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**Executive summary**

Waimahia Inlet is an affordable housing development located on the edge of the Manukau Harbour, 23 km south of the Auckland CBD and 5km southwest of Manukau City centre. Tāmaki Makaurau Community Housing Limited (TMCHL), an incorporated body comprising the Tāmaki Collective, Te Tumu Kāinga, Community of Refuge Trust (CORT) and the New Zealand Housing Foundation, has governance and management responsibilities for the development.

On completion, Waimahia Inlet will be Aotearoa’s largest third sector housing development comprising 295 dwellings, approximately 70% of which will be either assisted home-ownership (shared-equity and rent-to-buy) or homes retained by the community housing providers (CHP) as affordable rental accommodation. The development arose out of the shared interests of the consortium partners to provide good-quality, affordable housing for lower income New Zealand households. The report, prepared with the assistance of consortium partners, documents the establishment phase of the Waimahia Inlet development.

**Context**

Housing affordability is a major public and political concern in Auckland. In September 2013 central government passed the Housing Accords and Special Housing Areas Act (2013) (HASHAA), designed to increase land and housing supply and speed up development processes. In October 2013 the Auckland Housing Accord was signed by Auckland Council and central government. Waimahia Inlet was designated as the first special housing area (SHA), although planning of the development was already in train.

Concurrently, a programme of state housing reform was underway. The Social Housing Reform Act (2014) had particular salience to the Waimahia development as it introduced a regulated third sector into the legislative framework for the provision of housing. To foster third sector capacity, the Act enabled community housing providers to register with the government’s Community Housing Regulatory Authority thereby accessing the same legislated powers as Housing New Zealand in relation to allocating and reviewing tenancies. More importantly, CHPs also gained access to the income related rent subsidy (IRRS), a policy change that is likely to increase the financial feasibility of CHPs. Under this model CHPs essentially become organisations comprising state, third sector and market elements. The passing of the Social Housing Reform Act (2014) has both symbolic and material significance for the community housing sector and is an important part of the Waimahia project’s policy context. Waimahia became not only the first SHA but also the first major third sector development undertaken after the Act passed into law.

The policy shifts taking place in social housing in New Zealand resonate with changes adopted elsewhere: the transfer of subsidised housing from the state to community or hybrid organisations; and the promotion of socially mixed communities through tenure mix.

**Methods**

There were three phases of research:

- Review of the consortium’s archive of documents relating to the establishment of the development;
• Five semi-structured Interviews with key informants from the New Zealand Housing Foundation, CORT, and Te Tumu Paeroa (formerly the Māori Trustee) on behalf of Te Tumu Kāinga (TTK). Topics covered included the process of engagement in the project and establishing the partnership, areas of value congruence (or not), and potential for future collaborations;
• Twelve interviews with incoming residents representing four tenure groups: open market sales, shared equity, rent-to-buy, and CHP rentals.

Key informant and incoming resident interviews were audiotaped, transcribed and analysed thematically.

Findings

A number of factors cohered to facilitate the formation of TMCHL and for the new entity to develop housing at Waimahia Inlet. These factors included: a chronic shortage of affordable housing in Auckland; a greenfield site owned by the crown in an area of high housing need; the signing of the Framework Agreement between the Crown and Ngā Mana Whenua o Tāmaki Makaurau (the Tāmaki Collective) which guaranteed the Collective the right of first refusal on Crown land intended for sale; emerging reforms in the social housing sector; and financial support from central government which provided capital for the consortium to begin work on the site in 2013.

Developer experiences: Consortium partners attributed the success of Waimahia to the structure of the consortium, the complementary organisational and professional strengths of consortium partners, and an alignment of values. The structure of the consortium, designed to accommodate the charitable and community-sector nature of the organisations involved, is seen as a key innovation. The TMCHL is the general partner of the development entity, Waimahia Inlet Neighbourhood Limited Partnership (WINLP). The WINLP comprises three limited partners - Te Tumu Kāinga, CORT and the New Zealand Housing Foundation – which are the main beneficiaries of the Crown grant for the development. The structure allows for transparency, accommodates the tax implications of the development for limited partners and allows for the addition of limited partners. The complementary strengths of consortium partners include Tāmaki Collective’s legal and financial expertise and the CHPs’ knowledge of the housing sector and experience of housing Māori and/or low income households. In addition to these organisational strengths the coherence of people-centred values and shared purpose across the organisations was considered fundamental to the effectiveness of the collaboration. The relatively straightforward approach to decision-making reported between partners was attributed to their strong value alignment.

Central government played an instrumental role in enabling the development. In addition to the crown grant, requirements prior to signing the Heads of Agreement contributed to refinements in the cost, funding, delivery and governance structures. SHA status was seen to have had positive spin-offs in terms of the TMCHL’s relationship with central government and in supportive actions taken by Auckland Council such as purchasing storm-water areas and pocket parks as well as facilitating negotiations with subsidiary organisations.

A strong, mixed tenure community at Waimahia is a goal shared by consortium partners and the ‘offtake’ agreements between TMCHL and the CHPs are an innovative mechanism to achieve a tenure mix. These agreements guarantee that limited partners (CHPs) will purchase up to 70% of the dwellings. This provides funding certainty to the development while also enabling CHPs to line up households suited to specific houses with rent-to-buy or shared equity schemes.
Resistance to the development in adjacent neighbourhoods was evident in the early stages with concerns centring on a loss of open space amenity, misplaced fears that high-density, high concentration social housing was planned, and disruptions related to construction. The consortium’s engagement with local residents is seen to have allayed these concerns.

*Resident experiences:* Residents learned about Waimahia Inlet development through a variety of channels. Owner occupiers mentioned word of mouth from whānau or other local people, news media and Trade Me. CHP rental tenants were generally taken from participating CHP wait lists and referral systems.

Across all tenure types the relative affordability of living at Waimahia inlet was the main motivation for moving into the development. An urgent need for secure, stable and affordable accommodation was foremost in the accounts of CHP rental tenants. Security of tenure was also valued highly. Without exception the offer of a home at Waimahia was regarded as a transformative event; unstable, unaffordable or otherwise untenable living arrangements were suddenly replaced by low-cost, high-quality housing in an attractive setting and with tenure security. For owner occupiers the chance to access affordable home ownership was pivotal; it was seen as “the opportunity of a lifetime”. Other attractions included proximity to whānau, the proactive development and promotion of community by TMCHL, and a belief that dwellings would be mostly owner occupied. Waimahia represented newness not only in terms of ‘bricks and mortar’, but also in terms of the ethos of the development and the promotion of community.

Residents’ experiences of the process of signing up for their new home, and their engagement with TMCHL and other organisations had been overwhelmingly positive for all tenure groups. Accounts of interactions with TMCHL suggested that relationships with CHP staff were highly significant for some residents, more than merely a legal or transactional arrangement.

All participants were enthusiastic about the quality and design of their new homes, even though a few had experienced maintenance issues and some had suggestions for minor modifications (eg added storage space). The small size of backyards was disliked by some residents but others noted that bigger public spaces were the trade-off and they liked the way that parks encouraged interaction with neighbours. The natural environment and waterfront reserve were clearly valued.

A narrative of a strong emerging community among the families and, consequently, mutual concern for the welfare of each other’s children, was evident. Parents described feeling more at ease letting their children play outside unsupervised at Waimahia than where they had lived previously for reasons including: less through-traffic, houses overlooking open spaces, and knowing the other residents. While the streets were generally considered safe the comings and goings of a construction site and large areas of unlit open space with limited passive surveillance were of concern. Some participants suggested that the “scattered” way in which each stage was being built, with completed houses in amongst building sites and vacant lots, may have contributed to a vulnerability to property crime. The formation of a neighbourhood watch group had been welcomed.

Children’s interactions had been a useful catalyst for establishing neighbourly relationships between many households. TMCHL-initiated social interactions (such as Residents’ Association meetings and resident barbecues) were also valued by the longer term
residents. Among the more recent arrivals opportunities for developing neighbourly relationships had been more limited but all participants expressed a desire to foster these in the future.

Attitudes to diversity and homogeneity were complex. Participants praised the tenure mix goal of the development and by extension social mix, but at the same time there was a strong privileging of the role of commonality in creating social cohesion with notions of people “like us” (on the path to home ownership) and being “all in the same boat” being prominent in discussions of how the community was developing. A shared cultural identify was of particular importance to Māori participants and connections formed around a local waka ama club were noted. Not all participants were aware that CHP rental tenancies could be part of the development and a number who had recently been tenants themselves had negative attitudes to rental tenure, particularly relating to detrimental impacts on the community. In the minds of many participants, their perception of Waimahia as a neighbourhood of owner occupiers also set it apart from the surrounding Weymouth area.

Membership of the Residents’ Association (established and supported by TMCHL) is specified on the title of the dwellings, and requires that residents adhere to a suite of bylaws regarding matters such as property maintenance and parking. The Association has periodic meetings and, in collaboration with TMCHL, runs barbecues and other community gatherings, and makes two communal lawnmowers available with a gold coin donation. Owner-occupier participants were all aware of the Association but rental tenants were not.

All participants expressed an intention to stay at Waimahia at least for the medium term, with some intending to live there for good.

Conclusions

Community formation is discernible at three levels at Waimahia Inlet: between the consortium partners; between the CHPs and the residents they are partnering with as joint owners or landlords; and amongst the incoming residents. The consortium partners specifically sought to develop a community among themselves in order to grow their capacity to deliver the Waimahia project and, potentially, future projects along these lines. The CHPs offer more than shelter with an ongoing commitment to and connection with residents evident in actions such as the establishment of the Residents’ Association and the support offered to CHP rental tenants. The residents themselves also articulate a desire to foster a very particular sort of living environment, a “real community,” a whānau, a return to an Arcadian past where a neighbourhood is a supportive and safe space.

The success of TMCHL in the rapid delivery of affordable housing for people in a range of socioeconomic circumstances has been facilitated by the collaborative and values-based approach of the consortium. Convergence and alignment are two key concepts at play in the Waimahia context. Converging agendas between the community housing sector, mana whenua, central government and Auckland Council enabled the development, while the aligned values of the consortium members enabled their effective collaboration. Alignment between the developers and the new residents in relation to community formation has further enhanced the project’s success to date.

TMCHL has piloted a structure and operating model that has thus far proved highly successful. This success is not only measurable in terms of dwellings built; the stories of incoming residents also demonstrate the emergence of a healthy and resilient community.
This case study indicates that TMCHL provides an instructive model for future community housing partnerships—particularly ones that might involve CHPs and post-settlement iwi. However, without significant financial investment from government further large-scale investments in affordable housing, which is essentially the provision of a social service, will be difficult for the consortium, or CHPs, to realise.
1. Introduction

This report presents the findings of a study of the establishment phase of the Waimahia Inlet housing development. The case study contributes to a broader project, Resilient Urban Futures, concerned with the social, economic and environmental performance of different models of urban development. Waimahia is interesting for a number of reasons: it is being carried out by a consortium of Māori organisations and community housing providers (CHPs), drawing on the complementary capacities of these groups and their shared interest in providing affordable, good-quality housing for those in need; it is the largest third sector housing project undertaken to date in Aotearoa, with 282 dwellings across a range of tenures, 70% of which are either assisted home-ownership (shared-equity and rent-to-buy) or retained by the community housing providers as affordable rentals;¹ and it was the first Special Housing Area designated under the Auckland Housing Accord, signed between central government and Auckland Council in September 2013.

A number of factors have cohered to enable Tāmaki Makaurau Community Housing Limited (TMCHL)²—the aforementioned consortium—to form, and for this new entity to develop a ground-breaking affordable housing development at Waimahia Inlet. These factors have included: the presence of a large greenfield site owned by the state in an area of high housing need; the signing of the Framework Agreement between the Crown and Ngā Mana Whenua o Tāmaki Makaurau; a chronic shortage of affordable housing in the Auckland region; emerging reforms in the social housing sector; and the availability of financial support from central government. This introductory section of the report will describe the relevance of these factors to the development of the Waimahia project.

With the assistance of the Waimahia development consortium (TMCHL) it has been possible for the research team to examine documents relating to the initiation of the development, negotiation with central government, and the planning and financing of the project. In addition, interviews with representatives of the community housing organisations who are party to the development and interviews with incoming residents have provided insight into the experiences of both developers and residents during this early phase of the Waimahia story.

1.1. The site

Waimahia Inlet is located in the suburb of Weymouth, 23km south of the Auckland CBD, 8km southeast of Auckland International Airport, and 5km southwest of Manukau City. The suburb lies within the Auckland Council’s Manurewa local board area. The location of the site in relation to the greater Auckland area and the local context are shown in the following maps.

---

¹ Both the total number of dwellings and the split between CHP and open market sales has changed since the primary research was conducted. At the time of writing 295 dwellings are planned for the development, of which 144 are completed and occupied. The proportion of CHP properties has also increased to 70%, with 30% of the development offered for sale on the open market.

² TMCHL comprises: the Tāmaki Collective; Te Tumu Kāinga (formerly the Auckland and Onehunga Hostels Endowment Trust) a CHP under the auspices of Te Tumu Paeroa (formerly the Māori Trustee); the New Zealand Housing Foundation; and Community of Refuge Trust (CORT) Community Housing.
The 16-hectare coastal site on the Weymouth peninsula had previously been a farm used by Weymouth Girls’ School for recreational activities. This institution provided residential care and education for young women on remand, suffering from mental health problems, or otherwise vulnerable. The facility included both secure and non-secure units (Dalley, 1998; Ministry of Social Development, 1994). The School was plagued by difficulties and closed in the early 2000s.

In 2006, 10 ha of the land was sold to Housing New Zealand Ltd (HNZ) for $5.7 million and the remaining land was sold to the Ministry of Education for approximately $2.5 million (Collins, 2006). The intention was for HNZ to develop a mixture of state, private and community-owned housing on its share of the site, while the Ministry of Education would build new premises for Te Wharekura o Manurewa, a kura kaupapa Māori (Māori immersion high school) then temporarily sited on the Manurewa marae (Collins 2006). Although in 2006 it was expected that the school would be built in the near future with the housing development at least underway within a few years, neither of these eventualities came to pass; Te Wharekura o Manurewa is still located at the Manurewa marae at the time of writing, and HNZ’s plans for the site did not proceed past the concept stage.

An aerial image of the site before the development began is shown below; this large green space had been used as a public recreation reserve by the local community for some time prior to the Waimahia development, with some community members grazing horses there after the closure of CYF facility. As discussed in the findings, the perceived loss of public amenity was a concern for some of the existing residents of Weymouth (section 4.5 below).
Members of the community housing sector in Auckland had regarded the site as presenting an opportunity to undertake a large development for some time, but had not succeeded in securing central government support for the idea. The Waimahia project was enabled by the signing of the Framework Agreement between the Crown and Ngā Mana Whenua o Tāmaki Makaurau (the Tāmaki Collective); this agreement guaranteed the Collective the right of first refusal on Crown land intended for sale. It was the offering of the Waimahia site to the Tāmaki Collective under the terms of this agreement that led to the collaborative enterprise documented below.

The site was purchased from the Crown by the consortium for $8.9 million in 2013 (Collins, 2014). The rateable valuation at that time (based on 2011 ratings) was $11.6 million, but it was not acquired at a discounted rate according to the key informants. Rather, the purchase price reflected an agreed value reached in negotiation with the Crown, and based on the local market context. The financial input from central government came in the form of a grant for $29 million from the Social Housing Unit, part of the Building and Housing Group within the Ministry for Building, Innovation and Employment (MBIE). This sum paid for the land and provided the consortium with working capital to begin the development, which was forecast to cost $120 million (Collins, 2014).

1.2. Political context

A range of political factors is pertinent to the Waimahia project, such as the Treaty redress negotiations alluded to above. Two stand out as of particular import however: the booming Auckland property market and associated affordability crisis, and the reform of the social housing sector by the current National-led government. A brief summary of these contextual issues follows.

1.2.1 Auckland’s housing ‘crisis’

House prices in Auckland have risen sharply in recent years, significantly outpacing wage and salary growth (NZPC, 2013; Parker, 2015). While the measurement and definition of ‘affordability’ is contested (Murphy, 2014), there can be little doubt that the current mean house price to household income ratio of more than nine places home-ownership out of the
reach of many individuals and households. This situation is reflected in the growing shift in the region away from owner-occupation and towards rental tenure (Goodyear and Fabian, 2014).

Housing affordability in Auckland has become an issue of major political significance for both central and local government in the last five years. Conflict between these levels of government has arisen over the appropriate mechanisms to remedy, or at least mitigate this problem (Austin, 2013; Austin et al., 2014; Murphy, 2015). As Austin (2013) notes, central government “frames housing affordability in narrow purchase price terms” (p.6) and characterises planning as the problem: it is viewed as a constraint on development and a disruptor of market forces (Austin, 2013). Local government in Auckland, by contrast, has typically demonstrated a broader conception of housing affordability, taking into account “transport costs, housing quality and environmental impacts” (Austin, 2013, p. 7). Where central government’s preferred approach to addressing housing affordability is to reduce regulation and fast-track planning processes, Auckland Council has advocated for compact development and has considered progressive policy options such as “value capture through a betterment levy and inclusionary zoning” (Austin, 2013, p.5). It is noteworthy, however, that these approaches have recently fallen somewhat out of favour with the Auckland Council. A recent report by the Council’s Chief Economist suggests a shift away from an understanding of planning as a solution to a shortage of affordable housing and towards the view that regulation is itself the primary barrier to housing affordability (Parker, 2015). This apparent shift in position has occurred since the signing of the Auckland Housing Accord and the notification of the Proposed Auckland Unitary Plan, both in late 2013.

In September 2013, central government passed the Housing Accords and Special Housing Areas Act (2013) (HASHAA), designed to enable central and local government to determine targets for new housing supply and to speed up development processes. While the purpose of the Act is “to enhance housing affordability by facilitating an increase in land and housing supply” (s2), there is no requirement that a specific proportion of dwellings constructed under its auspices are affordable, nor is there a definition of affordability (Austin 2013). Auckland was the only region included in the initial schedule of the Act, and in October 2013 Auckland Council and central government signed the Auckland Housing Accord. Waimahia Inlet was designated as the first special housing area (SHA) following the signing of the Accord, although the planning of the development was already well progressed by this time.

As Murphy (2015) notes, HASHAA and the Auckland Housing Accord represent both a mutual commitment to the delivery of more housing in Auckland and “an emerging division in central/local government approaches to the release of land and the response to housing affordability issues” (p.2). This division is reflected in the fact that the HASHAA enables the Minister of Housing to overrule planning regulations and grant permission directly for housing development; Murphy (2015) proposes that this “represents a challenge to the nature of local planning” (p.2).

This political engagement with Auckland’s housing affordability issues and the related debates about how to remedy them have coincided with the establishment phase of the Waimahia development.

1.2.2 Social housing reform

In addition to legislating for increasing housing supply, the current National-led government has embarked on a programme of state housing reform. The discursive shift from ‘state’ to ‘social’ housing is reflective of a significant reorientation of government housing policy.
Because of the expectations regarding third sector provision of affordable housing that are embedded in this policy shift, it is of great relevance to the Waimahia case.

The Housing Shareholders’ Advisory Group was established in February 2010 to conduct a review of the state housing system. They were asked to provide advice on:

- The most effective and efficient delivery model for state housing services to those most in need
- More productive and innovative ways to use current social housing assets to better support the objectives of government
- Transparent measures of how the above goals are to be achieved (HSAG, 2010)

The Group’s report ‘Home and Housed - A Vision for Social Housing in New Zealand’ was completed in April 2010. The report characterised the current model of state housing provision as unsustainable and inefficient. As Goetz (2013) has noted, narratives of a broken public housing sector are frequently deployed as justification for privatisation or the transfer of state housing to the third sector. In this case, the report proposed that HNZ’s role should be shifted from being the primary provider of social housing to being a short-term provider of last resort. Increasing the third sector’s capacity to deliver social housing is recommended, with two primary recommendations to facilitate this: the transfer of capital or housing stock to selected providers with a view to meeting 20% of the sector’s needs for five years, and enabling housing NGOs to access the IRRS (income related rent subsidy) (HSAG 2010, p.57).

The report also recommended the establishment of a centralised unit for the development of social housing policy, and suggested that it should be located within the Department of Building and Housing, rather than Housing New Zealand. This recommendation resulted in the establishment of the Social Housing Unit (SHU) in 2011; this organisation played a key role in the negotiations regarding the Waimahia development.

A further product of this review process was the Social Housing Reform Act (2014). This Act brought about a number of significant changes to the management of state house tenancies in accordance with the HSAG recommendations. Tenancies were made reviewable (s75), ending the “house for life” ethos that had previously been central to state rentals. Of particular significance to the Waimahia project, however, are the new provisions relating to community housing providers. Part 10 of the Act sets out the regulations for the registration of community housing providers, introducing a regulated third sector into the legislative framework for the provision of housing. Community housing providers who become registered with the government’s social housing authority have the same legislated powers as HNZ in relation to the allocation and review of tenancies. More importantly, they are able to access the income related rent subsidy (IRRS), previously only available to subsidise the rent of HNZ tenants who receive social welfare benefits. This investment by central government in order to enable CHPs to offer income-related rents demonstrates a commitment to fostering third sector capacity for housing provision. The IRRS mechanism increases the financial feasibility of CHPs, essentially resulting in them being “hybrid” organisations—comprising state, third sector and market elements (Blessing, 2012; Bratt, 2012; Czischke et al., 2012; Gilmore and Milligan, 2012).

The hybridity promoted by this legislation is, we propose, in evidence at Waimahia Inlet. The contribution of the state (through both the initial grant and the ongoing IRRS to registered CHPs with rentals in the development) and the open market sales enable the provision of assisted home-ownership options and subsidised rentals by the third sector. The passing of the Social Housing Reform Act (2014) has both symbolic and material significance for the
community housing sector. The Act is an important part of the Waimahia project’s context, as the first major third sector development undertaken since it passed into law.

1.3. Weymouth demographics

The Weymouth East census area unit (CAU), in which the development is located, is in the most deprived decile nationally (Atkinson et al., 2014; Statistics New Zealand, 2013). For 27% of households, welfare benefits are the sole source of income, which is almost twice the Auckland average (‘Waimahia Inlet Residential Development: Design Concept Report,’ Jasmax Ltd and Paul Brown Architects, June 2013, WA). The unemployment rate in the 2013 census stood at 15.5% (Statistics New Zealand 2013). The area is ethnically diverse, and in comparison with many parts of Auckland it has a larger Māori and Pacific Island population. In the 2013 census, 32.8% of the population of Weymouth East identified as European, 31.4% identified as Māori, 35.7% identified as Pasifika, 17.1% Asian, and 4.5% as MELAA.3

In the 2000s, Weymouth had some of the fastest rates of population growth in Auckland, yet very little housing was built during this period (‘Waimahia Inlet Residential Development: Design Concept Report’, Jasmax Ltd and Paul Brown Architects, June 2013, WA). As these figures suggest, overcrowding is also a concern in the area. The mean number of residents per household in the Weymouth East CAU is 3.8, and 48% of households have four or more usual residents (Statistics New Zealand, 2013). As a comparison, the regional mean number of residents is three, and 33% of dwellings have four or more usual residents. Weymouth East also has lower levels of home-ownership than the region as a whole, with just over half of all households renting in 2013 (Statistics New Zealand, 2013).

These household characteristics underline the need for more affordable housing in Weymouth East. It must be noted many areas of Auckland are suffering from equivalent levels of deprivation and housing need; Weymouth East is not unique in this regard. The factor that has given rise to the ground-breaking development at Waimahia Inlet is the presence of a large greenfield site owned by the state. The availability of the site and financial support from central government have both been instrumental in the Waimahia project.

1.4. Case study research context: Resilient Urban Futures

Waimahia is one of several case studies of higher-density urban developments being undertaken by the Resilient Urban Futures research programme. The programme, led by the New Zealand Centre for Sustainable Cities, is supported by a 4-year grant from the Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment. Resilient Urban Futures brings together a multi-disciplinary team of researchers from five universities (Otago, Auckland, Massey, Victoria and Canterbury), NIWA and Motu. Working alongside end-users from local and central government, iwi, developers and community groups, the research programme is investigating the drivers of urban change and social, economic and environmental consequences of various forms of urban development.

The Waimahia case study falls within the residential choice and community formation strand of the wider research programme. A particular focus of this research strand is to understand the types of urban environments that New Zealanders want to live in and the neighbourhood characteristics that contribute to wellbeing.

3 MELAA is an abbreviation of Middle Eastern/Latin American/African. People may choose to identify with more than one ethnicity in the census, hence the percentage adds up to more than 100%.
2. Housing Developments and the Third Sector

This study contributes to current debates in housing, community development and third sector research. Brief surveys of international trends in two pertinent areas provide context for the findings presented in the following sections. These two areas of scholarship are: the transfer of subsidised housing from the state to community or hybrid organisations; and the promotion of socially mixed communities through tenure mix.

2.1. Housing transfer and the third sector

The transfer of housing provided by the state out of state ownership and control has occurred in a number of Western democracies over the past three decades. As well as this transfer of previously state-owned housing stock, the responsibility for housing groups who might previously have been housed by the state has increasingly been assumed by non-state organisations. This trend has seen the emergence of new forms of non-governmental organisations, which have taken over the ownership and management of social rental housing (Czischke, 2009; Mullins et al., 2012). The nature and consequences of this shift have varied according to the role of social housing in different contexts: while in some European countries social housing is “universalistic”—available across the socioeconomic spectrum—in Anglo-American countries (including New Zealand) it tends to be targeted at the poorest members of society (Czischke, 2009; Rhodes and Mullins, 2012). The general retreat of the state from the provision of social welfare and services under conditions of neoliberalism has meant that the residualisation and privatisation of state housing has had the greatest impact in contexts where provision is targeted, and thus the most significant effect on already-disadvantaged populations. In contexts where social housing is available universally, transfer to entities that are run along commercial lines is practicable (because of the potential for market-level rental income), whereas in targeted systems this is problematic as below-market rents are typically necessary to meet the needs of tenants.

The development of third sector social housing providers (non-government, not-for-profit) has been extensively documented and theorised (see for example, Blessing, 2012; Bratt, 2012; Czischke 2009; Czischke et al., 2012; Gilmore and Milligan, 2012; Mullins et al., 2012; Pawson, 2011; Rhodes and Mullins, 2009). For the purposes of this report a few observations from this literature provide a useful framework and taxonomy for understanding TMCHL. The first of these is the emergence of what have been termed “hybrid” housing governance organisations (Blessing, 2012; Bratt, 2012; Mullins et al., 2012). These are providers of social housing that blend market and state characteristics while operating in a community or not-for-profit capacity (Blessing, 2012). Blessing (2012) describes hybrid housing governance as “spanning state and market, combining public and private action logics, and subject to multiple sets of institutional conditions” (p. 190). Hybridity can be further categorised as “organic” or “enacted”: organic hybridity emerges incrementally, as third sector organisations interpolate market elements; enacted hybridities are, by contrast, embedded into the organisational structure from the outset (Billis, 2010). The extent to which this trend has positive or negative impacts is debated. Critiques of hybrid housing organisations often focus on the marketisation of housing that has given rise to them—representing this as an evil in itself—(e.g. Rhodes and Mullins, 2009), rather than
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4 Definition of the third sector is contested, as outlined by Kyle et al. (2015). It has been used to describe not-for-profit entities operating in a space between the state and the market, but more recently the idea of sectoral boundaries has come under scrutiny (Kyle et al., 2015). Increasingly, the term third sector is used to describe organisations that are “hybrids” of state, community and market.
the outcomes of this model of housing provision. This is an area that invites further research.

Gruis (2008) proposes that third sector housing associations can be differentiated by their entrepreneurial strategy. Drawing on the work of Miles and Snow (1978, cited in Gruis, 2008), he applies the defender/prospector binary to the operation of Dutch housing associations. In his analysis, “defender” housing associations are those concerned primarily with increasing the efficiency of their current operations and current social housing portfolio. “Prospector” housing associations, by contrast, are more experimental and inclined to innovate in response to changing market, political and social conditions (Czischke et al., 2012; Gruis 2008). Czischke et al. (2012) propose that the “prospector” associations demonstrate social entrepreneurship as defined by Stull (2003, cited in Czischke et al., 2012, p.432). The extent to which these distinctions can be applied to TMCHL is considered below.

Finally, contested interpretations of the third sector—as grassroots and democratic, or as a “shadow state” (Trudeau, 2008, 2012; Wolch, 1990)—warrant consideration. Introducing the concept of the “shadow state”, Wolch (1990) proposed that the processes of privatisation and the reduction of welfare transferred the responsibility for the support of vulnerable people to the voluntary sector. In this context, third sector organisations, collectively, constitute a “para-state apparatus” that is “administered outside of traditional democratic politics and charged with major collective service responsibilities previously shouldered by the public sector” (Wolch, 1990, p.xvi). Crucially, despite their non-governmental status, these organisations remain “within the purview of state control” (Wolch, 1990, p.xvi). This means that they may be subject to the state’s requirements in relation to their structure, operation and funding. Trudeau (2008) notes that since the definition of the shadow state concept, relations between the state and non-state service providers have become increasingly complex. In part, this is a result of private sector involvement in social service provision: “private sector actors are now part of the shadow state apparatus too” (Trudeau, 2008, p.670). The flourishing of this approach over several decades is attributable to its bi-partisan appeal, as Trudeau (2008) describes:

> Offloading responsibility for service delivery to nonprofits has been supported by the political right and left because it ostensibly fosters a leaner state apparatus and it enables the development of services that are responsive to local communities’ preferences and circumstances (p.671).

In terms of state—non-profit interaction Trudeau (2008) describes a continuum, from explicit state control at one end to relative autonomy at the other. At the state-controlled end of this continuum, non-profit organisations are subject to “obligations and constraints...embedded in contracts for direct service provision” (pp.673-674). At the other end of the continuum are non-profit organisations which “may receive funding from a government agency”, but are largely able to determine their own priorities and practices: “there is very little capacity of government to influence the organisation in direct or indirect ways” (p.674). The mid-point on Trudeau’s spectrum of state—non-profit power dynamics is where government has a limited but important degree of influence: “Government agencies exert direct influence by establishing the opportunity structures in which nonprofits operate”, but at the same time the non-profits retain “a capacity for negotiating the rules of the game” (p.675). This continuum provides a useful scaffold for considering the position of TMCHL in relation to the state.
2.2. Social mix and tenure mix

Promoting the development of communities that are socioeconomically diverse is an often-stated goal of planning policy (Galster 2009, 2013; Gans, 1961; Pawson et al., 2012; Sarkissian, 1976), particularly when the redevelopment of an area of concentrated deprivation is taking place. Proponents of social mix argue that it contributes to a range of positive outcomes, such as “broadening social networks; enhancing access to employment and other services; lowering area-based stigma; building social capital; and creating more inclusive communities” (Arthurson, 2004, p.102). A mechanism that is frequently employed to try to attain social mix is diversification of tenure types, despite relatively little research into its effectiveness or consequences (Kleinhans, 2004; Pawson et al., 2012; Tunstall, 2003; Wood, 2003). The literature in this area is relevant because the Waimahia Inlet development is explicitly endeavouring to create a socially mixed community through tenure mix.

The use of tenure mix as a proxy for social mix in policy has been criticised for being euphemistic. Tunstall (2003) proposes that tenure mix is a politically expedient substitute for social mix, as it “avoids some of the connotations of the term ‘social engineering’ … and side-steps sensitive discussion of ultimate goals in terms of social groups and what ‘balanced communities’ might consist of” (p.158). She notes the lack of definition of clear goals in relation to the mix of tenures in many policies designed to advance this outcome, suggesting that this is related to the difficulty of defining an appropriate mix and the lack of research into the effects of different tenure mixes (Tunstall, 2003). She also draws attention to the fact that tenure mix is not a policy objective applied to areas of intensive home-ownership, calling into question the extent to which mixed tenure communities are actually the goal of these policies (Tunstall, 2003). Tunstall (2003) considers that greater transparency about social mix as the true policy objective would remedy this, as she is generally supportive of social mix as a goal of policy.

The validity and usefulness of social mix as a goal is not universally accepted, however, and has been challenged over many years. Relatively little empirical work has investigated the impact of social mix on social outcomes. Arthurson (2004) summarises her concerns thus: “there is insufficient linking between the underlying assumptions made for social mix in contemporary regeneration policy and the empirical evidence base” (p.101). The criticisms levelled at social mix policies are various. Some scholars draw attention to the empirical evidence showing that there is little social interaction at the neighbourhood level, and argue that this means that proximity is not a sufficient (or necessary) condition for community (Atkinson & Kintrea, 2000; Galster 2009, 2013; Pawson et al., 2012; Wood 2003). This limited interaction undermines the expectation of “broaden[ed] social networks” (Arthurson, 2004, p.102) and bridging social capital, and thus reduces the likelihood that the other expected benefits of social mix will eventuate. For example, research suggests that social mix does not improve employment opportunities (Arthurson, 1998; Wood, 2003). The assumption that providing the poor with better-off neighbours to role model middle-class cultural and behavioural norms has been criticised as both unsupported by empirical evidence and paternalistic (e.g. Crump, 2002; Peel, 1995; Wood, 2003). As well as being criticised for ineffectiveness, social mix policies are also charged with having detrimental effects, particularly for poorer residents; for example, reducing the concentration of deprivation may make it uneconomic to provide services that are of specific benefit to the poor (Galster, 2013; Wood, 2003).
3. Methods

The first phase of the research involved scrutiny of the consortium’s archive of documents relating to the establishment of the development. These documents included those setting out the structure of the consortium and the role of the general and limited partners, correspondence with central government regarding the development, and various confidential legal and financial details. This process enabled the research team to gain an overview of the evolution of the proposal to central government through its various iterations, and the structure of the governance and development entities. It also contributed to the development of the research design for the interview phase of the project, specifically the selection of key informants and the content of the key informant interview schedule (included as Appendix A).

Five key informant interviews were conducted with representatives from the New Zealand Housing Foundation, Community of Refuge Trust (CORT), and Te Tumu Paeora (formerly the Māori Trustee) on behalf of Te Tumu Kāinga (TTK). These three organisations are the limited liability partners of the development entity, Waimahia Inlet Neighbourhood Limited Partnership. This limited partnership is managed by an incorporated body called Tāmaki Makaurau Community Housing Limited (TMCHL). This entity is the general partner, and comprises the three limited partners plus the Tāmaki Collective. The views of the Tāmaki Collective were not available to the researchers.

The key informant interviews were semi-structured conversations investigating the way in which each organisation came to be involved in the project, the process of establishing the partnerships, the values shared between organisations and the ways in which they differ. We also enquired into pre-existing relationships between the partners, and the possibility of the groups collaborating on other housing developments in the future. Procedural matters such as engagement with local residents and decision-making about design, tenure mix and procurement were also covered.

The interviews were audio recorded and transcribed for analysis. The research team worked together on a sample of the interviews to develop a framework for thematically coding the data. Once the coding framework was established, the transcripts of the interviews were exported into the Nvivo qualitative software programme to facilitate management and analysis of the data.

Following the completion of the key informant interviews, an interview schedule was devised by the research team to explore the experiences of incoming residents at Waimahia (included as Appendix B). We sought to interview people from across all the tenure types planned for the development: open market sales, shared equity, rent-to-buy, and CHP rentals. Recruitment of participants was undertaken through a number of mechanisms, but was primarily facilitated by a Housing Foundation staff member who is the development’s sales and project manager. Additional recruitment was undertaken at a meeting to set up a neighbourhood support group that the lead author was invited to attend. Interviews with families renting from Accessible, CORT, and Monte Cecilia were arranged through the tenancy managers in those organisations. These tenancy managers were also able to provide some of the more sensitive details of the tenancy arrangements to the interviewer in advance, such as the terms of the tenancy and the likelihood of review. In total, 12 residents of the development were interviewed; of these, three had purchased their

---

5 The structure of the consortium is discussed in section 4.2 below.
properties as open market sales, three were in rent-to-buy arrangements (called Home Saver), one was in a shared equity home, and five were in CHP rentals through Accessible Properties, Monte Cecilia, and CORT.

As with the key informant interviews, the incoming resident interviews were audio recorded and transcribed for analysis. The research team independently read through a sample of these transcripts and then collaborated on the development of a coding framework. Again, this coding framework was used to structure the thematic analysis and Nvivo used to manage the data.

The interviewees were provided with information about the project and signed consent forms to indicate their willingness to participate (see Appendix C). All participants had the opportunity to review and amend their transcripts.

Other methods of data collection used in this research included a number of site visits, including looking through the interior of houses of different types and sizes, observation of the establishment of a Neighbourhood Support group in one area of the development, and the observation of an auction at which a recently-completed open market home was sold. Researcher field notes provided the data for analysing the findings of these methods.

The findings are reported below, arranged thematically and divided into two broad areas: developer experience and incoming resident experience. In light of the small number of key informants and the need to preserve their confidentiality, we have chosen not to label their contributions with a unique identifier. Rather, all comments from key informants are labelled simply as (KI). Quotes from incoming residents are labelled with a descriptive phrase indicating only their tenure type in order to protect the confidentiality of participants.

Where information regarding the establishment or structure of the consortium is taken from a publicly available document, this source is fully referenced. However, documents that are confidential or privileged (such as the formal proposals and agreements) are identified with the abbreviation WA (Waimahia Archive). No sensitive information from these sources is included in this report.
4. Findings: Developer experience

4.1. Origins of the development: collaboration and negotiation

Interviewees all provided details of how they and their organisation came to be involved in the Waimahia project. Cumulatively, and in conjunction with the archive of consortium documents, these interviews facilitated construction of a narrative accounting for the development’s establishment. The land, which had been owned by HNZ since 2006 before being sold to the consortium, had been identified by the Housing Foundation as a possible site for a large-scale development in 2009. The idea was floated that year at a meeting between community housing sector representatives and the then Housing Minister Phil Heatley, and pitched as an opportunity for the community housing sector “to demonstrate what [they] were capable of” (KI). The meeting was convened to discuss opportunities for third sector involvement in housing provision, and was part of a process (along with the aforementioned HSAG review) that culminated in the establishment of the SHU.

The Framework Agreement between the Crown and Ngā Mana Whenua o Tāmaki Makaurau, signed in February 2010, established the structure and functions of the Tāmaki Collective. It also guaranteed mana whenua the right of first refusal (RFR) on Crown-owned land to be sold for 170 years from the date of the agreement, as part of a suite of redress mechanisms (cl 20). Consequently, the site at Waimahia was offered to the Tāmaki Collective with the condition that the land had to be used for housing. As the Tāmaki Collective did not at that point have any involvement in housing provision or development, discussions began between various organisations about how this opportunity might be taken up.

The Tāmaki Collective and Te Tumu Kāinga had a mutual interest in using the Waimahia site for the provision of affordable housing aimed at Māori and Pasifika, but also recognised the need to involve organisations with expertise in community housing development. As one key informant put it, this led to the project coming full circle back to the Housing Foundation, who were approached to work with the Collective and TTK to develop a proposal (KI). The Collective brought legal and financial expertise to the enterprise, as well as the advantage of the RFR agreement, while the Housing Foundation brought considerable experience in developing community housing, although none of their previous projects had been on the scale of Waimahia.

In October 2012 the Tāmaki Collective, Te Tumu Kāinga, and the Housing Foundation presented a proposal to SHU (‘Waimahia Inlet, Weymouth Mixed Use Housing Development Proposal’, WA). This proposal involved the development of 210 houses, of which 25% would be open market sales, 35% affordable private sales (through shared equity schemes), 30% community housing rentals, and 10% Housing New Zealand rentals. The proposal advanced a structure for the consortium designed to facilitate a long-term partnership between stakeholders, while also creating a development entity to deliver the houses at Waimahia and a community housing association to carry out tenancy and facilities management (‘Waimahia Inlet, Weymouth Mixed Use Housing Development Proposal’, WA).

At this juncture, discussions regarding expanding the project partners to include CORT began. By January 2013 a response to SHU’s queries was submitted (‘Waimahia Inlet, Weymouth Housing Development January 2013 Position’, WA). The issues the consortium sought to address were:
• The project’s alignment with community needs;
• The cost and funding structure, including the level of contribution required from private equity, debt and the Crown;
• Confirmation of funding from debt providers;
• Details of which providers would ultimately benefit from the Crown contribution;
• Details of the project’s governance arrangement;
• Confirmation from the Auckland Housing Network of their participation;
• A project timeline.

In addition to providing the additional financial and organisational details requested, the second proposal altered some aspects of the consortium structure, project plan, and housing allocations. Key changes to the second proposal were the inclusion of CORT as a consortium member, along with the Tāmaki Collective, TTK and the Housing Foundation. These four organisations undertook to collectively contract for at least 75% of the affordable sales and community housing rentals. The proposal also introduced offtake agreements—undertakings to purchase the residential units—with Habitat for Humanity, Accessible Properties, the Auckland Community Housing Trust, the Salvation Army, LIFEWISE and the Airedale Property Trust; each of these organisations was identified as willing to contract for a small number of properties—between two and 15. Housing New Zealand, which had been included in the initial proposal, was no longer identified as a provider at Waimahia. A further alteration proposed in the January 2013 document was the division of the construction into eight, rather than four, stages. This was suggested as a way to reduce the risks of the development, completing and allocating approximately 25 houses (rather than 50) before moving on to the next phase of the development. Oversight of the community was made the responsibility of TMCHL, while operational management of tenancies for rentals reverted to the CHPs that own those dwellings (‘Waimahia Inlet, Weymouth Housing Development January 2013 Position’, WA).

Under a Heads of Agreement, the consortium was granted some initial funding for the development of detailed design and prepared a business case for the Crown. After the second proposal was submitted, the project progressed quickly, as this informant recalls:

We provided a lot of detail in the proposal about how [we] were dealing with the risks of development, from contracting and delivery side, from the governance side, various requirements for the structure which we could go into in a little bit, but essentially out of that came the Heads of Agreement, some further funding, and then a Development Agreement in December 2013, I guess. And eleven months later we had our first houses constructed, so it has happened pretty quickly (KI).

During the completion of the design phase and the development agreement with the Crown, a number of further changes to the proposal occurred. Significant modifications were:
• The total number of dwellings was increased to 282, to be constructed in 4 phases (as per the original plan);
• The proportion to be sold on the open market was increased to 40%;
• A number of CHPs that had initially indicated an interest in offtake agreements did not formally become involved, while one other CHP came on board. The final make-up of this stakeholder group was: Habitat for Humanity, Accessible Properties, and Monte Cecilia Housing Trust.

---

6 As indicated on p.4, the number of houses later increased to 295 and the proportion available for open market sales reduced to 30%.
The key informants all highlighted the instrumental role of central government in enabling the development, but also the way in which the collaborative approach of the consortium partners and wider community housing sector has made the project more successful and efficient than was expected by government. The rapidity of the completion of dwellings and the success of the project to date has, in the view of several informants, proved that a collaboration between iwi and community housing organisations is not only a viable mechanism for developing social and affordable housing, but an ideal vehicle for it. It was described as “a huge game changer” (KI), and a model of collaboration for housing provision: “it’s been quite incredible how if you do it right you can go a lot faster” (KI). The factors that have contributed to this “doing it right” are primarily the structure of the consortium, the complementarity of the organisational and professional strengths of consortium partners, and the alignment of their values. These matters are elaborated on in the following sections.

4.2. Structure of the consortium

The structure of the consortium is one of its key innovations, and was designed to accommodate the charitable and community-sector nature of the organisations involved. The consortium itself, Tāmaki Makaurau Community Housing Limited, is an incorporated body comprising the Tāmaki Collective, Te Tumu Kāinga, CORT and the New Zealand Housing Foundation. This group exercises a governance and management function, and is the general partner of the development entity, Waimahia Inlet Neighbourhood Limited Partnership (WINLP). The development entity comprises three limited partners: Te Tumu Kāinga, CORT and the New Zealand Housing Foundation. Explaining the relationship between the general partner (TMCHL) and the limited partners (WINLP), one informant said: “the limited partners are the equivalent of the shareholders and TMCHL is effectively the company that acts on behalf of the shareholders” (KI). TMCHL is the decision-making body, while the limited partnership is the developer. Management of the development process undertaken by WINLP is carried out by the Housing Foundation, under contract to TMCHL.

The rationale for this structure has a number of facets. These include: the need for transparency when working in the charitable/community sector; the ability to have any number of limited partners should more CHPs wish to formally join the partnership (although in the event it was only the core three); and the fact that the tax implications of the development go back to the limited partners. The limited partnership (as the developer) is the chief beneficiary of the Crown grant provided for the Waimahia project.

Another crucial aspect of the structure of the development is that the three limited partners are essentially the purchasers of a large proportion of the housing. While 40% of the housing was to be sold on the open market, the remaining 60% is the subject of offtake agreements between TMCHL and various CHPs, primarily those CHPs that form WINLP.\(^7\) The limited partners guarantee to purchase a proportion of the houses, and this “provides a back stop for the funding and for the infrastructure of the deal” (KI). In addition to the general offtake agreement between the limited partners and TMCHL, sale and purchase agreements for specific dwellings are to be signed by the limited partners (and the other offtake CHPs) at the commencement of each phase of the development. This means that the CHPs have a guarantee of a specific dwelling-type on a specific lot, and have committed to purchase it. This then enables the CHPs to seek out a family to take on that house:

---

\(^7\) As noted above, additional offtake agreements for small numbers of dwellings are in place with Habitat for Humanity, Accessible Properties, and Monte Cecilia Housing Trust.
We have a little system where we make sure that not only have we got a Sale and Purchase Agreement, which is the legal commitment to buy a house if the partnership builds it but also we make sure behind that there is a family ready to move in. (KI).

This means that the risk for the partnership and for the CHPs is reduced. The CHPs undertake to buy the properties, but are able to line up a household to enter into a rent-to-buy or shared equity scheme in advance. The risk mitigation this represents is not the only reason for this approach however:

'It also comes back to development of that community; if you’ve got a family that suits the house, that suits their own budgetary and other requirements, and then when we finish building the house that family can move in and so the community starts being built. (KI)

The structure of the consortium and development entity presents a possible model for future third sector housing initiatives. There is also the potential for the general partner (the TMCHL consortium) to pursue further development opportunities with a limited partnership comprising the same or different limited partners. The structure allows for a larger number of CHPs to become involved, and there is no requirement for the current limited partners to participate in future developments if those do not make strategic or financial sense for them. The success of the structure in place at Waimahia, and the adaptability of it in terms of the make-up of the limited partnership, augurs well for future community housing initiatives under the management of TMCHL, provided the necessary funding can be secured.

4.3. Values, priorities and strengths

The interviews with key informants from the Housing Foundation, Te Tumu Paeroa and CORT described a strong coherence of purpose among the consortium partners. While the organisations had varied levels of experience and capacity in relation to community housing development and management, and to an extent different foci and target populations, the shared vision enabled effective collaboration. All participants proposed that this alignment was a function of pre-existing similarities in the organisational missions of the partners. In response to a question about the extent to which the values of the consortium partners were shared, one participant said:

They’re very good, they’re very similar, one of [the development’s] successes has been that everybody is on the same sort of page with regards to this [being] a community not for profit exercise... We’re about producing and demonstrating what the community housing continuum [is]. So there’s a lot of... we very rarely conflict with regards to those sort of communal values that we’re promoting (KI).

Another interviewee, commenting on these values, identified some particular factors that all consortium partners considered to be priorities:

I think there has been absolute alignment... in the desire to create a community that is a mixed community, with mixed tenure, to be able to walk down the street and not identify who’s in what house and so on, it’s a very important aspect of the development. That’s been shared by all of the partners (KI).
One informant explained this alignment as something that had become apparent during the establishment phase of the consortium:

You know when I step back and look at the project itself I think first and foremost, when the partners were courting if you like, I think we went through a process of establishing the values of each of the organisations, recognising that there was alignment there in terms of what we were each wanting to achieve (KI).

While CORT and the Housing Foundation had collaborated on previous smaller-scale projects in Auckland, the Waimahia development represented a new direction for Te Tumu Kāinga and the Tāmaki Collective. Te Tumu Kāinga had as its historical purpose the provision of housing for Māori in Tāmaki Makaurau, but had not previously acted as a developer of community housing. What struck a chord with the Tāmaki Collective and Te Tumu Kāinga, according to one informant, were the Housing Foundation’s priorities:

Their focus was on the right thing, and it was people. The houses are a means to an end, not the end. And so from our perspective it was what we could do to contribute to establishing vibrant communities, I think that was sort of the real hook for us (KI).

Interviewees indicated that the alignment of values of the various organisations has been instrumental in the success of the development to date. A mutual commitment to providing affordable, healthy housing options for groups that currently struggle to access these in Auckland made reaching consensus on development decisions straightforward, the consortium partners reported. The “meeting of minds” (KI) among the consortium partners was described by all informants in extremely positive terms:

I think what’s come out is that there has been, we’ve always understood that there was going to be good alignment between, in particular the Māori Trustee, the Tāmaki Collective’s objectives and the Housing Foundation, but it’s probably even stronger than we expected. And the outcomes have been probably better, may be not better but it’s been very satisfying to see that the outcome has been at least as id everybody had hoped it would be, perhaps not necessarily expected to be (KI).

As this participant expressed, this sense of shared purpose proved stronger and more facilitative of efficient and effective development than they had expected.

4.4. Decision-making

Our interviews enquired into the processes by which the consortium made decisions about matters such as tenure mix, design (including cultural and environmental aspects), the allocation of specific sites, procurement, and contracting. Participants reported that these decisions were made with little difficulty; things were “sort of debated” but there were “very few... eruptions” (KI). Indeed, the process of making decisions about practical matters was represented as a contributor to the collaborative spirit of the consortium:

...everybody had a say, [so] everybody starts to get an understanding ... [it] also did a great job of bringing all the contractors on board with... what are we trying to do, what [are] the outcomes here that we’re trying to do, how do we get the balance between quality, and value and price sort of thing, you know? (KI)

Communication among the consortium partners about the mechanics of the development provided a context for the articulation of common and complementary objectives and values, as well as the development of relationships between the individuals representing the organisations involved.
While interviewees’ descriptions of the decision-making process were overwhelmingly positive, it was apparent that in some instances compromises had to be made. For example, one KI explained that his organisation had been hoping that some single-bedroom units would be included in the development; the CHP he was representing specialised in providing this kind of accommodation. However, they “lost that, and that didn't go ahead” (KI):

That idea was sort of batted back in the agreement ... others felt that there wasn't a place for one-bedrooms in this semi suburban sort of setting, so we ended up with two bedrooms. Now I'd still argue that there should be one-bedrooms here, but I accept that the general consensus was that there wasn't a place now. (KI)

It was clear that this informant felt that the decision reached on this matter was sub-optimal, but he had been prepared to support the decision in the interests of moving the project forward.

In relation to the tenure mix in the development, participants described the decision to go with a 70/30 split (private/rental) as straightforward and uncontested. All participants expressed a belief that tenure mix would contribute to the development of a healthy community:

What we are doing is just normal working kiwis being given an opportunity to buy a first home, and their neighbours are going to be people much like them. Some of those neighbours are going to be in wheel-chairs and some people are going to be beneficiaries but they are all... it’s a real cross section (KI).

One participant noted that this was seen as a crucial aspect of the development from the beginning:

...how do you have this sort of engaged vibrant community? The tenure mix, the make up is vitally important... you know from the outset all of us were keen on avoiding this place becoming a ghetto. And so you know that’s in the early stages around getting the right balance in terms of not only a tenure mix but your sort of building quality and all of those sorts of things (KI).

Participants gave slightly varying figures about the desirable tenure mix—some said 70/30, others 60/40. In terms of the rationale for the proportions, this was described as “a rule of thumb” in the community housing sector (KI). The details of the split in terms of the more fine-grained tenure types were similarly determined according to assumptions about what might work best. These assumptions were variously described as based on “a lot of international experience and a lot of international knowledge from Australia to England to Canada to other places...it’s more from knowledge rather than practical experience” (KI) and “a little bit of guess-work, matched with the experience” of the Housing Foundation (KI).

### 4.5. Existing Weymouth community

During the planning phase of the development the consortium engaged with the existing residents of Weymouth. The local board, church groups and local community groups such as the Weymouth Residents’ Association were all included early on in discussions about the proposed development (KI). One of the key informants was personally involved in meetings with the local community, and recounted some vehement opposition:

I had a heckler down in the front [who] used some very strong language which didn’t worry me but it might have surprised some of the people in the audience ... you do get strong feelings, very strong feelings from people who have seen and used this place as it was, you know, rolling countryside. You know they have grazed their
This interviewee characterised the existing community as fairly stable and somewhat resistant to change. Their concern with loss of amenity was one significant driver of their initial resistance to the development, and they had “legitimate concerns” about traffic and pressure on local facilities (KI), but were also concerned that there would be social housing—specifically Housing New Zealand housing—included (KI). The concerned residents envisaged high-density, high concentration social housing. All our key informants described the need to allay these fears. One interviewee noted that the similarity between the names Housing New Zealand and the New Zealand Housing Foundation caused confusion, and may have fuelled the anxiety of Weymouth residents. As a result, it was necessary to be very clear in communications with the local community that the consortium did not include Housing New Zealand.

In general, despite some early opposition, interviewees reported that the community had come on board with the development reasonably quickly. While some issues persisted, mainly relating to the construction process and the disruption to traffic while a roundabout connecting the arterial Weymouth Road to Kaimoana Street was being built, according to our interviewees general feedback from the community now that the development is underway has been positive. Systematically exploring the experience of the local community through this development process would be a valuable piece of research to complement the work done on Waimahia to date.

4.6. The role of government

The interviews enquired into the roles both central and local government played in the development, and the relationship between the consortium and government agencies. While some details of central government’s involvement are detailed in previous sections, the observations below relate specifically to the nature of the relationship between TMCHL and central government ministers and officials.

4.6.1. Central government

Without exception, participants emphasised the crucial role of central government in enabling the development. The $29 million grant was repeatedly mentioned as the decisive factor in allowing the development to proceed. For example:

_The Government’s upfront contribution [was] a key enabler, and it’s fair to say without that upfront support we would not have been able to do the things we are doing (KI)._  

The government’s financial investment in Waimahia has, predictably, translated into a political investment in the success of the development, and a concern with how it is perceived by the public. During the period of negotiation about the proposal and then the development agreement the 2014 general election was on the horizon and this contributed to the government’s interest in the project being successful.

Interviewees noted that the government’s top priority was that the planned housing had to be developed quickly. Because of this, the government was initially uncertain about the staged nature of the Waimahia proposal:

_Crown was apprehensive in taking us in stages too, the other thing to realise is that there is a huge timeline pressure thing that was on, (KI)._
In response to questions about how much control or influence central government had over the project, participants described a keen interest in the structural arrangements of the new entity, TMCHL:

*I think central [government] have been very interested in the structure of how it came together, and I’m sure it reflects that they wanted a body that they could relate to, that made sense, and was...what’s the word? That could be scrutinised as being robust, and so they were always looking at their input in terms of how it was sort of formed: that it was done properly, legally, made a lot of sense (KI).*

The innovative structure of TMCHL was conceived of by the consortium, however, rather than designed by government. While central government had to approve the arrangements, they did not dictate them:

*I think we pretty much came up with that after a lot of legal advice in terms of what would work, what would be acceptable (KI).*

The Crown did have some specific expectations regarding the consortium’s structure, as this participant noted:

*They had requirements under the governance structure to make sure that we had some independent directors, and they had involvement in approving those independent directors (KI).*

This level of engagement, working closely with ministers and officials during the inception of the project, was understood in terms of government’s perceived risk in backing the untested development entity:

*I think that’s really a consequence of the fact that this was quite a new sort of bold step for the Government, and then as time has gone on... trust has increased and risks have also gone the other way. (KI).*

The sense, expressed above, that the relationship between the consortium and central government had evolved since the scoping and set-up phase was reflected in other participants’ comments. Our interviewees explained that once the consortium structure was confirmed and the development agreement in place, central government’s involvement in the details of the project diminished. This was represented as a consequence of the emerging trust described above, and something that made the decision-making process more straightforward.

Overall, consortium representatives were positive about the involvement of central government in the project and the relationship they had with key players. While it was clear that participants recognised that the Waimahia project’s success or otherwise was important to the government because of its wider social housing reform agenda, they also indicated that, regardless of the ideological underpinning, the outcomes sought were positive for the community housing sector.

4.6.2. **Local government**

Interviewees had relatively little comment on the subject of local government. In comparison with central government, Auckland Council’s involvement in the development has been limited. In terms of practical matters, interviewees were asked about the designation of Waimahia Inlet as the first Special Housing Area (SHA) and what the effect of that had been.
Although the project was already well advanced prior to the SHA designation, the benefit was not merely symbolic. Interviewees described some specific benefits that resulted from this status. In particular, the establishment of Auckland Council’s Housing Project Office (HPO) was cited as a mechanism for accelerating and streamlining the consenting process, and interviewees who had had direct dealings with the HPO were highly complimentary:

[The] Housing Project Office. They were good people to work with. You know. They were just helpful, they knew we were trying to accelerate, trying to cut through…(KI)

Participants’ comments suggest that the HPO was effective in facilitating the development process and reducing the impact of inter-departmental silos in the consenting and compliance areas.

The other key area where Auckland Council involvement was helpful was getting through “the tangle of development contributions and parks development” (KI). Council assisted with negotiations with Watercare regarding storm-water management on site, and also agreed to purchase the storm-water areas and two pocket parks. Participants described this contribution from Council as significant, and some saw Council’s willingness to invest in the development in this way as a further spin-off from the SHA status:

Most references to Auckland Council were in the context of the importance of compatible or shared objectives on the part of the consortium and government, at both central and local levels. One participant drew attention to the fact that the appearance of Auckland’s Mayor, Len Brown (formerly Labour-affiliated), and the then-Minister of Housing, Nick Smith (National MP), together at the official opening of the development demonstrated bi-partisanship:

Even just having Len and Nick on the same stage … opening this [the development], you know, it sort of signifies what we are about. It is about coming together and being together for one purpose and there is a synergy there (KI).

Participants’ comments suggest a combination of genuine alignment between central and local government and the exertion of central government authority to ensure that the Council facilitated the development. One concrete example of the latter is the aforementioned Auckland Housing Accord. Following the creation of the ‘supercity’ in 2010, disagreement between Auckland Council and central government over the city rail loop and the draft Unitary Plan had received considerable media attention; the policies of Brown as Mayor conflicting with those of central government, as he sought funding for public transport infrastructure and promoted urban containment policies (see e.g. Dearnaley, 2009; Orsman, 2013). As has been noted in section 1.3.1 above, the HASHAA and Auckland Housing Accord, while demonstrating a joint commitment to housing affordability by central and local government, represents a challenge to local planning powers (Murphy, 2015). In this context, then, the opening of the Waimahia development by Brown and Smith together was significant and, in the eyes of the informant quoted above, symbolic.

4.7. Future opportunities and state housing transfer

The desire for TMCHL to work together on future developments along the same lines as Waimahia (of equivalent or greater scale) was expressed by all KIs. It is clear from the research to date, however, that without a significant financial investment from government further large-scale developments will be very difficult for the consortium to carry out. This also holds for the community housing sector more generally. These matters were discussed
as interviewees were asked to comment on the government’s policy (recently announced at the time of the interviews) of transferring a significant number of HNZC properties to community housing providers. Key informants acknowledged that if the properties are to be transferred at market value, it is unlikely that this model will be viable for CHPs.

Participants were aware of the difficulty facing the sector, given the government’s intention to sell HNZ properties at market value. The contradiction between the stated aim of transferring state houses to CHPs and the desire to maximise the Crown’s return from the sale of the assets was mentioned by several interviewees. These interviewees expressed the view that the houses would need to be either heavily discounted or transferred for nothing in order for CHPs to be able to take them over. KIs thought the social function of CHPs—the provision of affordable housing to those in need—should be recognised when government is determining the transfer model.

The direct transfer that took place in the UK was appealed to by one participant as a possible model to develop the community housing sector locally:

> If you looked at the parallel in England you know they just basically divided up the pot [of houses] and created housing associations that were no longer government run. We could follow that sort of model. That just immediately gives the balance sheet and the resources to new groups (KI).

Direct transfer was advocated in light of the “huge cost in running and developing [social housing] and so on” (KI). CHPs “need a balance sheet to start it” in order to finance what is essentially social service provision (KI). The view that state houses could be retained as social housing, while also being an attractive investment proposition, was represented as naïve:

> Some players in the sector think it’s a golden goose and a huge opportunity to make money and other things. But the reality is that the space is tough. That quite apart from the asset management plans and the stock itself, you know there’s the people; how do you provide the right support for your tenants and your tenancy policies and so on and so forth? I think it’s much more complicated than people think (KI).

The enthusiasm of all informants for future TMCHL collaboration on affordable and social housing developments was tempered by an awareness that the critical financial support may not be forthcoming a second time.

### 4.8. Discussion

Narratives of alignment and convergence were prominent in all our key informant interviews. Alignment of purpose and values among TMCHL partners was represented as the foundation of the development’s success to date. Despite their differing constituencies and functions, the shared priorities of providing quality affordable housing and creating a healthy community provided the basis for effective collaboration among consortium member organisations. Cooperation between TMCHL and the state (in both its local and central manifestations) was enabled through convergence; institutions of diverse political, ideological and organisational types worked together to bring about a collective goal and advance specific individual interests. The collective goal—housing provision—and the convergence of policy and political objectives provided the conditions for government and TMCHL to work together. This demonstrates in part the way in which community-based housing provision is appealing to both the political left and right; the left can celebrate the
communitarian aspects, while the right can disengage the state from an obligation to house the needy (cf Trudeau, 2008, p.671).

Returning to the literature, one can attempt to categorise TMCHL as an organisation in terms of the various taxonomies discussed. As a recipient of significant state funding and as an entity that engages in open market as well as social and affordable housing provision, we argue that TMCHL fits the criteria of a hybrid organisation (Blessing, 2012; Bratt, 2012; Mullins et al., 2012). It brings together market and state elements while operating in the third sector as a non-profit. Given that this hybridity is designed into the structure of the consortium, it is an example of an “enacted”, rather than “organic”, hybrid (Billis, 2010). This hybrid design is, in the local context, highly innovative. As our interviewees noted, they sought to leverage off each other’s specific organisational strengths and experience in order to create a new kind of organisation, and a new kind of housing development. This clearly locates the consortium as a “prospector” organisation, as they are “innovative, in a broad sense, and undertake all kinds of activities outside their traditional working area” (Gruis, 2008, p.1079).

Part of this innovation has been the forging of a new kind of relationship with central government, one that could potentially provide a model for future community housing developments. While TMCHL, as a non-profit organisation providing both some services previously provided by the state and innovative new services which offer an alternative to state provision of housing, constitutes part of the “shadow state” (Trudeau, 2008, 2012; Wolch, 1990), it is not at the state-controlled end of the spectrum. It does not have total autonomy either, however. As our informants noted, in addition to providing funding the state had a range of requirements in terms of their structure and organisation, and had to approve a detailed proposal before the development could be confirmed. We propose that TMCHL sits somewhere near the middle of Trudeau’s (2008) continuum: the state has influence through these institutional requirements, but also because it controls “the opportunity structures” (p.675) in which the consortium is operating. The programme of social housing transfer is a case in point: TMCHL (and other CHPs) will struggle to engage in further developments without the direct provision of opportunity by the state. At the same time, however, TMCHL still has “a capacity for negotiating the rules of the game” (p.675); the consortium and the organisations that comprise it have controlled many operational aspects, including the design, pricing and allocation of housing. In relation to the CHP rentals at Waimahia there is further evidence of the consortium and its partners “negotiating the rules”. Despite the expectation (articulated in the Social Housing Reform Act (2014)) that community housing providers will operate along the same lines as Housing New Zealand, CHP rental tenants at Waimahia have security of tenure (see section 5.4.1 below). This differentiates the providers of state and social housing, carving out a niche for the latter, and enables innovation through diverse tenures.

Our findings suggest that the TMCHL structure and approach have been highly effective, and that the shared values that underpinned the coming-together of the partners have been expanded and enhanced through their collaboration. This provides an instructive model for future community housing partnerships—particularly ones that might involve CHPs and post-settlement iwi.
5. Findings: Incoming resident experience

5.1. The participants

As discussed in section 3, 12 residents from the development were interviewed, representing a diversity of tenure-types. In order to preserve their confidentiality and privacy we have not provided summary characteristics for each participant. To give a sense of the range of people interviewed, the following observations can be made:

- Three participants had purchased their dwellings on the open market;
- Three participants were in rent-to-buy arrangements (called Home Saver);
- One participant was in a shared equity home;
- Five participants rented their dwellings from community housing providers (Accessible Properties; Monte Cecilia Housing Trust; or CORT);
- Some participants were among the earliest households to move into the development in November 2014, while others had been in their homes for only a few weeks at the time of the interview;
- Participants were aged between 28 and 65;
- Ethnicities with which participants identified were: Māori; Samoan, Cook Island Māori, Fijian, Pākehā/NZ European, Indian, and Chinese;
- Household size ranged from one person to five people, with four- and five-person households being the most common;
- All households except one had at least one child in residence. The age of children cared for by participants ranged from two to 13 years;
- All participants who lived in open market, shared equity and rent-to-buy homes were in full-time paid work, and in most instances there were at least two adults working full-time in the household;
- All participants who lived in open market, shared equity and rent-to-buy homes were first-home buyers except for one, who had previously owned in another New Zealand city.

A brief descriptive statement identifying only their tenure-type will be used to contextualise interviewee’s comments, in lieu of unique identifiers; this is in order to protect participants’ confidentiality.

A rather blunt primary distinction is made in the following sections between participants living in CHP rentals and in the other tenure-types. While the more fine-grained tenure variation is discussed, a significant difference was observed in the experiences and circumstances between these two primary groups. For this purpose, these groups are referred to as ‘CHP rental tenants’ and ‘owner-occupiers’. It is important to note that the ‘owner-occupier’ group includes those who are in rent-to-buy and shared equity arrangements, as these are considered pathways to home ownership.

5.2. Finding out about Waimahia Inlet

Interviews enquired into how residents had found out about the Waimahia development. Among owner-occupier participants, the means of learning about the development were varied. The participants who had moved in as part of the first stage of the development in late 2014 had close connections with the Weymouth area and learned about the project through these:

Resident: My uncle, he lives on the outskirts of the area.
Interviewer: The Waimahia area?
Another participant had heard about the project initially through the Board of Trustees of a local school. Several participants had lived in the Weymouth area immediately prior to the development beginning, and had found out through word of mouth in the community. One participant explained that his awareness of the development had come through whānau, as he and his family were living overseas at the time:

Resident: Yes, so my dad is quite high up in the hapū and he just said, oh there’s a housing meeting. This would have been about maybe two years ago now...Beginning of last year anyway. Then I said, yes I’ll pop along and it just kind of all evolved from there.
Interviewer: So that was at the local marae?
Resident: Yes, that’s at the Manurewa Marae (Rent-to-buy tenure).

The owner-occupiers who moved in to stage two reported hearing about the development through the news media:

It was I think over the news and so I thought “OK, affordable” and then we went to check it out, yes (Open market sale).

Another had simply found the development advertised on Trademe by LJ Hooker, the agents for the open market sales at that time.

The CHP rental tenants had a different experience; all participants in CHP rentals were unaware of the development until they received a call offering them a dwelling at Waimahia. One of these participants had lived in Waimahia in the past and had been surprised to discover the area had been developed:

I didn’t even know that this place was being developed. I actually used to live down in Weymouth, just down on Evans Road, but that was a couple of years ago. So I think this was all a park or something at one point (CHP rental tenant).

Unsurprisingly, compared with those in owner-occupier categories the CHP rental tenants described much less agency in relation to their housing situation; their discovery of Waimahia was instead the result of their housing application being transferred from HNZ’s waiting list to those of a CHP.

5.3. Motivations for moving

We also investigated the reasons participants gave for moving to Waimahia. Again, a significant difference was observed between CHP rental tenants and residents in categories of owner-occupation, but within these two groups there was marked consistency. Across all tenure types, the relative affordability of living at Waimahia inlet was the main motivation for moving in to the development.

5.3.1. Community Housing Provider tenants: affordability and security

For all the CHP rental tenants, an urgent need for secure, stable and affordable accommodation was reported. For these residents the opportunity to move to Waimahia was so welcome all but one described accepting the offer of a place over the phone without feeling the need to view the dwelling or visit the development. The two key aspects that seemed important to these residents were the income-related rent and the security of
tenure—their rent will be increased if their income increases, but they can stay in their dwelling for as long as they wish. While the quality of the dwellings was a huge bonus for these residents, the appeal of having a new place in a new development was of much less significance than the basic fact of secure and affordable shelter.

These participants related narratives of severe deprivation and housing insecurity. One resident explained that after losing her HNZ house (as a result of the behaviour of family members whom she had taken in) she had spent more than two years without a stable home. After moving six times with a young child, staying on people’s couches, in overcrowded dwellings and in camping grounds, this participant and was immensely relieved and grateful to have been offered a two-bedroom unit. Initially she struggled to believe her good fortune after such a long period of intense and ongoing struggle:

It gave me a shock when I, out of the blue I had a phone call on the Tuesday: “Oh, we hear that you’ve got nowhere to stay.” I said, “yes that’s right”... He told me about the house and I had no idea it was a brand new house. I just couldn’t believe it. I thought, wow! ... it was really awesome for me. For me it was just like a load lifted off me, yes. It was just a load lifted (CHP rental tenant).

Another participant had moved with his family to Auckland to find work. They had rented a house for $450 per week; this was unaffordable given that their pay was frequently not more than $550 per week\(^8\), and moreover the house was of a poor quality. This participant reported that when they asked the landlord to carry out repairs the house was put on the market. They moved out after four months, shifting to live with extended family: 15 people sharing a five-bedroom house. The participant expressed incredulity that their family had not been regarded as high priority for the allocation of a HNZ dwelling. Like the previous participant, this interviewee expressed relief and a sense that the intervention of the CHP had been a stroke of good fortune.

While the stories and situations of the CHP rental tenants who participated in our research varied, without exception the offer of a home at Waimahia was represented as a transformative event; unstable, unaffordable or otherwise untenable living arrangements were suddenly replaced by low-cost, high-quality housing in an attractive setting and with tenure security. In this context, their motivation for moving to the development is self-evident.

5.3.2. Owner-occupiers: affordability, opportunity, community

The owner-occupiers, too, cited affordability as the key factor in their decision to move to Waimahia, but for this group the chance to access affordable home ownership was pivotal; it was seen as “the opportunity of a lifetime”. The following comment is representative of the views of these participants:

So we heard about it [the development] and then I figured it was the only chance to get into our own home (Open market sale).

A strong preference for home ownership was expressed, even though most of these participants described the rental accommodation they were in prior to Waimahia as perfectly acceptable:

Resident: No, the renting was fine. The place was nice...the place was good. Everything was good. But if you look at the rent it was $490 a week and was not

---

\(^8\) Excluding supplementary payments from MSD such as Working for Families.
getting anything back. I’d rather buy a place. I could afford to buy a place. It was like, this [renting] is not getting us anywhere, so would rather just go and buy a place, yes.

Interviewer: So you had always had that aspiration?
Resident: Yes, we always had that. If it wasn’t here, it would have been Wellington. I would have gone back to Wellington [in order to buy] (Open market sale).

Some of these residents had not been considering moving from their rented dwelling until the Waimahia opportunity came up:

No, I wasn’t looking at all. So basically, the inlet opportunity came up and I ummed and ahed for quite a while, for various reasons... I never thought I was going to be in a position to own my own home, I didn’t exactly have the savings behind me (Rent-to-buy tenure).

While the desire to access home ownership at an affordable price (either on the open market or through an assisted home ownership scheme) was the primary motivation for moving to Waimahia, participants did identify other factors that made the development attractive to them. For a number of residents the location was important, either because of proximity to whānau, or because they were already living nearby and knew and liked Weymouth:

I knew it was a good place, but I was kind of hoping other people wouldn’t. When I used to see it on the news I was like,‘ oh people are going to find out what a great place [it is],’ you know that it’s close to the motorways. I don’t want people coming in and finding out because then it would you know bump up the prices, so yes. I really wanted to get in before people realised, oh Weymouth is, you know it’s not Clendon Park, Weymouth is a little bit different, even though it’s just there (Open market sale).

However, as noted above, even with a strong preference for the location, the opportunity for affordable home ownership was a more important consideration:

We both have family in Weymouth, so that was attractive. But, to be fair, if it were in another area, say they had one in Takanini, if it had have been there we would have been happy there. Is location a huge factor? It would have played a little bit of a part. So if it was out west, or even over the [north] shore, we would have thought longer about it. Probably still would have gone for it, because with our particular situation you know can’t really be too fussy (Shared equity tenure).

Not all participants were positively predisposed towards the Weymouth area. Those from outside Auckland in particular were initially put off by the location:

When we started looking for houses we came for a drive … we found it a bit rough. [The area] looks like it is rough, but it’s, once you started living in that area, it’s like it’s normal. They were preconceived [ideas]. There were kids playing on the road. It’s like, where are the parents? It’s that (Open market sale).

For these new residents their observation of the residential areas near Waimahia—Clendon in particular—made them wary of purchasing in this part of Auckland. The combination of the affordability of the dwellings and the proactive development and promotion of community by TMCHL gave them the confidence to purchase despite their initial concerns, as is discussed below.
Another factor mentioned as particularly appealing by all three open market sale participants was their perception that the development would be largely owner-occupied, as reflected in the following comment:

One of the considerations was that they made it very clear that it was mostly owner-occupied. I think that was a key point for me to consider moving in. If it was...if the whole area was poor without any sort of control and it just would turn into a big rental community, then I think we would have second thoughts on buying (Open market sale).

When asked what it was that led them to regard owner-occupation of the development as desirable, the answer was that owner-occupation indicated commitment, stability, and the likelihood of commonality between them and their neighbours:

I think it’s the commitment... To be able to know your neighbours, especially as ... it wasn’t an area we were considering. But if they are owner occupier then we are all in the same situation, yes, and that sort of made us feel that the whole development was planning to be that way, so we felt more comfortable, yes living there, especially when you know, when you have a chance to get to really know the people living around you (Open market sale).

The preference for a largely owner-occupied neighbourhood was, as the comment above suggests, closely linked to narratives of community formation and the participants’ expectations of life at Waimahia. One participant explained that in neighbourhoods with many rentals “people come and go”, and as a result they are less committed and less “protective” of the area. As another participant framed it, Waimahia represented newness, not only in terms of bricks and mortar but also in terms of the ethos of the development and the promotion of community:

It was going to be a new community, meaning everything would be a new development whereby, the other thing was it wasn’t being sold to developers who could just on sell and make money, or make it a renting place for everyone, where nothing is personal, everything is money minded. Whereas, here at the moment, everything is community, everything is, it is regarded as a community. So hence that it would be a good place for everyone to bring up their families (Open market sale).

Our analysis indicates that while the affordability of living at Waimahia was the most important motivator for participants from all tenures, and the opportunity for affordable home ownership was key for those in owner-occupier tenures, other aspects of the development were significant in their decision-making. Those participants who already had connections with the Weymouth area were attracted by its location, while those without such connections were initially dubious about moving into this part of Auckland. For a number of participants, the expectation that the community at Waimahia would be different from other communities was another motivation for moving into the new development. Participants characterised Waimahia as safe and neighbourly, a return to a golden age of community that they recalled from their childhoods. This representation is instructively linked to ideas about tenure and homogeneity, as discussed further below.

5.4. The early stages: interactions with TMCHL and CHPs

This section summarises residents’ experiences of the process of signing up for their new home, and their engagement with TMCHL and other organisations during this time.
5.4.1. Community Housing Provider rental tenants

As has been discussed above, all the CHP rental tenants we spoke to were contacted directly by a CHP and offered a dwelling at Waimahia. All the tenants had been on the HNZ waiting list for some time, and the CHPs had been provided with their contact details by HNZ. This led to some confusion among participants about which organisation was offering them accommodation, at least initially. Until their engagement with their new CHP landlord, our participants were not aware of providers of affordable rentals other than HNZ.

All these participants spoke very positively about their interactions with the staff at their respective CHPs and the process of arranging their tenancy. They found the conditions of their tenancies to be better than expected: the rents lower and their tenure more secure. The confidence that they could stay as long as they wished to, and with a guarantee that the rent would remain the same relative to their income, enabled these tenants to plan for the medium to long term.

One participant spoke in detail about the quantity and quality of support his family had received from their CHP. This interviewee, whose story is mentioned in section 5.3.1 above, felt that from the moment the organisation made contact with them, things started looking up. They had found all the staff extremely helpful, including the senior managers:

*The whole organisation, starting from right on top ... From [name] to ladies in the office, you know. [It was] a really good experience with that and it’s going to be an ongoing thing I think (CHP rental tenant).*

This participant’s sense of affinity with their CHP was so strong he characterised it as an emerging familial bond:

*We mention [the CHP] now because now it has become part of our family. It was funny because there was a time when we didn’t even know [it] existed. So whenever we thought of state housing it was Housing New Zealand, that’s all we knew. But now being with [our CHP] and seeing the work they’re doing, you know, it’s just like “oh amazing” (CHP rental tenant).*

Our findings suggest that CHP rental tenants at Waimahia have found interactions with their new CHP landlords highly satisfactory and, as indicated in the quote above, the support of CHP staff can be transformative for people who are in financial and accommodation difficulties.

5.4.2. Owner-occupiers

Our interviews enquired into how participants experienced “buying off the plans,” as well as how those in shared-equity and rent-to-buy schemes had found the process of setting up these arrangements.

In relation to signing up for a dwelling that had not yet been built, participants were divided between finding it exciting and nerve-wracking. Two of the open market purchasers indicated that signing up to buy a house without being able to see it first was uncomfortable. One of these participants had purchased in stage one of the development, so there were no houses constructed:

*I had had a look at [the plans], still couldn’t figure out what it would be, because there wasn’t anything built. It was just a piece of land, so you didn’t know what you were buying into (Open market sale).*
This participant suggested that if there had been some show-homes constructed before the development was marketed, the first stage homes would have sold more quickly. This view was reinforced by the comments of the other purchaser who expressed nervousness about buying off the plans:

*Because we actually bought it after the first lot was finished, it did kind of give us some sort of indication of how it would look like. Even though it wasn’t exactly the same, but sort of gave us a bit more confidence to buy (Open market sale).*

Being able to see completed houses reassured this purchaser about what he was buying into.

Having someone with expertise in construction to call on enabled another participant to make sense of the drawings, although visualising the finished product still proved challenging:

*I probably have an advantage over some people because my dad is a builder. So he was wonderful where, like I mean I looked at the plans and went “errrrr”, and sent them through to Dad and went, “right, tell me how big that is.” So he was able to map the sizes out for me…It’s still hard though. It’s really hard to envision how it’s going to look (Rent-to-buy tenure).*

Other participants also described involving family members in deciphering the plans and making decisions about their new home; this was described as an exciting and collaborative process:

*It was actually quite exciting. Because for us, because through that whole process we actually involved our parents in it…We had a lot of hui with them and it was important what they had to say, too, because they wanted to have a say, not on what the final product was, but more so that we were making the best choice for us and the kids. So it wasn’t just signing a paper, it was a whānau discussion (Shared-equity tenure).*

For this participant, whānau were integral to the process from the outset. Several meetings between representatives of the Housing Foundation, Kiwibank and whānau were described, during which the different options available to them were discussed. As a result of these meetings, a number of other whānau members have also now moved into the development. Our participant emphasised the helpfulness of the TMCHL partners during this process. Asked to comment on their experience of the shared-equity scheme, the interviewee noted that their lawyer had not seen such an arrangement before. The lawyer drew their attention to the fact that the terms of the agreement precluded them from buying out the partner organisation’s share in a lump sum, but this was “not a deal-breaker” for our participant:

*I just thought, “well, they have to make their money somehow.” I didn’t think it was that unreasonable, I really didn’t, in the grand scheme of things. They’re helping us. You know without them we wouldn’t be in the home, as well. So my family fully appreciated that fact. So we were quite happy with that (Shared-equity tenure).*

As this comment indicates, the participant viewed the shared-equity scheme very positively; it enabled them to become homeowners, and it had been straightforward to put in place. The participants in rent-to-buy arrangements were similarly positive about their experience.

One participant recounted their experience of moving in to Waimahia:
So we were one of the very first families that they partnered with. On our settlement day when we went to pick up the keys and met them at the house, they were all there. There were a number of their employees [affiliated to the same iwi as the purchasers] that were all there to welcome us. So they were all like, “let’s go and support these people.” So they were there. We weren’t aware they were going to be there, but it was such a nice touch. It’s just, I don’t know, when you know you’re in partnership with people and you see the names and you read the documents, it’s one thing, but then to sort of see them it was, yes we were taken aback, like “oh wow, thank you so much” (Shared-equity tenure)

This narrative illustrates the ethos of partnership between the TMCHL members and the residents of Waimahia. This partnership is not merely legal or transactional, but also relational.

5.5. Experience and perceptions so far

5.5.1. Dwelling quality and design

All participants were enthusiastic about the quality and design of their new homes, even though a few had experienced maintenance issues and some had suggestions for future developments by TMCHL. One participant specifically referred to the 6-star environmental rating of the Waimahia houses, while many mentioned how warm and dry their homes were as a result of the insulation and double-glazing. A number of participants talked about how important a warm house was to their family, and contrasted their new home with previous rental accommodation. The following comment is representative:

It’s very good, we’re very pleased with the house, yes. You know it was insulated and [that] was very important for us, especially because we have children, it was important for us. We’ve been renting for 3 years, right, and then having a house which is warmer it makes a huge difference (Open market sale).

Two participants mentioned minor problems they had discovered with the dwelling after moving in, but they had found the builders very responsive and easy to deal with so did not consider this a major issue. One family had encountered more significant problems as a result of the collapse of one of TMCHL’s construction contractors, eHomes, which went into receivership in February 2015 (Gibson, 2015):

Our house was one of the last ones, so they rushed everything. So we saw heaps of things happen, like cracks in the walls, our backyard wasn’t finished properly so we were having, like not landscaped at all, so we’ve had lots of problems with trying to just even sort that out, a lot of flooding, lot of mud (Rent-to-buy tenure).

These issues, which for a different family may have been very distressing, were irritations for our interviewee. Because of their resilience and their sense that Waimahia presented “a great opportunity” for them, they were able to take this in their stride. Despite the protracted repairs, the overall impression this participant had of the quality of the house was: “beautiful… so warm… nice and cosy.”

Feedback about the design of the dwellings was also largely favourable. Participants saw the size of their home as representing good value, and found the internal spaces suitable for their activities. A lack of storage space—cupboards and shelving—was noted as one negative about the design. This was not a major concern, but rather a suggestion for something TMCHL might consider in future developments. This resident’s constructive criticism gives the flavour of these comments:
Oh look the quality is brilliant. I think one thing that they [the developers] could do is probably come back… and talk to the people who have moved in: “are there things that you would like to see that we could look at including in other places?” For me, it’s a couple of little things that my dad is fixing for me, but a shelf in the laundry, you know, the space is there, you need to put one up. A microwave cupboard. Little things like that (Rent-to-buy tenure).

Another observed that the living areas of the houses are away from the street, oriented towards the backyards. As a result, he and his family felt the streets were less of a site of community activity than they might otherwise have been:

If you have a big yard, or a big terrace in front people can put chairs and sit down or something, then when you walk past they’re sitting outside. But in this one here, you walk past and everybody is inside, nobody is out the front (CHP housing tenant).

Several participants commented that the size of their garden area was initially disappointing, as this example indicates:

When we first moved in, we were like, “oh this is small.” I think it’s the ideal of a big backyard, to have a trampoline… it’s just the dream of having that. My partner wants a man cave and some land (Open market sale).

While an aspiration for a larger backyard in the future persisted for these residents, they recognised that the cost of land in Auckland was high, and that thus smaller lot sizes were a crucial element of the development’s affordability. Moreover, once they moved in they had found their garden to be larger than they had understood from the plans, and adequate for their needs:

But in saying that now that we’re in there, I think we’ve adjusted. It’s OK. They’re actually more generous than what people are expecting. That’s the common, that’s the consensus. It’s like, oh wow, the backyard is bigger than what we were expecting. So I think people are pleasantly surprised with it, yes (Shared-equity tenure).

Overall, participants were delighted with both the quality and design of their Waimahia homes. Where they identified aspects that could be improved they did so with a view to future developments, rather than as a complaint. Where they felt the house did not match their ideal (in terms of lot size or bedroom size for example) they contextualised this in relation to affordability; these were trade-offs they were happy to have made.

5.5.2. Development design: public and private spaces

As mentioned above, a number of the owner-occupiers expressed some disappointment with the size of their private outdoor space. When asked how the smaller backyards might influence their activities, however, they acknowledged that this design feature may encourage them to use the public spaces in the development more:

We’re opposite a reserve, so if we ever wanted to go and kick a ball around we cross the road. So it’s not a major. I think that’s nice to be out. So, I guess, it’s [having a small back yard] just made us look beyond, yes (Shared-equity tenure).

Another participant described using the park for fitness training, noting that this activity could lead to greater interaction with neighbours. This participant had heard of other residents who were interested in setting up group fitness activities, such as boxing in the park, and was eager to get involved with that. Several participants suggested that building a playground would be beneficial for children in the development, and also encourage interaction between residents:
An area like a playground for the kids that will help, that will draw the kids and that will draw the adults with them (Open market sale).

In addition to discussing the potential community function of the public spaces, residents were keen to express their appreciation of the open spaces’ amenity value:

What I really like ...[is that] they’ve established like the reserve areas, the grass areas before they started building ... Out here you’ve got the estuary with the stream: they had all that fenced and the paths put in. So they have that vision of what they wanted to do to start off with, which was nice. They have made a point of trying to keep the green and I think that’s really important, especially round here because you’re so close to the water (Rent-to-buy tenure).

Some residents were eager to take the interviewer for a tour around the waterfront area, displaying the estuary and foreshore walk. Interviewees clearly valued their access to the natural environment at Waimahia, and regarded the waterfront reserve as a very positive attribute of the development.

5.5.3. Transport

The majority of people we interviewed made most of their trips by private car. The two participants who did not have access to a car used a combination of rides with friends, public transport and walking to get around. As one might expect, the most frequent journeys people made were to work and children’s schools.

Among participants who were in paid work it was usual to travel to work by car. For some interviewees their work specifically required travel by car, but for others it was perceived to be the most efficient means of getting to work. This was true regardless of whether they worked in the general vicinity of Waimahia or not. One participant caught the train to work from Manurewa, carpooling with their partner to and from the train station. Another walked approximately five kilometres to work because of the cost of public transport:

What I’ve found is from just up here when you go to Becker Drive [to] the bus stop from there to [my work] is $4.50 fare. Why? Because the bus... changes stages, or something. So not paying $5. I walk for an hour and I reach work on time (CHP rental tenant).

Only two participants interviewed had children attending the closest schools to the development—Weymouth Primary and Waimahia Intermediate, both a short walk away—and one of these two households had been living in the area previously. Other residents with school-aged children had chosen to either keep their children at the school they had been attending prior to moving, or were sending their children to Māori immersion schools outside the area. For these residents transporting their children to school usually took the form of dropping them off by car. Some participants had carpooling arrangements with friends and family, while for others it became a time-consuming exercise each day:

It’s quite a commute for us, 40 minutes to drop the kids off yes... my wife [takes them]... It takes most of her day to get them to and from school (Open market sale).

Several participants expressed an interest in using public transport if there was a bus stop located in the development. While there are bus stops less than a kilometre from most houses in the development, some participants with mobility constraints found the walk up the hill a hindrance.
5.5.4. Safety

In the course of the fieldwork, two matters of safety came to light. The first of these was a sense among interviewees that the development was a safe environment for children. Even those participants who had lived very close to Waimahia in the past felt more relaxed about allowing their children to play outside unsupervised in the new development. This was for a number of reasons: less through-traffic, open spaces that are overlooked by houses, and knowing the other residents. Some participants mentioned that they “know the local children”—the children living at Waimahia—and that they “don’t really sort of get other kids” coming in to the area. A narrative of a strong emerging community among the families and, consequently, mutual concern for the welfare of each other’s children, was evident. Participants described allowing their children to roam around the development relatively freely because of this:

> Definitely we encourage the kids to [play outside]. They feel safe here... Our baby—she’s 5—so we’ve got a 10-year-old that can kind of keep an eye on her. A friend from school in her class lives just at the end of the street, so she’s always between here and her friend’s house. Oh yes, no we definitely encourage the kids. Because if we’re here for however many years, they can all grow up together (Rent-to-buy tenure).

This perception of Waimahia Inlet as a safe community for children relates to the ideas of neighbourliness and community discussed in further detail below.

The second safety-related issue was burglary. While the fieldwork was underway a burglary took place in one of the houses, spurring the initiation of a network of Neighbourhood Support groups in the development. At a meeting to set up one of these groups, it was noted by attendees that while construction was still going on there were many people coming and going from the area and large areas of unlit open space with limited passive surveillance. Some participants suggested that the “scattered” way in which each stage was being built, with completed houses in amongst building sites and vacant lots, may have contributed to a vulnerability to property crime.

In addition to an expectation that the risk of burglary would reduce as the development reached completion, a proactive step to prevent crime was taken. The establishment of the Neighbourhood Support groups was described as an opportunity to “build the community... and help each other”, something residents were “really excited about”. The meeting attended by the lead researcher demonstrated the commitment to the creation of community articulated in the comment above. This meeting, held in the house that had been burgled, brought together residents from a cluster of houses and was facilitated by the development’s project manager, with assistance from a Manurewa Neighbourhood Support coordinator and a community constable. Presentations from the Neighbourhood Support and police representatives emphasised the role of knowing your neighbours in preventing property crime: knowing who is local and identifying “outsiders” who might pose a threat. This precipitated an extended discussion among the residents in attendance—many of whom had not met before—about their aspirations for the Waimahia community. One attendee reproached some of his neighbours for not engaging in conversation with him when he greeted them. He said he wanted to live in a “real community” where people knew each other well and “felt like whānau”, not a “normal neighbourhood”; this would only

---

9 Neighbourhood Support (formerly Neighbourhood Watch) is a network of voluntary organisations throughout the country geared towards promoting safety and reducing crime and fear of crime. Neighbourhood-level groups work together, often supported by local police, to encourage community interaction, deter property crime and build local resilience.
happen, however, if people were responsive. Other attendees expressed similar ambitions for the development. A number emphasised their intention to live at Waimahia for a long time, indicating both a commitment to the community and an investment in its safety and security: “this is where my kids’ll grow up...they need to be safe.” People raised their concerns and told their stories. By the end of the meeting a Neighbourhood Support group had been formed and a coordinator appointed, food and conversation had been shared and ideal communities discussed. Although it was precipitated by an unfortunate event, this meeting was a site of unexpectedly reflexive community development.

As is evident from the discussion above, both the perceived safety of the development for children and the perceived risk of property crime provided opportunities for reflection on the nature and function of community. This theme is explored further below.

5.6. Perceptions of community

5.6.1. Neighbourliness

Our interviews sought to discover the kinds of interaction taking place between residents at Waimahia. As might be expected, we found that residents who had been in the development for a longer time had both broader and deeper networks in their neighbourhood. While more recent arrivals tended to only have met their next-door neighbours, and in a number of cases had not interacted beyond an exchange of greetings, those of longer standing had developed relationships with other residents. Participants who had moved into the development’s first stage felt they were part of a well-established community in their immediate vicinity:

*We have our own little pockets of like, you know our kids play together... we know our own little community here. Yes, have each other’s numbers and we’re on Facebook and just created a Facebook page and had a neighbourhood support meeting last night (Open market sale).*

These longer-standing residents described both TMCHL-initiated social interactions (such as Residents’ Association meetings and resident barbecues) and organically emerging and spontaneous neighbourhood connections: “popping in for a cuppa”, communal rubbish collection in the reserve, and carpooling to shared destinations such as churches and the local waka ama club. Significantly, these relationships were framed by most participants as the corollary of children’s interactions. Children playing together was frequently represented as the catalyst for their parents getting to know each other. Several participants described “looking out for” households they felt an affinity with, and then initiating contact following encounters between their children and those of the other residents. As mentioned earlier, all the participants except for one were from households with children, and clearly this predisposed our sample to focus on households like theirs. Participants made comments along the lines of “assuming we are all families [with children], which I think, in general, we are” and:

*I’m kind of expecting a lot of families similar to our own. That’s exactly what we’ve seen. Well most of them, yes. Our neighbour over here I think he’s got three or four kids. The neighbour across the road, three or four. Similar ages (Rent-to-buy tenure).*

Although the development aims to provide housing predominantly to families (conventionally understood as configurations of children and their caregivers) it should be noted that almost a fifth of households in Auckland now comprise only one resident (Goodyear and Fabian, 2014 p.65). The absence of one-bedroom units and the focus on
families and child-centred interactions limits the extent to which the neighbourhood integration of older people or those without children can be examined at Waimahia.

Among the more recent arrivals, as mentioned above, opportunities for developing neighbourly relationships had been limited; all these participants expressed a desire to foster these in the future, however:

*I don’t know much about the family opposite, because they just moved in. But, I don’t know, you try to be nice to everybody, to meet all the new families (CHP rental tenant).*

For this resident, extending a neighbourly gesture to new arrivals was integral to the development of a good community.

### 5.6.2. Difference and commonality

Among our interviewees, a complex attitude to the values of diversity and homogeneity was evident. All participants praised the goal of having a mix of tenure types and by extension social mix, but at the same time there was a strong privileging of the role of commonality in creating social cohesion. This was reminiscent of the Kl comment in section 4.4 above, in which the desire for people to have neighbours “much like them” was conjoined with a valorisation of “a real cross section” of society.

Negative views about the effects of social homogeneity were expressed by people from a range of tenures, but it is significant that these were exclusively about homogeneous rental or social housing communities. The following comments, from opposite ends of the tenure ‘continuum’, illustrate this perception:

*It’s like for social housing, you cannot just put them aside, OK 5000 social housing in one place? There’s no attachment to other community, other types of walk in life (Open market sale).*

*Resident: When I first moved in I was kind of worried that it would be quite typical of a Housing New Zealand street.*

*Interviewer: What sorts of things might be typical of a Housing New Zealand street?*

*Resident: I guess a lot of drugs and drinking and gang members and stuff like that. But from what I’ve seen around the neighbourhood it’s actually really nice family people. I like that it’s a mixture of people that are owning and people that aren’t able to (CHP rental tenant).*

Despite these negative views of homogeneity (albeit homogeneity of a very specific kind) and the widespread agreement that having a diverse community was a virtue (at least in theory), narratives of commonality, of “all [being] in the same boat” and “no-one [being] better than anyone else”, of people being “like us”, dominated our explorations of how the community was developing.

In addition to the aforementioned assumption that most households would be families with children, participants also expressed both an expectation and a desire that the other residents would be people like them in other ways. Some residents specified that having a shared cultural identity was of particular importance to them:

*What’s a bonus for us is, yes we have a lot of Maori here. It’s really, nice, because we’re all thinking the same and we’re all excited to be here and happy to be here. Everyone’s journey has all been different, but that’s nice, yes... Nice to see that they’ve had the same opportunity, like us. And we’re actually all good mates, you*
Given the consortium’s specific interest in providing housing for Māori and Pasifika, this finding is significant. It appears to date that the development is succeeding in relation to this objective, and that the residents feel that this contributes to a healthy community. Some of our Māori participants were heavily involved in the local waka ama club, and explained that some of the newer Māori residents in the development had connected with them through this activity. Connections through shared culture, churches, and sporting activities created a sense of cohesion among residents.

A particularly significant theme in relation to the competing values of difference and commonality pertained to the shared experience of participants as owner-occupiers and first-home buyers, and the perceived difference between rental and ownership tenures:

*We’re all kind of in the same situation and whether it’s we’re open market or getting assistance, you know it’s kind of your first home and you’re, you know I guess similar kind of situations that we are in. Whereas, I guess, when you move into a rental and you don’t really know anyone and you don’t really talk to anyone (Open market sale).*

Some participants understood that there were a range of tenure types, but were not aware that in addition to the three ownership-oriented tenures there were CHP rentals in the development. Their sense of neighbourhood cohesion was predicated on the assumption that all residents were on the path to home ownership:

*I think everyone kind of has respect for everyone because whatever way you’re going to own your house… We’ve all gone through the same path to get here. It just makes it so much easier living, yes. When you’re living with people that rent properties and just disrespect it, you know, disrespect the community. Here everyone looks after their homes and are proud of their homes...It makes a good rapport with everyone around you (Rent-to-buy tenure).*

This participant was slightly taken aback to learn from the interviewer that there were a small number of CHP rentals in the development: “Renters? Oh!” They commented that given the tidiness of the development, “you wouldn’t know” that there were renters living there. Another resident, also in rent-to-buy tenure, expressed a similar view about rental tenure:

*You look around now and you see rentals and you know that they don’t have pride in their house because they don’t own it. Whereas, I think here because of the mix that it is, but also the fact that you’re in a brand new home, I think there’s a lot more pride and I think because of that pride that’s already here that will continue to stay (Rent-to-buy tenure).*

A large number of residents, many of whom had until recently been renting themselves, expressed a negative attitude towards rental tenure. In particular, they emphasised its perceived detrimental impact on the community. A homogeneous neighbourhood comprising owner-occupiers was seen as ideal, although our owner-occupier participants expressed confidence that the CHP rental tenants at Waimahia would be carefully chosen, and would appreciate and look after their high-quality dwellings. Their attitude towards the rental tenants was compassionate, even welcoming:
They have come through an organisation there would have been a need. I mean you have to put them somewhere, so why not put them in a community where they feel secure, they feel part of it? (Open market sale)

5.6.3. Waimahia and Weymouth

We were interested in residents’ perceptions of the relationship of Waimahia Inlet to the surrounding neighbourhood; did they see the development as part of the local area or distinct from it? Views on this issue were mixed. Only one participant was unequivocal about Waimahia being “just an extension of Weymouth, stating that “the kids go to the school, so you’re included”. Significantly, this participant was one of the few whose children attended the local schools, and they had lived in Weymouth for many years before buying at Waimahia. These factors could be assumed to contribute to their sense of the connection between the development and the wider local context. Another long-standing Weymouth resident had a very different view, however:

Having lived in Weymouth for as long as what I have, this is like its own little community. It’s almost like it’s not Weymouth. I suppose part of that is that it’s very much off the beaten track (Rent-to-buy tenure).

Participants identified a number of things that gave a sense of separation between Waimahia and Weymouth. Some commented on the fact that the newness of the housing stock contrasted sharply with some of the run-down areas adjacent to the development:

If you drive through Becker Drive you’ll see houses which are old, small. Then you come in and you see these big brick houses, which are new. It totally gives that feel, that this is different. We’ve had visitors come here and they drove through and they’re like, “what is this?” And then suddenly you get here, this is nice (Open market sale).

The perception that Waimahia was entirely owner-occupied and therefore more affluent than areas with rental properties, was also as a differentiating factor for some participants:

To be able to get one of these houses, to own one, you have to be working at least. You know, you have to have the income to be able to afford to live here. On the other side of the road, that community is known for lower socioeconomic... a lot of problems, a lot of things happen there. So I think there’s actually a difference between the two (Rent-to-buy tenure).

Several participants alluded to the fact that—in the early stages of the development at least—many people in Weymouth had little idea that a large residential area was being constructed on the site because it was not easily visible from the main road. Among these participants there was an expectation that over time integration between the new and existing communities would occur. The completion of construction and the opening of an additional access off the main road were seen as likely catalysts of this:

It is a part of Weymouth, because it is in Weymouth. It can only be called new subdivision now because it is still getting built. But maybe like 5 years from now, it’ll be just known as Weymouth. There won’t be anything building that time, so it will just become part of it, yes (CHP rental tenant).

Despite this expectation, most of our participants saw the present distinction as a positive thing:

Resident: I think it’s still part of Weymouth, but it’s kind of to the side and separated a little bit, which in a way is a good thing.
Interviewer: What’s good about that?
An interesting element of these conversations was the suggestion from a number of participants that Waimahia Inlet would influence the surrounding area for the better; a version of the social mix hypothesis scaled up from the household to the neighbourhood:

*It's good to have this kind of community in Weymouth, because you know it's growth and development, and it's always good to show other people that we may have been there before, but this is where we are now and that there is hope and it gives them encouragement to want to have this, as well (Rent-to-buy tenure).*

Participants recognised that the relationship between the development and its context would change over time, and saw integration with Weymouth as an inevitable future state. For the present, however, the majority of those we spoke to enjoyed a sense that they were living somewhere slightly exclusive and apart from the surrounding area.

### 5.6.4. The Residents’ Association

One of the innovations of Waimahia Inlet is the establishment and support of a Residents’ Association by TMCHL. Membership of the Residents’ Association is specified on the title of the dwellings, and requires that residents adhere to a suite of bylaws regarding matters such as property maintenance and parking.

The Association has an executive drawn from the community, and is currently facilitated by a member of staff from the Housing Foundation. It has meetings periodically and under its auspices, in collaboration with TMCHL, barbecues and other community gatherings have been arranged. All our owner-occupier participants were aware of the Association, as it was explained to them during the process of signing-up for their dwelling. Several residents mentioned the communal lawn mower, provided by the Association, that was available for use with a gold coin donation. Those who had been in the development the longest had attended some events and expressed a desire to get more involved in the future, although their focus was more on developing their Neighbourhood Support group than this development-wide organisation. More recently arrived residents expressed an intention to get involved in the future. All these participants were positive in their attitude to the Association, and saw it as a way to develop a sense of community:

*I think it’s important that we are involved. It's also a really good way to meet. I mean you’re going to meet your initial people who are around you, but I think something like that is actually a good way to meet more people around the area, as well (Rent-to-buy tenure).*

None of the CHP rental tenants were aware of the existence of the Association prior to our interviews (although some of them were aware of the communal mower). This drew attention to a communication issue, one that we believe can be easily remedied: as it is the owner of the dwelling who is legally the member of the Residents’ Association, it is the CHPs rather than their tenants who are members. It appeared from our research that the CHPs had not informed their tenants about the existence of the Association, and that at that point there was no systematic way for all residents in the development to be informed of the Association’s activities. In order to ensure that the Association is for the residents, rather
than being effectively an owners’ association, better communication channels will need to be established.

5.7. Future intentions

We asked participants whether they envisaged themselves living at Waimahia long-term, to gauge their satisfaction with their experience so far and to get a sense of how they expected the community to develop. All of our participants expressed an intention to stay at Waimahia at least for the medium term, with some intending to live there for good:

I’m staying here. They’ll have to carry me out! (CHP rental tenant)

Some participants saw their Waimahia house as a stepping-stone, enabling a move into another house—with more land—in the future. While these interviewees were happy with their experience so far, they did not see their current dwelling as their “forever home”:

Right now I see it as being a first home and progressing towards another home in future years. Obviously, you know, where we have more choice in a few things (Shared equity tenure).

These participants did not have any firm plans about when they might look to move on—five and ten year plans were mentioned by some, but generally timing was likely to be contingent on other events. Employment opportunities and changes in family configuration were given as examples of likely motivators for moving on. One participant explained that seeing their child through high school and launched was a priority, and that change would not be on the agenda before then:

I mean maybe once [my child] is ready to move out of home and stuff like that, that’s when I’d look at possibly moving (CHP rental tenant).

Other participants intended to stay at Waimahia unless circumstances changed dramatically for them. Moving overseas or to another city—for work or to care for ageing parents—were examples of reasons for leaving the neighbourhood.

Overall, participants articulated a desire to remain settled at Waimahia for the foreseeable future. Even those who viewed it as their first step on the property ladder were “realistic” and thought they might end up staying there for more than a decade. Only one of the CHP rental tenants interviewed had any desire to move on, and that was not for at least five years. The long-term tenure available to these households had provided them with a sense of security and stability some had not experienced before. These findings indicate that the community at Waimahia may remain quite stable over the coming years; this may contribute to the development of strong social networks.

5.8. Discussion

Our interviews with incoming residents at Waimahia give a snapshot of a community-in-the-making. The findings demonstrate that TMCHL’s desire to enable families to access affordable home ownership has been transformative for many residents: for those who have entered into owner-occupation it is the “opportunity of a lifetime”. For the CHP rental tenants, too, Waimahia represented more than simply shelter; the security of tenure, the affordable rent, and the quality and newness of the dwellings were overwhelming for some:
I just couldn’t believe it. When I came here I was just... oh I walked in here and I just sat and I cried (CHP rental tenant).

The stated intention of all participants to live at Waimahia for at least the medium term illustrates their satisfaction with their new homes and the development as a whole. Interviewees were universally pleased with the quality of their homes, and all had positive experiences to recount of their dealings with TMCHL and its partner organisations.

A commitment to build a strong community and develop networks with neighbours was evident in most of the interviews. Participants had strong views about the characteristics of an ideal community, as well as about the preconditions for its emergence. They aspired to recreate the remembered neighbourhoods of their childhood; places where everyone knew each other, where people helped and supported each other, where houses and gardens were well maintained, and where children could play safely without supervision. The prerequisite for the emergence of this community, according to our participants, was a significant degree of similarity between them and their neighbours. Life stage, family type, employment status, modest but secure financial status, and culture were all identified as aspects residents either hoped or expected they would share with others in the development.

The idealised community they described was not only something hoped for, but also something our participants were actively trying to bring about. Involvement with Neighbourhood Support and the Residents’ Association, and fostering relationships with the parents of other children at the development are examples of community-forming activities they were engaged with. Here the alignment between the desire of TMCHL to build a community, rather than just houses—as evidenced by their promotion and support of the Residents’ Association—and the aspirations of the incoming residents is clear.
6. Conclusion

It was going to be a new community. The other thing was it wasn’t being sold to developers who could just on-sell and make money, or make it a renting place for everyone, where nothing is personal, everything is money-minded. Whereas, here at the moment, everything is community. So it would be a good place for everyone to bring up their families (Open market).

Our research has found discernible communities forming at three levels at Waimahia Inlet: between the consortium partners; between the CHPs and the residents they are partnering with as joint owners or landlords; and amongst the incoming residents. At each level the relationships that are developing are simultaneously incidental and purposive. The interactions that continue to occur between individuals and organisations through the course of development are building trust and reinforcing the mutuality of particular aspirations. At the same time there is a deliberateness embedded in this process. As discussed in section four, the consortium partners specifically sought to develop a community among themselves in order to grow their capacity to deliver the Waimahia project and, potentially, future projects along these lines. The CHPs, unlike traditional commercial developers, have an ongoing commitment to and connection with residents; in order to achieve their progressive social aims, these organisations offer more than just shelter. This is evident in several ways, such as the establishment of the Residents’ Association and the wrap-around support offered to CHP rental tenants. The residents themselves also articulated a desire to foster a very particular sort of living environment; a “real community”, a whānau, a return to an Arcadian past where a neighbourhood is a supportive and safe space.

These findings are significant in the context of Auckland’s housing shortage, the rapid development expected under the Housing Accord, and central government’s social housing reform programme. The success of TMCHL in the rapid delivery of affordable housing for people in a range of socioeconomic circumstances has been facilitated by the collaborative and values-based approach of the consortium. The active promotion of community by the consortium and its constituent organisations, coupled with residents’ aspirations for a cohesive and supportive network of relationships within the development, appears at this stage to be effectively transforming a subdivision into a community.

Convergence and alignment, as has been noted previously, are two key concepts at play in the Waimahia context. Converging agendas between the community housing sector, mana whenua, central government and Auckland Council enabled the development, while the aligned values of the consortium members enabled their effective collaboration. Alignment between the developers and the new residents in relation to community formation has further enhanced the project’s success to date. TMCHL shares with its residents a slightly nostalgic vision of New Zealand suburbia, and together they are working to (re)create neighbourhoods that are more cohesive, happy and healthy: as one participant described it, at Waimahia, “everything is community.” While our research sheds some interesting light on the social mix debate, in general the project of community building seems to be going extremely well.

The development at Waimahia is, we suggest, a possible model for further large-scale third-sector housing projects. TMCHL has piloted a structure and operating model that has thus far proved highly successful. This success is not only measurable in terms of dwellings built: the stories of incoming residents demonstrate the emergence of a healthy and resilient community.
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List of organisations

Accessible Properties: a not-for-profit, charitable organisation. It manages New Zealand’s largest non-government housing portfolio of 1100 IHC dwellings. It provides housing for people with disabilities, older people, and those on low incomes.

Auckland Community Housing Providers Network: a collective community housing group that was formed in 2010 to share resources, support each other and to collaborate on projects in the Auckland area.

Auckland and Onehunga Hostels Endowment Trust: the former name of Te Tumu Kāinga (see below).

Community of Refuge Trust (CORT): a Trust set up by the Ponsonby Baptist Church in 1987 to provide financial assistance to low-income people in order to find housing in Central Auckland. CORT is a registered community housing provider, and specialises in providing one- and two-bedroom dwellings close to public transport and services. CORT is part of the TMCHL consortium.

Habitat for Humanity: an international, non-governmental, not-for-profit organisation founded in 1976. It is devoted to alleviating issues of housing poverty by building affordable housing for low-income families.

Housing Shareholders’ Advisory Group: a group set up by the Government in 2010 to review and report on the current and likely future demand for subsidised housing. It was also set up to make recommendations on the future role of the Housing New Zealand Corporation in delivering assistance.

Monte Cecilia Housing Trust: a Trust offering a range of housing services in order to support low-income families in the search for affordable housing. The organisation’s focus is on providing culturally appropriate support for families in crisis.

New Zealand Housing Foundation: a not-for-profit, charitable trust formed in 2003. NZHF has assisted those who cannot afford to buy a home on the open market, yet are not poor enough to satisfy the eligibility threshold for state housing. The Foundation had built over 300 dwellings prior to the commencement of the Waimahia development, many of which operate under the shared equity system. NZHF is part of the TMCHL consortium.

Social Housing Unit: a government agency set up as a semi-autonomous body within the Building and Housing Group of the Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment. It works with organisations that provide social and affordable housing, including not-for-profit, iwi and private sector providers.

Tāmaki Collective: an abbreviated name for Ngā Mana Whenua o Tāmaki Makaurau, a group consisting of 13 mana whenua iwi in the Auckland region. The Collective is part of the TMCHL consortium, and its representative is Chair of the TMCHL board.

Tāmaki Makaurau Community Housing Limited: a limited partnership formed in 2013. The partnership comprises the Tāmaki Collective, Community of Refuge Trust, New Zealand Housing Foundation and Te Tumu Kāinga.
Te Tumu Kāinga: formerly called the Auckland and Onehunga Hostels Endowment Trust, Te Tumu Kāinga is a Trust endowed by the Crown in the 1850s. The Trust is a not-for-profit community housing provider established to support Māori Housing needs and aspirations, and is administered by Te Tumu Paeroa (the Maori Trustee). Te Tumu Kāinga is a member of the TMCHL consortium.

Waimahia Inlet Neighbourhood Limited Partnership: governed by Tāmaki Makaurau Community Housing Limited, WINLP is the entity carrying out the development at Waimahia. The limited partners are: New Zealand Housing Foundation, Te Tumu Kāinga and CORT.
Appendix A: Key informant interview schedule

Introduction of the interviewer, the project, the range of key informants. The interview will include questions relating to the formation of the consortium; the role of community housing providers; the nature of relationships between partners, central and local government agencies; and the consortium’s engagement process with neighbouring residents and service providers.

1. Organisational involvement and values
To begin, I wonder if you could tell me how your organisation came to be involved in the development?

How does the Waimahia project align with your organisation’s values or mission?

What were the particular priorities for your organisation?
Follow-up questions as appropriate:
  - Do you feel that these priorities are reflected in the final decisions about the development of Waimahia?
  - Are there things you would like to have had more control over?

What are the points of difference, in your view, between the priorities and values of the different institutions in the consortium?
Follow-up questions as appropriate:
  - In the process of forming TMCHL, did you encounter any difficulties as a result of conflicting organisational values or priorities?
  - In what ways has central or local govt influenced the structure, priorities, or modus operandi of the consortium?

2. Characteristics of TMCHL
How would you articulate the shared values of the TMCHL group?

How did the consortium get to the position of having shared values?
  - Follow up/prompt: Have they emerged as a product of working together on this project, or were they pre-existing?

The stated vision of the Waimahia Inlet development partnership is “to create a great place to live with quality affordable housing in a healthy and strong community.” Part of this goal is the ongoing involvement of TMCHL with the Waimahia community over the first few years after completion, through partnering with the Residents’ Association. This active promotion of community building is a distinctive feature of this development, and I would be interested in the origins of this idea. Could you tell me a bit about how that aspect of the project came about?

3. Community formation among institutions
As well as being interested in the emerging community of those who will live in the Waimahia development and the community who currently live in the vicinity of the site, we are interested in the relationships between the different organisations involved in the project and the potential for the development of a community among these institutions.
Has your organisation worked with any other members of the consortium prior to the Waimahia project?

*Follow-up questions as appropriate:*

- Can you tell me a bit about those projects?
- Are there any notable similarities or differences between how you worked together then and the way the Waimahia development is being carried out?
- Did the relationships developed through those projects influence your organisation’s decision to work on the Waimahia project? Or did these experiences lead you to operate differently in this instance?

Has your organisation had other/prior experiences of working with groups other than the TMCHL partners to develop affordable housing?

*Follow-up questions as appropriate:*

- Can you tell me a bit about those projects?
- Did any aspects of those experiences influence your organisation’s decision to work on the Waimahia project? Or did these experiences lead you to operate differently in this instance?

Has the Waimahia project formed a platform for further work in collaboration with other member organisations?

*Follow-up questions as appropriate:*

- Do you consider that there is potential for further co-development opportunities along the lines of Waimahia?

The initial proposal for the project identifies a number of aspirations for TMCHL. It states that:

> The Waimahia Inlet, Weymouth project represents the starting point for collective meaningful partnering at all levels of project delivery, on-going management of community housing, and future opportunities for housing developments at scale. The objective is that this model, and entity established, will become the primary driver of growth in the Auckland community housing sector.

Would you say this is still an accurate expression of the vision for TMCHL? At this stage of the process to what extent do you think the consortium is on track to meet its objectives in this regard? Do you see the formation of an enduring community of providers as a legacy of the Waimahia project?

Was there any involvement from locally-based service providers, the local board, or residents in the neighbourhood in developing a notion of community for Waimahia? Are you aware of any resistance to the development?

### 4. Procurement

The next group of questions are about how the consortium has made decisions around four key issues.

- **a)** The range of tenure options offered (eg rent / Rent-to-buy/ shared equity)
- **b)** The types of houses built (eg size/range/aesthetics)
- **c)** Housing performance standards (eg energy efficiency standards)
- **d)** Procurement processes — how did you end up selecting 3 (was it three) construction companies? How did you negotiate outcomes (costs, building performance standards) with the builders?

For each of the decision points: could you please talk about who was involved in making the decision, whether particular past experiences were influential in the decisions reached, and any particular decision making processes that were used?
5. Political context

During the 2014 election campaign, Waimahia was used by the then government as an example of the success of the Auckland Housing Accord. How did you (and the consortium) experience the attention focused on the development?

In your view, was this framing of the development a positive thing for the project and the organisations involved?

Has the involvement of the government in the project been constraining in any way?

Given the progressive goals of your organisation, and of the Waimahia project, do you find that sometimes you are making trade-offs between your organisational values and the expectations and values of government? Is there a danger of being co-opted, or of there being a perception that you have been co-opted, in service of a particular agenda?

As they foreshadowed last year, the government now intends to transfer a significant number of HNZC dwellings to community housing providers. A key players were you or your organisation consulted as the policy was developed? What do you see as the opportunities and drawbacks of the policy as currently framed? Does TMCHL, or your organisation (either independently or in conjunction with other partners), intend to take up this opportunity or respond in any way to this proposal?
Appendix B: Incoming resident interview schedule

Introduction: The research is one small part of a very large research initiative called “Resilient Urban Futures” which involves researchers from across the country with interests in urban development from a range of perspectives — sustainability, climate change, planning, transport, safety, community development, economic development and so on. The Waimahia case study is part of the ‘Residential choice and community formation’ research strand of Resilient Urban Futures. We are interested in Waimahia because it’s an unusual development in lots of ways — the involvement of community housing providers, the affordability of the housing, the range of options both in terms of type of dwelling and type of tenure (ownership/shared ownership/Rent-to-buy/rental). The development consortium is also really determined to promote a strong community at Waimahia, so it fits in well with the research strand. We’ve been interviewing people involved in the design and management of the development to understand how it’s worked from their perspective, but now we are hoping to understand how incoming residents are finding it. We are interested in (for example) how you heard about the development, what appealed to you about it, and whether it is living up to your expectations so far. The research will be written up into a report for Resilient Urban Futures later this year, and it’s possible that in addition there might be some academic articles or conference papers written to share the findings further, but we haven’t planned the details of these yet. Any reporting of findings will keep your name and any identifying information completely confidential, of course!

Background

I’d like to start by getting to know a bit about you and your household. Could you start by telling me who lives here with you?

Details to explore:
- resident ages, relationship to interviewee, permanent/temporary residents in the household;
- number of earners in the household

When did you move in to Waimahia?

Whereabouts were you living before you moved to Waimahia?

Was it the same people living with you there?

What type of place was it — house, unit, etc?

Did you own that place (with/without mortgage), or were you renting?

Were you already looking to move on from there when you heard about Waimahia? If so, what were you hoping to change about your situation by moving?

Decision to move

How did you hear about Waimahia?

What attracted you to it?
As you know, there are a range of different options here in terms of ‘tenure’ — there are open market sales, shared ownership, home-saver, and rental. Which one of these options have you chosen?

What other options did you consider when you were making a decision about where to live?

Other options considered at Waimahia — tenure type or dwelling size? Alternatives elsewhere? Reason for the decisions made?
What did you know about this part of Auckland before you moved here? What were your feelings about the area?

For buyers, shared equity, Rent-to-buy: how did you find the process of buying a house off a plan? Were there any particular challenges to do with buying a house that hadn’t already been built?

For shared equity and Rent-to-buy: Were you aware of schemes like this before you found out about Waimahia? How have you found the process of setting it up? Would you recommend it to others?

For social renters: what was your reaction to being offered a rental property here?
Do you have a fixed term rental agreement?

ALL tenure types: How have you found living here so far? Is there anything you especially like (or don’t like) about living here?
Prompts: location impacts? Dwelling quality?

Expectations about community

The next few questions are about the community forming here at Waimahia.

Do you expect the community here to be similar to or different from other places you’ve lived? How? Why?

It seems to me that moving in to a place that is a completely new neighbourhood like this might be quite different from moving into an established community. Do you have any expectations about the kind of relationships you might form with other residents?

Have you got to know your neighbours here already? How did that come about?

Where might you meet other residents of Waimahia?

Are you familiar with the Residents Association? Have you had any involvement with that yet — meetings, events? Might you get involved in the future?
If they knew about it before they moved in: was this an attractive aspect of the development?

There’s an emphasis in the design here on having smaller backyards and more public open space — do you think this will make a difference to where you (your family) spend/s their non-working time? - do you think it will have an impact on how people interact here?

Do you think having a mixture of owners, rent-to-buy, shared equity and renters will have an effect of the community? What do you think that effect will be?
As well as the community in this new development, there’s the wider Weymouth community here too. Do you see Waimahia as part of the wider Weymouth community, or separate? Why? How might relationships with the neighbourhood beyond the development be fostered? [and is this desirable?]

We are also interested in how you and the other people in your household get around, where you travel to and how you get to different things like work, visiting family, school, children’s activities, social stuff. Could you tell me a little about the places you regularly go, and how you get there?

Prompts: visiting family, church, marae, children’s schools/activities, tertiary training

Future intentions

Now you’ve moved in, are you happy with your decision to live here? Has it met your expectations? How?

I know it’s early days, but do you have any thoughts about how long you might want to live here?

Intend to stay long term: do you feel a particular commitment to building the community here, as one of the foundation residents?

Not sure: what might influence future decisions? Possible drivers for future moves? Schools, capital gain, employment etc

External interest

There has been a lot of media attention on Waimahia, as well as interest from people like me who are doing research. I wondered how you’ve found that attention so far? Has it impacted you at all? Does it influence how you see your new home?

We’d be interested to follow up with you to find out how living in Waimahia is for you over the longer term. Would it be ok if I or one of my colleagues got back in touch with you in a year or so to see about arranging another interview?
Appendix C: Participant information and consent forms

Waimahia: a case study of community housing provision

INFORMATION SHEET

Key Informant Interview

Background

My name is Emma Fergusson and I am a researcher with SHORE & Whariki Research Centre, Massey University. During 2015 I will be documenting the set up phase of the Waimahia Inlet development. The research is funded by the Ministry of Business Innovation and Employment as a component of the Resilient Urban Futures Project.

You have been invited to participate in this project because of your role in the planning and/or development of Waimahia.

Participant involvement

You will be one of 8-10 key informants interviewed for the research. The interview will take approximately 60 minutes and will be conducted by me, at a time and place suitable to you. The interview will include questions relating to the formation of the consortium; the role of community housing providers; the nature of relationships between partners, central and local government agencies; and the consortium’s engagement process with neighbouring residents and service providers. With your agreement the interview will be audiotaped and later transcribed.

What will happen to the information provided

The information you provide will contribute to a written summary of the set up phase of the Waimahia Inlet Development and potentially included in a publication on innovations in housing provision in New Zealand. Digital tapes and transcripts of interviews will be stored in password protected computer files at SHORE & Whariki’s premises 90 Symonds St, Auckland. Data will be kept for 10 years, after which it will be destroyed by Karen Witten or a nominated support staff member.

Participant’s Rights

You are under no obligation to accept this invitation. If you decide to participate, you have the right to:
\begin{itemize}
  \item decline to answer any particular question;
  \item withdraw from the study up to 3 weeks after the interview;
  \item ask any questions about the study at any time during participation;
\end{itemize}
• provide information on the understanding that your name will not be used unless you give permission to the researcher;
• be given access to a summary of the project findings when it is concluded
• ask for the recorder to be turned off at any time during the interview.

Project Contacts
For any queries regarding this project, please contact either Emma or Karen

Researcher: Supervisor:
Emma Fergusson Professor Karen Witten
E.Fergusson@massey.ac.nz K.Witten@massey.ac.nz
0212619258 0272802090
09 366 6136 xtn 41346 09 366 6136

Committee Approval Statement
“This project has been evaluated by peer review and judged to be low risk. Consequently, it has not been reviewed by one of the University’s Human Ethics Committees. The researcher(s) named above are responsible for the ethical conduct of this research.

If you have any concerns about the conduct of this research that you wish to raise with someone other than the researcher(s), please contact Professor John O’Neill, Director (Research Ethics), telephone 06 350 5249, e-mail humanethics@massey.ac.nz”.

SHORE & Whariki Research Centre, School of Public Health, Te Runanga, Wananga, Hauora me te Paekaka
P O Box 6137, Wellesley Street, Auckland, New Zealand. Tel: +64 9 366 6136. Fax: +64 9 366 5149
Email: shore@massey.ac.nz Web: www.shore.ac.nz
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CONSENT FORM

Key Informant Interview

Project title: Waimahia: A Case Study of Community Housing Provision

Names of researchers:
Principal investigator: Professor Karen Witten (Massey University)
Researcher: Emma Fergusson (Massey University)

I have read the Participant Information Sheet, have understood the nature of the research and why I have been selected. I have had the opportunity to ask questions and have them answered to my satisfaction.

- I agree to take part in this research.
- I understand that I am free to withdraw participation at any time, and to withdraw any data traceable to me up to one week after the interview.
- I agree to be audio-recorded.
- I understand that a third party who has signed a confidentiality agreement will transcribe the audio-recording.
- I understand that I will receive a summary of findings.
- I understand that data will be kept for 10 years, after which they will be destroyed.
- I would / would not like to review a copy of the transcript of the interview.

Full name ___________________________________________  Date _______________

Committee Approval Statement

“This project has been evaluated by peer review and judged to be low risk. Consequently, it has not been reviewed by one of the University’s Human Ethics Committees. The researcher(s) named above are responsible for the ethical conduct of this research.

If you have any concerns about the conduct of this research that you wish to raise with someone other than the researcher(s), please contact Professor John O’Neill, Director (Research Ethics), telephone 06 350 5249, e-mail humanethics@massey.ac.nz.”
• be given access to a summary of the project findings when it is concluded
• ask for the recorder to be turned off at any time during the interview.

Project Contacts

For any queries regarding this project, please contact either Emma or Karen

Researcher: Supervisor:
Emma Fergusson Professor Karen Witten
e.fergusson@massey.ac.nz K.Witten@massey.ac.nz
0212619258 0272802090
09 366 6136 xtn 41346 09 366 6136

Committee Approval Statement

"This project has been evaluated by peer review and judged to be low risk. Consequently, it has not been reviewed by one of the University’s Human Ethics Committees. The researcher(s) named above are responsible for the ethical conduct of this research.

If you have any concerns about the conduct of this research that you wish to raise with someone other than the researcher(s), please contact Professor John O’Neill, Director (Research Ethics), telephone 06 350 5249, e-mail humanethics@massey.ac.nz". 
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CONSENT FORM

Incoming resident interview

Project title: Waimahia: A Case Study of Community Housing Provision

Names of researchers:
Principal investigator: Professor Karen Witten (Massey University)
Researcher: Emma Fergusson (Massey University)

I have read the Participant Information Sheet, have understood the nature of the research and why I have been selected. I have had the opportunity to ask questions and have them answered to my satisfaction.

• I agree to take part in this research.
• I understand that I am free to withdraw participation at any time, and to withdraw any data traceable to me up to one week after the interview.
• I agree to be audio-recorded.
• I understand that although the researchers will make every effort to avoid reporting information that could identify me, they cannot guarantee that no-one will be able to guess my identity.
• I understand that a third party who has signed a confidentiality agreement will transcribe the audio-recording.
• I understand that I will receive a summary of findings.
• I understand that data will be kept for 10 years, after which they will be destroyed.
• I would / would not like to review a copy of the transcript of the interview.

Full name ______________________________________
Signature ______________________ Date _________________

Committee Approval Statement

“This project has been evaluated by peer review and judged to be low risk. Consequently, it has not been reviewed by one of the University’s Human Ethics Committees. The researcher(s) named above are responsible for the ethical conduct of this research.

If you have any concerns about the conduct of this research that you wish to raise with someone other than the researcher(s), please contact Professor John O’Neill, Director (Research Ethics), telephone 06 350 5249, e-mail humanethics@massey.ac.nz.”