is often affected.\footnote{\textit{Alatini} (2004) and Koloto and Associates Ltd. \textit{et al.} (2007), point out that cultural obligations can be seen as both a positive and a negative aspect. While it may put financial strain on households, Pacific people can also turn to their extended family for financial help during times of need.}

3.4 Housing Design Needs and Preferences of Pacific People

While there are a number of studies that investigate the housing challenges and needs of Pacific people, many of these focus on the issue of affordability, poor housing conditions and the health implications associated with these. Very few studies address design issues and preferences. The following section will primarily focus on two reports that have been published in relation to the specific design needs of Pacific people.

The first report is the \textit{Pacific Housing Design Guide} (2002) which was developed by Faumuina and Associates for HNZC with the purpose of improving understanding of the housing and cultural needs of Pacific people and providing appropriate solutions. The research involved a review of the literature and consultation with Pacific Reference group members and participants from the Pacific community. The second report is the Otara Health Inc. (2001) report that was reviewed in the section on Maori housing design needs. Their findings are discussed below.

Several aspects that are presented below are not limited to Pacific households, and will also hold for Maori, as well as other groups within the wider community.

Durability of Housing

As mentioned before, the standard New Zealand home has not been designed to cope with the pressures of larger families. The numbers of person living in the dwelling can be relatively large – for
example, a study undertaken by Cheer et al. in 2002 found up to 15 people living together. Such living arrangements often put pressures on the physical facilities of the house which can lead to failure and add to financial burdens (Macpherson, 1997). As such, Faumuina and Associates (2002) highlight the need for houses to be built using durable materials not just with regard to the structure of the house but also the internal fixtures and fittings.

Location of the House
Faumuina and Associates (2002) reported that the position of the house is important, and that ideally, it should be positioned to maximize exposure to the sun to ensure solar gain. A master plan should be made for each house that will allow for future extensions on the property to be made. The Otara Health Inc. report (2001) also stated that houses should be positioned at ground level, as this will make the home more accessible for older people and those with less mobility. It will also help to keep the house warmer during winter.

Outdoor Space
Three important aspects of outdoor space were highlighted in the Pacific Housing Design Guide (Faumuina and Associates, 2002). These were landscaping and vegetable gardens, outdoor cooking space and suitable fencing.

- While landscaping is an important visual enhancer for any house, vegetable gardens are particularly important for economic, health and cultural reasons.
- For many Pacific people an underground cooking space is important because it allows food to be cook in a traditional way and to extend hospitality to guests during large gatherings. ‘Alatini (2004) notes that according to Tongan culture, a feast is not complete without a roast pig and yams.
- Suitable fencing is also important for both security and privacy reasons.

The Housing Report: 1999 by the Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs also recommends that driveways should not be shared between neighbours. If each house had a separate driveway, it would be easier to line cars up particularly when large family gatherings occur.

Kitchen and Dining Area
Kitchens need to be large enough to accommodate larger families and frequent visitors. Ideally, the kitchen should be big enough for two or three people to be working in the area at the same time. Having adequate storage space is also necessary for bulk supplies of food and cooking ware (Faumuina and Associates (2002)).

---

9 The household size ranged from 2 and 15 people with a mean of 6.5 people. The national mean recorded around that time (1998) was 2.7 people per household.
The Main Room
The main room is important and usually seen as a formal space where guests can be entertained. It is often used for a variety of purposes which include a living room, meeting room, dining room, sleeping room and relaxing room (Otara Health Inc., 2001). As such, the room needs to be large and adaptable. The Faumuina and Associates (2002) report suggests a number of criteria in order to maintain flexibility. Ideally, the room should have:

- multiple entries to allow for visitors to depart formal occasions without causing inconvenience to others
- a visual and physical connection to outdoor areas to ease pressure on internal space and promote a healthier lifestyle. This is also useful so that adults can monitor children when they are playing outside
- the ability to temporarily separate formal and informal living areas so that both places can be used for different purposes or so that a larger space can be created
- be located separately from cooking spaces to avoid interruption during formal occasions.

Bedrooms
There are two main factors relating to bedrooms in Pacific households:

- Most Pacific cultures separate the living quarters of single females and males
- Pacific households tend to be fluid and therefore need to be flexible in terms of how many people the house can accommodate.

The Faumuina and Associates (2002) Pacific Housing Design Guide recommends that a minimum of five to six sleeping areas be available for busy times when there are lots of family members or friends visiting. This may involve flexible walls to be built between rooms so that they can be partitioned or opened up to create larger rooms. Storage areas are also important so that large items such as fine mats can be stored when not in use.

Bathrooms and Toilets
The larger household-sizes of most Pacific people means that a separation between the bathroom and toilet will help to ease the pressure for their use (i.e. two people can use them at once). Bathrooms and toilets should also be located away from formal spaces and at least one should be accessible for the disabled or elderly with a minimum width of 1.20m.

Passageways
A wide main entry into the house is important especially when a death in the family has occurred because it allows for the coffin to be carried through the main entrance with ease. Ideally this main entry point should lead directly into the lounge. A secondary entrance way into the house (for example, a side or back door) is preferred as it can be used for informal occasions to preserve the sanctity of the main entrance (Faumuina and Associates, 2002). Further, Faumuina and Associates recommended corridors should be a minimum width of 1.10m.

**Multi-use Spaces**

The *Pacific Housing Design Guide* (2002) suggests three alternative ‘utility’ spaces that can be used for multi-purpose rooms. These include loft space, verandas and garages.

### 3.5 Challenges Associated with Housing Design in New Zealand

For Pacific people, the fundamental challenge associated with New Zealand’s housing design is that most houses have been designed to meet the needs of the dominant ethnic group (the Pakeha or European population) (Macpherson, 1997 and Otara Health Inc., 2001). In general, Pakeha households tend to live in smaller, nuclear family units that are only loosely affiliated with other kinship and community groupings while Pacific communities, such as Samoan and Tongan, tend to have larger households with a constantly changing composition (‘Alatini, 2004 and Macpherson, 1997).

It is common among Pacific groups to host large family and community activities in their home and in many cases there is simply not enough room to accommodate for so many people. This mismatch in terms of what Pacific people want and what the market has supplied means that many Pacific people have resorted to the use of garages as a solution to the inadequacies of the standard New Zealand home. The evolution of this trend from ‘garage space’ to ‘social space’ has been documented in Macpherson (1997) for the Samoan community and ‘Alatini (2004) for the Tongan community.

For these cultural groups (and others), the garage has been, and still is, a cost effective and simpler alternative to acquiring more indoor space. During earlier settlement for the Samoan community, garages were used as a space for unmarried men to sleep, informal entertainment, large meetings, informal living areas, social events, kava ceremonies, chapel services, language ‘nests’, bingo and music studios (Macpherson, 1997). However, as affordability becomes a greater issue, garages have been increasingly used as temporary accommodation for extended family members who are unable to afford their own place (Macpherson, 1997).
Chapter 4: Intensive Housing

There is evidence to suggest that there is a lack of suitable housing that meet the needs of Maori and Pacific people and that more consideration needs to be given to their preferences. However, based on the literature reviewed for this report it is not possible to make any conclusive comments regarding whether or not Maori and Pacific people have a demand for more intensive housing. More primary research would need to be conducted to fully understand their perspectives towards intensive housing and the reasoning behind their attitudes. There is evidence that points in both directions and these are discussed in the sections below.

Evidence against Intensive Housing

While there is nothing in the literature that explicitly states that Maori and Pacific people do not have a demand for intensive housing, there is strong evidence to suggest that intensive housing is not a preference. Firstly, the report by Hoskins et al. (2002) clearly stated that Maori have a preference for low residential developments. Secondly, the report by Koloto and Associates et al. (2007: 28) stated that in 2006, 92% of Pacific households that owned a home lived in a separate house while only 6% lived in a flat. There are also a number of other general indicators that allude to the idea that intensive housing is not a preference. For example:

- There is a lack of discussion in the literature reviewed on intensive housing and this could, by default, imply an aversion by Maori and Pacific people to intensive housing.
- Intensive housing tends to compact the living space within a dwelling. However, the literature shows that most Maori and Pacific people desire larger homes with larger living spaces and more bedrooms to accommodate larger families and extended family living.
- There are particular cultural and social practices among Maori and Pacific people that are best suited for single dwellings. For example, holding large meetings or family gatherings that require space for adults to gather but at the same time outdoor areas for children to play under supervision.
- More intensive housing may pose mobility issues especially when caring for elderly and physically handicapped but also during funerals when caskets are usually carried into the home and left there for a particular span of time.

Evidence for Intensive Housing

The literature suggests opportunities for intensive housing in the future include:

- The Koloto et al. (2007) report discussed how the demand for housing in the Manukau area has changed from a three bedroom stand-alone house to one and two bedroom homes and larger houses. If this is true, further research needs to be done to investigate exactly who are
demanding these smaller homes and whether or not more intensive housing will appropriately meet their requirements.

- The desire for extended family living and to live within close proximity to family and associated community may provide opportunities for new housing designs that are more intensive but also take into account the desired features of single dwellings. The extended whanau whare model in Hoskins et al. (2002) is a good example of how this can be achieved.

- Younger Maori and Pacific people may be more accepting of more intensive housing than earlier generations.

- Activities such as gardening and outdoor food preparation and cooking can become more difficult as housing intensifies because these activities are best suited for single dwelling properties. However, these activities can potentially take place in a communal (public) space within close proximity to the dwelling. When cultural preferences such as these are taking into account intensive housing may be more culturally and socially accommodating.
Cultural and demographic differences have implications on the housing designs required by both Maori and Pacific groups. For example the concept of tapu and noa in Maori culture, and the importance of extending hospitality in Pacific culture have impacts on space requirements. Differences in the demographic and household characteristics of these population groups also impact on housing requirements. Maori and Pacific households tend to be large and to have many children.

As discussed in Schrader (2005), many of the design elements required by Maori and Pacific people are compatible with other cultural groups and are not exclusively desired by Maori and Pacific people. In fact, the market does supply houses that meet their requirements, however, affordability is a big issue and generally these houses are located relatively far from family and associated communities. Thus, it appears that a mismatch exists because it is difficult to find a house that meets design requirements at an affordable price and appropriate location.

Looking forward, it is anticipated that Maori and Pacific ethnic groups will continue to be a significant part of the Auckland regional population. According to Statistics New Zealand ethnic projections, New Zealand’s Māori, Asian and Pacific populations are projected to continue growing faster than the European or Other (including New Zealander) population. Nationally, the Māori population is projected to increase by an average of 1.4% a year from an estimated 620,000 in 2006 to 820,000 in 2026; and the Pacific population by 2.4% a year from 300,000 to 480,000. The growth of the Māori and Pacific populations is driven by births, which can be attributed to higher fertility rates and a young age structure. The latter also provides a built-in momentum for future growth. By comparison, the expected slower growth of the ‘European or Other’ population largely reflects lower fertility rates and an older age structure.

Further Research

Further research will help to reveal the nuances and differences within Pacific and Maori groups with regard to inter-generational shifts and changes in cultural practise and expectations, and the impacts this has on housing requirements. Further research could also be undertaken to investigate the level of current and future demand among Maori and Pacific people for intensive housing.

In doing any further work, consideration should be given to the following issues:
**Maori and Pacific groups are not homogenous** - Cultural values are not held consistently among all individuals and care must be taken to avoid seeing Maori and Pacific communities as homogeneous groups. Most of the literature does not adequately take into account the growing complexity of these populations. As an example, Pacific people are becoming increasingly represented among the middle-class (see Anae, 2004), are increasingly marrying outside their own ethnic group and a greater proportion of the population are now New Zealand-born. 10 There is likely to be a mix of preferences among different segments of the population.

**Supply-side issues** - There is a gap in the research regarding the supply-side issues experienced by private developers in meeting the housing needs of Maori and Pacific people and research could be done that investigates the real and perceived constraints that they face.

---

10 For example, while in 1973 only 38% were born in New Zealand, this had increased to 50% in 1991 and to 60% in 2006 (Callister and Didham, 2007: 5).
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### Appendix: Housing design issues from the Otara Housing Hui (2001)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concerns</th>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>Solutions</th>
<th>Emerging Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Size of dining rooms</td>
<td>Larger people larger whanau/fanau/aiga</td>
<td>Larger dining rooms</td>
<td>Food as a social dimension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of space for teenagers</td>
<td>Teenagers leave home later than in Pakeha families</td>
<td>Multi use spaces or breakout space</td>
<td>Inter-generational occupancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough rooms for whanau meetings/gatherings</td>
<td>Whanau are based on collective decision making</td>
<td>Larger rooms</td>
<td>The home is part of the whanau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cold during winter</td>
<td>Don’t make use of heaters because of cost</td>
<td>Passive solar heating</td>
<td>Total occupancy costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toilet near public spaces</td>
<td>Odour problems and privacy issues</td>
<td>Toilets in more discrete parts of the house</td>
<td>Public v private parts of the house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special corners to sit matai</td>
<td>VIGs (very important guests) come into home for cultural practice</td>
<td>Design of house to replicate meeting houses</td>
<td>Social role of house in the wider community (outside extended family)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited use of bedrooms – living room preferred for sleeping</td>
<td>Warmer (fireplace) and Sky TV</td>
<td>Larger living rooms</td>
<td>Public v private parts of the house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House up North or somewhere else</td>
<td>Suburban house is not our tarangawaewae</td>
<td>Is there a solution?</td>
<td>The question of having two homes – one it Otara and the other where I was born or where my people are from.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Few cultural events at home</td>
<td>Home is place for the family to live in</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Cultural practices differ between Pacific cultures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of house during a death in the family</td>
<td>Deceased are mourned at home – rooms are too small to handle large number of guests</td>
<td>Large living room</td>
<td>Peak demands on the house – only every few years not often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doors and passageways too narrow for coffins</td>
<td>Deceased whanau/fanau/aiga normally come home for a period. Coffins are often large.</td>
<td>Use of French doors or ranch-sliders into living rooms and/or bedrooms</td>
<td>The role of the house at time of death and mourning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houses designed for people of medium not heavy build</td>
<td>Pacific people are often of a bigger build – greater wear and tear on house</td>
<td>Consider bigger circulation/work spaces and higher specs on materials</td>
<td>Different physiology different house design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy access in and out of house</td>
<td>Raised floors less accessible. Wooden floors noisy. Underfloor spaces create a problem with pests</td>
<td>Concrete at ground level floors</td>
<td>At ground level floors – similarity to traditional houses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional bedrooms</td>
<td>Extended family living can mean two adults and</td>
<td>More bedrooms in houses</td>
<td>Some preference for living communally as an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerns</td>
<td>Reasons</td>
<td>Solutions</td>
<td>Emerging Themes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>three or four children per bedroom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>extended family. Obligations to children = extending obligations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matai status of some people places additional demands on their homes</td>
<td>Houses being visited continuously from 8am – 1am</td>
<td>Larger social spaces in houses</td>
<td>The use of houses for wider social occasions and cultural practices. For Samoan these practices are house based rather than community facility based.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside spaces too small to cater for needs</td>
<td>Space required for outside cooking</td>
<td>More useable outside space – not necessarily more space</td>
<td>Outdoor cooking as a cultural practice and as a response to peak demand from visitors/ non household members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitors for people when they are terminally ill.</td>
<td>Cultural practice</td>
<td>Question location of person – living room or bedroom – response not know</td>
<td>Custom of visits at times of stress for support etc. Question of manaakitanga.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care for grandchildren</td>
<td>Extended Obligations</td>
<td>More space more bedrooms.</td>
<td>Extended obligations – the permanent presence of children in houses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of veranda</td>
<td>For overflow space especially for children and during wet weather and</td>
<td>Include verandas</td>
<td>Inside/outside usage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separate sleeping spaces for boys and girls. Boys end up sleeping in left-over spaces</td>
<td>Strong cultural value that boys should respect their sisters’ privacy</td>
<td>Needs for more bedrooms and multi-use spaces</td>
<td>Flexible spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children having quiet spaces to sleep and to do homework</td>
<td>Social/Cultural events in the house often make it difficult to for children to sleep or study</td>
<td>Quiet bedrooms or breakout spaces.</td>
<td>Public v private spaces Quiet v noisy spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separate bath and shower</td>
<td>Shower over the bath can be dangerous (slipping) and do not allow for maximum use of washing facilities</td>
<td>Separate shower and bath, preferably in different rooms</td>
<td>Flexible use of spaces to provide multi purpose rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teenagers</td>
<td>Inter-generational tension made worse by small living spaces.</td>
<td>Use garages and sleepouts</td>
<td>Noisy v quite spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location of house</td>
<td>Generally happy with location – close to family friends shops, (cheap food), good neighbours</td>
<td>Otara is a great place to live</td>
<td>Value of location and location factors to make a house a good home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Road safety for children and security from burglaries are a general</td>
<td>Greater emphasis by Council on safe driving and safe streets – all</td>
<td>Safety is a universal concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerns</td>
<td>Reasons</td>
<td>Solutions</td>
<td>Emerging Themes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>concern</td>
<td>Otara neighbours have children living in them. Security systems to reduce the burglary risk.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared facilities</td>
<td>Some value seen in sharing facilities especially outdoor spaces and open cooking areas</td>
<td>Fewer fences and unusable side yards</td>
<td>Need for ample outdoor space. Make outdoor spaces more usable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership</td>
<td>Owning your home gives your whanau/fanau greater security</td>
<td>Encourage more widespread home ownership</td>
<td>Tenure is an important determinant of housing satisfaction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>