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Introduction

The term ‘housing crisis’ is now commonplace in our six-o’clock TV news reports, newspaper articles, social media posts and in public debates, discourse and policy discussions. The housing crisis in Aotearoa is extremely complex and multifaceted. Is it a crisis around housing supply? Or is it really an affordability problem? Is the crisis about expensive and unhelpful bureaucratic processes? Is the crisis instead focused on those who are homeless? Or on those living as part of generation rent? Or on those locked out of first-home ownership? Are there enough builders, plumbers, electricians, surveyors and so on? Is it an Auckland-only issue, or something affecting other parts of the country? What is this housing crisis exactly? Is it ALL the above? Or just some of these things?

These are all critical and relevant questions and there have been many articles, reports and commentaries that have tried to answer them. But in our view, there has been a distinct lack of discussion about how this housing crisis directly impacts on specific groups of people. Whatever shape or form this housing crisis takes, there are some New Zealanders who are more adversely affected by it than others. The purpose of this discussion paper is to look deeper into how these major housing challenges are affecting specifically Pasifika people living in Aotearoa. We’ve made this focus for several reasons. Firstly, The Salvation Army believes there has not been enough public discussion about Pasifika peoples and housing in our nation. We hope to change this. Secondly, Pasifika people constitute nearly 11 percent of those using our Salvation Army Community Ministry hubs around the country, and make up a large amount of those using our transitional housing services. A significant proportion of those using our services are Pasifika. Consequently, we believe we have some valuable insights into the serious social issues, particularly around housing needs, that Pacific people and families face in New Zealand. Finally, we suggest that looking closer at the effects and realities of housing policies and challenges for a specific ethnic group can ideally help better inform future housing policy development overall. This Paper clearly cannot be an exhaustive commentary on Pasifika people’s housing hardship. Neither can this Paper go into too much detail about the social issues that we highlight here. But ideally this short Paper can contribute to the public conversation about the housing crisis or challenges facing our nation.

As this Paper progressed, what emerged was a very troubling picture of Pasifika people and housing in Aotearoa. These concerns, for example, are captured well in the 2018 report A Stocktake of New Zealand’s Housing which stated clearly:

Recent housing policies have failed to address the housing problems of Māori and Pacific peoples. Rising housing costs have contributed to declining home ownership rates, greater housing instability, and Māori and Pacific peoples living in poor quality housing.

A key challenge, of course, is to determine whether current and future policy settings and policy development from central and local government can effectively address these issues for Pasifika, and for the multitudes of other Kiwis affected by housing problems. But another vital consideration is whether
there is any innovation in the community housing sector that could greatly influence the future housing situations of Pasifika families. The challenges here are immense. But the opportunities for change are exciting, too.

In terms of structure, this Paper will follow the following outline:

- **Introduction**
- **Theological Reflection**

The Table below summarises the primary issues and resulting recommendations that emerge from this Paper. These issues and recommendations are developed throughout this document.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue(s)</th>
<th>Recommendation(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| What is the strategy or overarching plan of action to address this Pacific housing crisis? | 1. Develop an all-encompassing strategy and action plan across various government and non-government sectors. This could be led by the Minister of Pacific Peoples.  
3. Undertake a data project to ensure data is accurate and robust, especially given the 2018 Census debacle. This is important for ethnic-specific data.  
4. Scope the establishment of a Pasifika Housing Unit.  
5. Develop a Pasifika-relevant Housing Continuum for Aotearoa. |
| Innovation in the housing sector that could help address these challenges | 1. Matanikolo Project—review, evaluate and determine how the lessons from this innovation could inform other projects and possibly be replicated elsewhere.  
2. Existing innovative home ownership programmes need more resourcing.  
3. Financial capability at the core of Pacific housing. We submit that financial mentoring and budgeting must be at the core of any action or outcome related to Pacific people and housing. |
| Urban redevelopment projects taking place in areas with significant Maori and Pacific populations (e.g. Porirua, Mangere, Mt Roskill) | Include community representation in the new Kainga Ora Board, ensure that regeneration not redevelopment is the focus, and mandating a community voice at the strategic level to influence the master planning of these projects. |
Theological Reflection

Is there any such thing as a theology of housing? That was one of the main questions that faced me in approaching this Paper. While I am passionate about the Bible and its wonderful truths and lessons, I have not invested time or effort in thinking about whether it includes a theology of housing. But for me, the Bible is the beginning of theological thinking. Furthermore, my other starting point as I’ve considered theology and housing is my own personal context. I was born in Samoa and see that land as home. Yet I was raised in a state house in Mangere, South Auckland and this has also become my home, my place of belonging and standing. One thing I do know now is that theology is not a dirty word, particularly when it is a Biblically-based and informed theology. Essentially, theology is a combination of two Greek words that when combined means the ‘study of God’. As the very accessible website www.gotquestions.org states, Christian theology is simply an attempt to understand God as He is revealed in the Bible. No theology will ever fully explain God and His ways because God is infinitely and eternally higher than we are. With that clarity, is there indeed a theology of housing? Is there an appreciation or understanding from the Bible of how God and humans are to view housing, particularly the housing challenges millions face around the world?

For many professing Christians, the answer to these key questions is a resounding yes. The Church Leaders Group, which meets regularly with the Cabinet, tabled a paper with the Prime Minister in February 2019 titled Housing, good progress but vital gaps. This paper pushed strongly for three specific actions from the government; more social housing, more support for the community housing sector, and more innovative house purchase programmes for Kiwis. Clearly there is a strong focus from church leaders and their denominations about advocating for housing changes. But this advocacy doesn’t clearly show the theological thinking that might lie behind these views and actions.

In August 2017, the Anglican Social Justice Unit dug a bit deeper in this area. Wayne Kirkland from this Unit developed a resource for their churches that reflected on a 2017 housing statement from the Church Leaders Group. This resource focused on three questions; What is the housing crisis and why does God care? What is God’s vision for housing in NZ? What is God asking of us? This resource was intended for use in preaching sermons, Bible studies and other discussions. Whatever your theological leaning might be (if you have one at all), Kirkland’s work did highlight the inherent difficulty in trying to overstretch parallels between the Biblical text and modern-day social issues like housing. But Kirkland did argue that there are lessons to be learnt, particularly from the Old Testament of the Bible, that can inform modern views and actions centred on housing issues. I agree with Kirkland that there are lessons from this amazing book called the Bible. I do disagree with some of the parallels and lessons he makes, but I definitely value his work in building or trying to capture a theology of housing for housing-theology novices like me.
The Centre for Theology and Community in the United Kingdom has in recent years undertaken a lot of work around the intersection of Christian theology and housing. This Centre’s mission is to equip churches to transform their communities – through community organising and missional enterprise, rooted in theological reflection and prayer. In 2016, this group released a report titled *From Houses to Homes: Faith, power and the housing crisis.* The theological unpacking in this report is very similar to the resource from the Anglican Social Justice Unit and Mr Kirkland. The authors of *From Houses to Homes* frequently refer to Catholic Social Teaching. But they also frame their theological reflections on Walter Brueggemann’s thinking around the inextricable link between land and housing. The authors follow Brueggemann’s four key themes from his 1977 book, *The Land;* God deals with specifics, not abstractions and so place matters; ‘Home’ is an important Biblical image of redemption; communities are not commodities and; God is present in the poorest communities in a particular way.

For the authors of *From Houses to Homes,* Brueggemann’s framework and themes are crucial in building a theology of housing (pardon the pun!). So, what can made of all of this? The key question in this section was; *is there any such thing as a theology of housing?* After looking at some of the available resources, the answer is that for many Christians, there truly is a strong theology of housing, especially a theology that is connected to a housing crisis and housing needs (which nearly every nation faces in some form). Are these theological themes ones that I now ascribe to? Probably not fully. But the theologically-informed thoughts on land, home and place detailed above are hugely significant for me as a Samoan born in Samoa who truly values the links between land and home. But these concepts of land, home and, as Brueggemann articulates well, place, are equally important for me as a long-time resident of Mangere and South Auckland as well as Samoa.

The Bible and theology can and do inform someone’s thinking about housing. I understand this now. But how it informs this thinking will depend on numerous factors, including how we view God Himself, the Bible, and complex ideas of land, home and place. The way Dr Shook summarises these notions is helpful. Dr Shook and her husband served as Christian missionaries through the Missions Door ministry focussing on work around homelessness, faith-based housing provision and other housing-related ministries. In her doctoral thesis *A theology of housing as stewardship and mission based on making housing happen: faith-based affordable housing models,* Shook makes connections between housing crises and the concepts of land, stewardship and the Jewish Biblical teaching of the Jubilee (Leviticus 25). Dr Shook adds in her thesis; *It is hoped that the reader will have a new understanding of the God-given purpose of land and its just use so that all will have a place to live. It is hoped that the body of Christ will be mobilized to see and implement some practical ways that the church today can live out this part of the gospel to advance God’s kingdom on earth.*

In the end, a theology of housing is a practical one, rooted in informing Christian thinking on current and future housing problems. This theology can be diverse and shaped by
Biblical concepts of land, home and place, or stewardship and the Christian mission to evangelise the world. For The Salvation Army Te Ope Whakaora or any Christian organisation or denomination, the challenge is to ensure that all our practical responses (or theology in practice responses) to a housing crisis are grounded in Scriptures Biblical truths to ensure mission, theology and practice intersect and interact effectively to address these housing challenges.
Summary
1 • Snapshot of Pacific Population in New Zealand

1.1

We would have loved to analyse and present related statistics about Pasifika people and housing in this Paper. But not enough relevant information was available at the drafting of this work. The 2018 Census debacle has made these vital Maori and Pacific statistics somewhat questionable, especially for Pacific people. For example, in mid-August 2019, several Pacific academics strongly warned against using data about Pacific people because of the low response rate to the 2018 Census.\(^{14}\) Still, recent Census information releases do paint an interesting picture of Pasifika in New Zealand. It is also important to note here that throughout this Paper, we use the terms Pasifika and Pacific frequently and interchangeably. We understand that the terms Pasifika or Pacific are essentially Western constructs. We do at various times refer to the specific island ethnicities or nations that comprise the generic Pasifika category. Figure 1 (right) shows the Pacific population growth from 2006 to 2018. Additionally, recent Census information releases show that Pasifika now make up 8.1 percent of the overall population. But the Pasifika population is not growing as quickly as the Asian population for example. Additionally, 3.9 percent of Kiwis identify as Samoan which is the fifth largest ethnicity in our nation. The Pacific population has increased by more than 43 percent since 2006, and between 2013 and 2018 there were 85,701 additional Pacific people in New Zealand, an increase of nearly 29 percent.

Many government departments and other organisations have been resigned to continuing to use Census 2013 figures in their work. However, there are other more specific up-to-date data sets available that are more recent and regular. This data is likely to give a more accurate picture of Pasifika in New Zealand. Below is a brief snapshot of some indicators for Pacific communities.
1.2 PASIFIKA PEOPLE AND HOUSING—GENERAL STATISTICS

- In a 2015 BRANZ report, Meeting the housing needs of multi-generational households, the authors had a particular focus on multi-generational Maori and Pasifika households. Some of their findings included:
  - Their literature review strongly recommends that Pasifika housing should cater for larger households, have suitable space for gatherings and rituals, flexible space to accommodate visiting family members (short or longer-term) and land for a garden.
  - But multi-generational households were increasing across all ethnic groups, usually driven by various demographic, social and financial reasons such as people marrying later, cultural traditions for immigrants, child-care arrangements, caring for elderly and so on.
  - The report made two main recommendations; addressing the social needs of multi-generational households through design and function; and promoting multi-generational living through rules, regulations, policy and planning. The authors advised larger open spaces (for cultural and family gatherings) and garden spaces (for economic and recreational purposes) for housing developments for Pacific families.
  - Using the Canadian National Occupancy Standard definition, according to the 2013 Census, nearly 40 per cent of Pacific people live in overcrowded homes, with nearly 49 per cent of Tongans in New Zealand living in overcrowding.

1.3 CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE

- In 2018, the proportion of Asian school leavers attaining at least NCEA Level 2 or equivalent was 90.6 percent, European/Pakeha 82.4 percent, Pacific was 74.6 percent and Māori was 65.8 percent. The proportion of Asian school leavers achieving NCEA Level 3 or above in 2018 was 75.7 percent, European/Pākehā 56.4 percent, Pacific was 46.1 percent and Māori was 35.3 percent.
  - As at 2018, there were 29,400 young people aged 15–24 categorised as NEET (not in employment education or training) in Auckland. 18 percent of these young people were Pacific.

1.4 WORK AND INCOMES

- In terms of the employment and the labour market, the following indicators were reported by the Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment (MBIE) for the year to June 2019 in its Pacific Peoples in the Labour Market update:
  - 60.2 percent employment for Pacific adults
  - 158,900 Pacific people working in New Zealand
  - The unemployment rate for Pacific people is now 8 percent.
  - Approx. 67 percent (116,200 people) of the total Pacific workforce live in Auckland. But the employment rate for Pasifika in Auckland (57.9 percent) is significantly
lower than the rate for Pasifika in the South Island (71.5 percent) or Wellington (64.7 percent).

1.5 CRIME AND PUNISHMENT

- 11.8 percent of the adult men’s prison population as at June 2019 was of Pacific ethnicity. This is a slight increase from 2018 (11.4 percent).²²

- Of those of Pacific ethnicity in prison, more than 41 percent of those in prison are Samoan, and 25 percent are Cook Island-Maori. As at April 2015, 55 percent of those in prison were born in New Zealand. The rest were born overseas.²³

1.6 SOCIAL HAZARDS

- Pacific immunisation coverage at age 2 increased from 84.2 percent in 2010/11 to 96.4 percent in 2014/15.²⁴

- 23 percent of Pacific people smoke compared to 15 percent of other New Zealanders.²⁵

1.7 OTHER RELEVANT STATISTICS

- The Pacific population is projected to make up 11 percent of the overall New Zealand population by 2038.²⁶ Statistics New Zealand made this prediction in May 2015. In the same release, they also predicted that by 2020, Pasifika would comprise 9 percent of the population. This is close to reality as Paragraph 1.1 above shows.

- 79 percent of Pacific people are affiliated to a religion.
2.1 HOUSING CONTINUUM
After this snapshot of statistics, this section will focus on the housing situation of Pacific people living in New Zealand. This data will be divided up according to the key parts of a housing continuum or spectrum. A housing continuum is a very practical tool that, according to Community Housing Aotearoa, is useful for understanding housing delivery and need in communities over New Zealand ... helps provide a way to understand the state of each housing segment, how they are performing, or failing to perform, and how they affect other parts of the continuum.27 There are many versions of this continuum.

2.2
A positive recent development is the re-thinking of the traditional housing continuum commonly used in the public and community sectors undertaken by the Independent Maori Statutory Board (IMSB). The IMSB is an independent body of nine members based in Auckland which has specific responsibilities and powers under the Local Government (Auckland Council) Amendment Act 2010 to promote issues of significance to Māori to the Auckland Council. The IMSB has tried to re-imagine the range of housing provision and situations from a kaupapa Maori framework.28 This IMSB version of the continuum is taken from their Kāinga Strategic Action Plan that emerged from the Auckland Maori Housing Summit in 2018. This Plan aims to improve housing outcomes for Māori in Tāmaki Makaurau. The Plan promotes Te Tiriti and the underlying principle of Kāinga; targeting Iwi, community and whānau outcomes. It proposes actions based on stakeholders’ existing roles and responsibilities.

Figure 2: Re-thinking the Housing Continuum—IMSB 201929
2.3
This innovative approach is based, according to the IMSB, on a focus that seeks to help the shift from thinking about housing in terms of financial cost, to thinking about its social function. We have therefore developed the model above which reflects housing experiences—the social function of housing, not income and financial outcomes as the principle outcome of housing. We have also reconsidered the typical linearity of the model which presupposes a linear differentiation of homelessness experiences and seems to imply a need to move through those stages before exiting—a kind of graduation exercise from homelessness.\textsuperscript{30} The Salvation Army applauds this approach to build culturally relevant and designed models when looking at housing experiences and need in Aotearoa. The emphasis in this Kāinga Strategic Action Plan on the social function of housing and whanau is a great re-focussing of thinking and planning around how housing need is conceptualised and addressed.

2.4
We are unaware of any specific Pacific version of the housing continuum for the Pasifika communities in Aotearoa. There are clearly helpful lessons from the Maori form of the continuum given the numerous similarities between Maori and Pacific communities. Conversely, the traditional continuum also provides a useful framework from which a more comprehensive picture of Pacific peoples and housing can be developed. We return to a possible Pacific version of the continuum later in Section 3 of this Paper, particularly as the Kainga Strategic Action Plan has provided a solid foundation for reframing not just the continuum, but also challenging how we conventionally approach housing need, supply and policy in our nation. But for the remainder of this section, we will use a more traditional gamut of housing that we have recently developed to capture current housing provision and need.

2.5
The Salvation Army has in previous housing-focused reports included references to the generic housing continuum.\textsuperscript{31} Figure 3 (next page) was developed in 2019 by The Salvation Army as our attempt to simplify, understand and document the current state of housing supply and need in our nation for various public presentations. The reality of housing is much more complex than this picture. But relatively recent changes in policy and practice such as emergency and transitional housing developments have led to us review our view of this continuum. This version of the continuum is a very simple model and does not capture the nuances around need, social function and subsidy provision that other models use.\textsuperscript{32}
The following paragraphs will now add some more information and context to these various phases of the continuum from a Pasifika perspective. We have tried to find and use the most current and relevant data we could, but this proved difficult with the 2018 Census gaps and the lack of reporting of ethnic-specific data. In addition, a quick word of caution: we are looking specifically at the numbers here in relation to the continuum. We have not captured the experiences, stories and realities of these Pacific people and families. This is beyond the scope of this Paper. However, we acknowledge and respect these realities, particularly for those facing real housing problems and housing-related challenges (e.g. financial, health, mental health, homelessness etc.) all along this continuum. There is some recent research that does record some of these themes and experiences around homelessness, including some of own Salvation Army research such Invisible in the Super City: Hidden homelessness in Auckland and our 2017 and 2018 State of Our Communities reports. Alongside the statistical information, this Paper will note some of the recent policy announcements relevant to this area.
The widely used definition of homelessness is from Statistics New Zealand; *living situations where people with no other options to acquire safe and secure housing: are without shelter, in temporary accommodation, sharing accommodation with a household or living in uninhabitable housing.*\(^{34}\) Despite this definition, we still do not have an effective way to record or review homelessness in New Zealand. In early 2018 Johnson et al added; *there is no systematic recording or monitoring of homelessness on a month-by-month or year-by-year basis. There is no data on the ‘floating population’—homeless people who do not, or cannot, access government housing assistance, or are turned away from community agencies because they have no capacity to provide help ... [a]part from Census data, we currently have no reliable way of knowing whether the homelessness problem is improving or deteriorating, and whether funding put into homelessness services is actually working to reduce homelessness.*\(^{35}\)

a) In her 2016 report *Severe Housing Deprivation in Aotearoa New Zealand*\(^{36}\), Dr Kate Amore found there were at least 41,000 homeless people in New Zealand. Dr Amore added that *people identifying as Pacific, Māori, or Asian groups are over-represented in the homeless population. Pacific New Zealanders are ten times more likely to be homeless than European New Zealanders.*\(^{37}\) Dr Amore concluded that by 2013, there were 11,396 homeless Pacific people, which amounted to 29 percent of the total homeless count. In comparison, in 2013, 32 percent (12,754 people) of those defined as homeless were Maori and 34 percent (13,498) were European.\(^{38}\) The Pacific figures are even more troubling given the Pacific population in New Zealand is significantly smaller than the European or Maori populations. *Figure 4* below from Dr Amore’s report illustrates the trends of housing deprivation across three Census periods..

**Figure 4: Ethnicity of severe housing deprivation population—2001, 2006 and 2013 Censuses**\(^{39}\)
b) On 17 September 2018, the Housing First Auckland Collective did the first Point in Time count of homeless people in the Auckland region, counting those without shelter or in temporary accommodation. In their ensuing report, Housing First Auckland reported that a minimum of 3674 people were homeless in the region.\(^4^0\) On the actual night of the count, 336 people were recorded as living without shelter, but this had a validation-adjustment and was estimated to be 800 people. Additionally, 2874 people were reported by providers as being in temporary accommodation on the count night. In terms of Pasifika peoples, the report stated that 17.7 percent (approx. 136 people) of those counted as living without shelter were Pacific.\(^4^1\) But the report highlighted that nearly 39 percent (approx. 1121 people) of those in temporary accommodation were Pacific.\(^4^2\) It is clear that, according to Housing First Auckland, Pacific people are over-represented in their counts and definitions of people without shelter or in temporary accommodation. This is troubling when you consider that Pacific people make up about 15 percent of the Auckland region population and most of the Pacific population in New Zealand lives in the Auckland region.

c) Other regions have undertaken their own versions of a homelessness count, including the People’s Project work in Hamilton. But even though there is some (dated) information on homelessness, it is crucial that a better mechanism or system is developed to count and monitor homelessness in New Zealand on a regular and robust basis.

2.8 GOVERNMENT RESPONSES

The Government responses to homelessness also overlap with other parts of the housing continuum we are basing this analysis on. A basic summary of responses is in Figure 5 below:

*Figure 5: Survey of recent key Government responses to homelessness*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August 2019</td>
<td>$54 million–$31 million over the next four years for 67 intensive case managers and navigators to work with these people and a further $16 million for increased social services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2019</td>
<td>$197 million—Wellbeing Budget 2019—This funding is tagged to the Housing First Programme and aims to house an additional 1,044 people and whānau in high need areas (bringing the total number of homeless people housed to 2,700).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2018          | • $37.1 million invested to increase the number of public housing, transitional housing and Housing First places as part of the Government’s Winter 2018 Response.  
• Housing First programme expanded to Christchurch, Tauranga and Hamilton.  
• Creating Positive Pathways (CPP) initiative begins working with people who leave prison with no access to stable housing and who are at high risk of both homelessness and re-offending. |
| 2017          | • Housing First programme launched in Auckland.  
• Sustaining tenancies programme begins.  
• Transitional housing initiatives begin. |
| 2016          | Emergency housing initiatives begin. |
2.9 PASIFIKA AND HOMELESSNESS

There is a massive amount of activity from central Government around homelessness. This does not capture the work happening in local regions, also. For example, Wellington has Te Mahana: Ending homelessness in Wellington—A strategy for 2014–2020.43 Other local authorities have similar strategies in place. Additionally, there are multitudes of community, church, iwi, marae and even family-based initiatives around the country working with homeless people, rough sleepers, beggars and others in housing crisis.

Pasifika are severely over-represented in homelessness figures, particularly in Auckland. This is even more concerning given Census 2018 figures recently released. Firstly, 63.9 percent of the Pacific population (more than 244,250 people) live in the Auckland region.44 Secondly, the median age was 23.4 years for the Pacific ethnic group, compared to 25.4 years for Māori, 31.3 years for Asian, and 41.4 years for European.45 The Pacific population is highly concentrated in Auckland and very youthful. Therefore, any acute housing need in the Auckland region especially has a disproportionate impact on Pasifika, and in particular Pasifika young people and children. Additionally, the social issues associated with acute housing need such as health issues (e.g. rheumatic fever), child poverty and problem debt will also excessively impact on Pacific people in Auckland. In the following sections of looking at the housing continuum, a more detailed picture of the specific serious housing needs facing Pacific people and families is developed as we look at Pasifika in emergency and transitional housing.

2.10 DATA

Arguably, those people in emergency and transitional housing could be classified as homeless given the temporary nature of this housing for them. For the purpose of this Paper, we look at these parts of the continuum separately to try and develop a more comprehensive picture for Pasifika people.

a) The previous National Government began a series of housing responses, particularly after community advocacy with events like Park Up for Homes in South Auckland that put pressure on policy makers to focus on acute housing needs.46 Responses included more assessment of housing need by the Ministry of Social Development (MSD), greater identification of housing need in the Social Housing Register, and provision of more transitional housing places.

b) A good starting point is the Public (Social) Housing Register which is administered by MSD. This register records applicants who are eligible for, but not currently in, public housing; and who are ready to be matched to a suitable property. Those are on the register as facing complex housing (and often social) issues. Figure 6 below shows the worrying increase in this waiting list since 2014.47 As at August 2019, MHUD reported that the waiting list was now 13,167.48 These increases are...
partly explained by policy and practice changes within government where people were able to get on the Register quicker than in previous years.

c) Pasifika people now make up more than 14 percent of the total register. Again, like the homelessness data discussed earlier, this is even more concerning given the comparatively small Pacific population in New Zealand. Furthermore, as of June 2019, nearly half of the people on the register were in Auckland. Finally, as of June 2019, nearly 18 percent of the total number of those on the register came from five Auckland local board areas with significant Pacific populations (Mangere-Otahuhu, Manurewa, Otara-Papatoetoe, Papakura and Henderson-Massey). Again, these statistics are very concerning regarding Pasifika communities. Figure 7 below depicts the ethnicity of the main applicant for the register since 2016. This figure gives a good indication of the scale of this aspect of acute housing need for various ethnicities, including Pacific peoples. This figure clearly shows the large numbers of Maori and Pacific people applying to MSD for critical housing support. But for Pasifika, this picture is particularly dire with the numbers of Pasifika applying for the register increasing 232 percent since 2016.
d) In terms of emergency housing, an Emergency Housing Special Needs Grant (EH SNG) is there to help individuals and families with the cost of staying in short-term accommodation. This is usually in a motel or something similar. An EH SNG is usually paid if they are unable to access one of MSD’s contracted transitional housing places. The EH SNG pays for short-term accommodation for up to seven days at a time, with the accommodation being provided by commercial and community providers who are not contracted by MSD to deliver accommodation services. Clients can have multiple EH SNG if transition to another form of housing proves difficult. The Salvation Army is involved nationally in supporting people using these EH SNG typically through our social work, budgeting, food welfare and addictions services. In the quarter ending June 2019, $34.3 million was spent on the EH SNG. The Ministry of Housing and Urban Development (MHUD) in its quarterly reports does not break down the EH SNG in terms of ethnicity. But Figure 8 below shows the consistent increase in clients who received one or more EH SNG. While most EH SNG do not need to be repaid, MHUD reports that 4 percent of these grants are now recoverable payments. This is an area The Salvation Army is following closely, especially given the recent public discussion around the huge amounts of debt clients owe to government departments. Increasing levels of debt, including recoverable payments like this, can add further stress and pressure on clients facing serious social issues.

Figure 8: Numbers of clients receiving one or more EH SNG since 2018

In the quarter ending June 2019, $34.3 million was spent on the EH SNG. The Ministry of Housing and Urban Development (MHUD) in its quarterly reports does not break down the EH SNG in terms of ethnicity. But Figure 8 below shows the consistent increase in clients who received one or more EH SNG. While most EH SNG do not need to be repaid, MHUD reports that 4 percent of these grants are now recoverable payments. This is an area The Salvation Army is following closely, especially given the recent public discussion around the huge amounts of debt clients owe to government departments. Increasing levels of debt, including recoverable payments like this, can add further stress and pressure on clients facing serious social issues.
2.11 DATA

Transitional housing provides short-term housing for individuals and families who don’t have anywhere to live and have an urgent need for a place to stay. This housing is provided by MSD-contracted providers who deliver the housing along with other wrap-around social support services for clients. Families stay in these houses or accommodation options for an average of 12 weeks, which can be rolled over if more permanent options are not found. People living in transitional housing pay rent of up to 25 percent of their income (like income-related rents for public housing) with the balance paid by MHUD. As of June 2019, there were 2789 transitional housing places across the country.54

a) The Salvation Army Te Ope Whakaora is a contracted transitional housing provider. From January to September 2019, we had 1275 clients use our transitional houses.55 Forty-three percent of these clients had children, and the average stay in our houses across this period was 13.2 weeks.56 Figure 9 below includes the ethnic breakdown of these clients, showing that Maori make up nearly half of our transitional housing clients, and Pasifika people also comprise a major part of our clients relative to their population.

Figure 9: Ethnic breakdown of clients using Te Ope Whakaora transitional houses Jan–Sept 2019
2.12 PASIFIKA IN EMERGENCY AND TRANSITIONAL HOUSING

From the data and discussion above, it becomes evident that Pasifika are, compared to the total population, over-represented in these housing support services. The numbers of Pasifika on the Public (Social) Housing Register points to some extreme housing problems for many people and families. This is, of course, connected to the homelessness data discussed earlier. With Pasifika featuring heavily in this ‘sharper’ end of the continuum, questions must be asked about whether the policy development and programme delivery in these housing supports are effectively helping and empowering Pacific families to (where appropriate) move along the continuum. Moreover, questions need to be asked within the Pacific communities themselves as to why Pacific people are disproportionately represented in these acute housing need statistics. In our view, these results simply are not good enough for Pacific peoples. Therefore, there must be substantial change within the current policy settings and, when required, innovation outside of these settings to address these pressing issues for Pasifika people.

2.13 DATA

As discussed above, the information around Pasifika in relation to homelessness, emergency and transitional housing is a helpful indicator of the need for social or public housing from these Pacific communities. As at August 2019, there were 69,509 public housing tenancies, with this Government signalling it wants to increase the public housing places to 73,628 by June 2022.\(^57\) This plan to increase the stock is positive given the serious housing need prevalent especially among Maori and Pacific communities. The volume of public statistics in this area is massive. Therefore, drilling down to the needs and realities for Pasifika communities can be very difficult. There are some other interesting sources of data that can inform this Paper on Pasifika peoples and housing.

a) Since 2017, there has been a focus by government to diversify the ownership of social or public housing. In 2017 Penina Health Trust was the first Pacific provider to be registered as a Community Housing Provider (CHP) and provide transitional housing places. Again, this is positive development given the high numbers of Pacific people in transitional housing. More than 6000 public housing places are provided by 36 registered CHPs.\(^58\)
b) Most of the public housing is managed by HNZ. In its 2018 Contemporary Status Report, the Ministry of Pacific Peoples noted that more than 27 percent of HNZ tenants were Pacific, and in Auckland approximately 40 percent of these tenants were Pacific. These numbers are fairly well known. But they are still indicative of the challenging circumstances many Pasifika people are facing, especially in Auckland.

c) MSD funds most social housing places through the Income Rent Related Subsidy (IRRS) which supports people on lower incomes. The other main form of subsidy is through the Accommodation Supplement (AS). As Johnson et al noted, nearly two-thirds of the recipients of the AS are in private rentals, which amounted to an $870 million spend in the 2016/17 financial year. This will be discussed in the next section. But it is necessary to note here that Pasifika people’s rental costs in both public housing and the private rental sector is being heavily subsidised by the Government through the IRRS and AS. This signposts the lower incomes that Pacific families have. Figure 10 below shows some comparisons of median income from the 2006 and 2013 Censuses from the 2018 Ministry of Pacific Peoples report. Figure 11 shows some income trends from 2009–2019 compared between European, Māori and Pacific workers. The clear evidence in both figures is the lower income levels Pasifika have relative to other peoples. Interestingly, the average weekly earnings (and the median weekly earnings) for Māori and Pacific have grown closer in the last few years. In terms of Auckland, Figure 12 highlights some specific socio-economic challenges that directly affect Pasifika in the region. Again, the income levels and associated challenges are hugely influential in terms of the quality, tenure and even stability of the housing Pacific people are likely to have.

**Figure 10: Median income levels (and median age) for various ethnicities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Median Income ($)</th>
<th>Median Age (Years)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2006 Census</td>
<td>2013 Census</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>24,400</td>
<td>28,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European</td>
<td>25,400</td>
<td>30,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori</td>
<td>20,900</td>
<td>22,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Peoples</td>
<td>20,500</td>
<td>19,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>14,500</td>
<td>20,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Eastern/Latin American/African</td>
<td>16,100</td>
<td>19,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Ethnicity</td>
<td>31,200</td>
<td>37,100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
More than 64 percent of the Pacific population live in private rental housing, compared to about 32 percent for the rest of New Zealand.63

A BRANZ report from 2017 supported these findings when it claimed that inequalities in renting was even more likely for Maori and Pacific living outside of large metropolitan areas.64 But with the Pacific population centralised in Auckland and other large cities, BRANZ reported some figures based on the 2013 Census that show again the high likelihood of Pacific people living in rental housing.65

- More than 70 percent of Pacific people in Auckland were renting;
- Pacific people were also the highest group of renters in both the Christchurch and Wellington areas, two other areas with major Pacific populations;
- Renting was more likely for those aged 20 to 34 years old, which again aligns with the Pacific population. With 103,752 people aged 15 to 30 years old, Pasifika young people are more likely to be renting than others.
b) In 2016, Statistics New Zealand published *Changes in home-ownership patterns 1986–2013: Focus on Māori and Pacific people.* This was a comprehensive look at Census data and gave some great insights into home ownership and renting for Maori and Pacific people. The data here affirms the information stated above. **Figure 13** from this report highlights the significant changes for Pacific people in terms of housing tenure over several Censuses. Again, without the 2018 data, it is difficult to clarify what the true picture is today. This figure also clearly shows the decline in home ownership for Pacific people too, particularly since 1991.

![Figure 13: Tenure type for Pacific people—1986–2013 Censuses](chart)

- **Lack of security of tenure for those in private rental situations.**
- **Questions around the quality of the housing available.**
- **Relationships with landlords.**
- **Increasing rental costs.**
- **Potential over-crowding due to larger Pacific families and attempts to reduce rental or housing costs.**

d) In terms of the specific Pacific groups, the numbers in rental situations are all high. Renting is highest for Tuvaluan and Tongan people and families.

**Figure 14: Percentage of Pacific groups in rental accommodation (2013 Census)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Percent in rental accommodation (N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Samoan</td>
<td>63% (82,848)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook Islands</td>
<td>64.5% (36,411)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tongan</td>
<td>66.9% (36,432)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niuean</td>
<td>63.5% (13,890)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fijian</td>
<td>59.3% (7,881)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tokelauan</td>
<td>63.3% (4,209)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuvaluan</td>
<td>78.1% (2,424)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

e) The General Social Survey (now grouped under Wellbeing Statistics) gives some amazing insights into housing tenure and quality issues. This survey provides some ethnic-specific data. **Figure 15** below summarises some of the key information. From the information below, one can conclude that tenure stability, connections with landlords and moving along the housing continuum are all substantial barriers for Pacific people in market or private rental housing.
Figure 15: Housing and tenancy security measures by ethnicity—Apr 2018–Mar 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>European (% estimated)</th>
<th>Maori (% estimated)</th>
<th>Pacific (% estimated)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moved rentals because tenancy ended by landlord</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moved rentals because costs too high</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moving from rental to owned dwelling</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House not repaired because landlord is unwilling to do the work</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.15 DATA

We have referred to some home ownership data in Paragraph 2.14(b) above. In the 2013 Census, a massive 81.5 percent lived in homes they did not own (or potentially were living without shelter). Figure 16 is a good summary of home ownership for the individual Pasifika groups. Still, it would have been helpful to have the 2018 figures to assess what the changes in home ownership for Pasifika are, if any. Home ownership is more of a reality for Fijian and Samoan people but is clearly a real challenge for Tuvaluan families. Also, consistent across all these island groups is that those aged 45–54 are more likely than others to own their home. With the Pacific population being an overwhelmingly young population, this indicates major hurdles for younger Pacific people to enter home ownership.
In the *Changes in home-ownership patterns 1986–2013: Focus on Māori and Pacific people* report, the comparisons across ethnicities showed that Europeans are much more likely than other ethnicities to own homes, although like other groups, this is declining. But the decline for Pasifika was alarming, with home ownership declining by more than 35 percent from 1986 to 2013 for Pasifika. This report delved further into specific regions, especially those with high Pacific populations. Figure 17 below details some of these.

### Figure 16: Home ownership by ethnicity—2013 Census

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Home ownership by ethnicity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Samoan</td>
<td>19.2 percent or 17,139 people stated that they owned or partly owned the home that they lived in. This includes those whose home was held in a family trust. New Zealand-born Samoans were less likely than those born overseas to own or partly own their own home. Those aged 45 to 54 were most likely (24.5 percent) to own or partly own their own home.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook Islands</td>
<td>17.6 percent (6522 people) stated that they owned or partly owned the home that they lived in, including homes in a family trust. New Zealand-born Cook Islanders were less likely to own or partly own their own home than those born overseas. Those aged 45 to 54 were most likely (28.7 percent) to own or partly own their own home.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tongan</td>
<td>5328 or 15.3 percent own or partly own their own homes, including homes held in a family trust. New Zealand-born Tongans are less likely to own or partly own their own home. Those aged 45 to 54 were most likely (28.7 percent) to own or partly own their own home.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niuean</td>
<td>18.1 percent or 2589 own or partly own their own homes, including homes held in a family trust. New Zealand-born Niuean are less likely to own or partly own their own home. Those aged 45 to 54 were most likely (28.2 percent) to own their own home.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fijian</td>
<td>22.9 percent or 2289 people own or partly own their own homes, including homes in a family trust. New Zealand-born Fijian are less likely to own or partly own their own home. Those aged 45 to 54 were most likely to own their own home (28.2 percent).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tokelauan</td>
<td>16.9 percent or 714 people own or partly own their own homes, including homes in a family trust. New Zealand-born Tokelauan are less likely to own or partly own their own home. Those aged 45 to 54 were most likely to own or partly own their own home (25.4 percent).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuvaluan</td>
<td>9.7 percent or 195 own or partly own their own homes, including homes in a family trust. New Zealand-born Tuvaluan are less likely to own or partly own their own home. Those aged 45 to 54 were most likely to own or partly own their own home (26.5 percent).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
regional challenges. Again, with Pacific people living mostly in Auckland and other urban centres, these numbers show plainly the home ownership difficulties Pasifika face.

**Figure 17: Home ownership across various regions for Pacific people**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northern Auckland zone</td>
<td>63.1</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>-38.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Auckland zone</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>-47.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Auckland zone</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>-31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Auckland zone</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>-44.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Auckland urban zone</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>-38.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Hutt zone</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>-19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Hutt zone</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>-15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porirua zone</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>-18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellington zone</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>-10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Wellington urban area</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>-14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>-38.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total New Zealand</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>-34.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) There are many factors involved in determining or shaping home ownership e.g. personal preference, work situation, family situation etc. But in our view the most significant factor is affordability. Home ownership is simply out of reach for the majority of Pasifika people because they are just too expensive and Pacific income levels are too low. **Figure 18** from Johnson et al below captures the steady increase in house prices, and the mammoth increases in Auckland. The most recent update on median house prices from the Real Estate Institute of New Zealand captures the steady increase in house prices, and the mammoth increases in Auckland. **Figure 19** from Johnson et al below captures the steady increase in house prices, and the mammoth increases in Auckland. In this update, the median house price in Auckland is $848,000. Yet again, this is a major challenge for Pacific families. But even in other regions, the high prices will make it difficult for Pasifika to enter home ownership.

**Figure 18: Median house prices for selected regions 2007–2017**
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Finally in this section, some comments around shared equity schemes. In the 2019 Wellbeing Budget, $2.5 million was delegated to help Pacific people into home ownership. With the massive home ownership gaps outlined above, this is in our view a relatively small amount tagged for this huge challenge. Furthermore, this $2.5 million was stated to be for targeted financial capability services to assist in the home ownership journey for Pacific people. We fully endorse the importance of building financial capability and financial literacy for Pacific families, especially those wanting to move along the continuum and enter home ownership. But to truly impact Pasifika home ownership rates, more serious investment is needed. In our view, shared equity or similar types of initiatives could greatly assist in this. Many CHPs have these types of programmes, with many of their clients being Pacific. But these are not at scale yet. For example, the Habitat for Humanity annual report states that 47 families are partnering with them around home ownership. There might be some hope ahead with Minister Woods announcing in September 2019 $400 million to be provided for a progressive home ownership scheme, reducing the deposit required for a Government-backed mortgage to 5 percent, and changing policy settings so that family and friends can each use their $10,000 First Home Grant and their KiwiSaver to buy their first home together. All of these announcements could have an impact on Pasifika people and their movement along the continuum. Our hope is that the initial $400 million for this progressive home ownership programme follows the advice from the KiwiBuy campaign and is done in conjunction with the experts in the CHPs.
3 • Critical Emerging Issues and Recommendations

3.1 In this final section, we want to make some concluding comments and recommendations about key or emerging issues related to the discussion of Pasifika and the housing continuum in Section Two of this Paper. Looking at these issues for Pasifika has been somewhat disjointed because of the 2018 Census problems, the large amount of housing information available, and the difficulty in securing ethnic-specific data. But despite this, it is clear that Pasifika people face some critical housing challenges all along the housing spectrum, from homelessness through to home ownership. The picture painted by this data is not a pretty one for Pasifika people and families, especially for younger Pacific people and those living in Auckland.

3.2 ISSUE: WHAT IS THE STRATEGY OR PLAN OF ACTION?

In 2009, the Orama Nui Housing Strategy for Pacific Peoples 2009–2019 was launched. This was a ten-year plan of action to improve HNZ’s delivery to Pacific people. The strategy had four main proposed strategy outcomes: Pacific communities have strong and enduring partnerships with local and central Government, and others, that advance their development; Pacific people understand what Housing New Zealand does and Housing New Zealand effectively communicates and delivers its products and services; Pacific people have access to quality, suitable, affordable and stable rental housing; Pacific people have opportunities to progress their home ownership goals and aspirations. With HNZ now moving to the new Kainga Ora entity, what is happening with this strategy and plan of action? Additionally, what has this strategy delivered for Pacific people? A strong strategy and plan of action is vital in generating real change for Pacific people across this housing continuum.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- **Overarching strategy**—While an HNZ strategy is useful, we recommend that an overarching Pacific housing strategy is developed between government, Pacific peoples and the community housing sector. This strategy should look at the whole housing continuum and, as this Paper initiates, develop the picture of Pacific people and housing in Aotearoa. From this foundational picture, some clear goals and aspirations can be set to focus action for all key parties. We recommend that the Minister of Pacific Peoples and other key ministers lead the development of this crucial work. In our view, particularly with the significant housing and social problems Pacific people face, an urgent plan is needed. Pacific people are facing stress, hardship and vulnerability across all parts of the continuum and so urgent action is needed. Clear thinking is needed here so that robust solutions are developed by the
various sector partners. For example, we have noted the Government’s intention to implement a progressive home ownership scheme. Since Pacific people are primarily renting and essentially locked out of home ownership, how can Pacific families leverage the funding available and the expertise of Pacific-friendly CHPs to join these schemes and move towards home ownership? Additionally, it is crucial that these schemes are reflective and embracing of the various cultural dynamics that Pacific people have. For instance, the differing views and prioritising of money and wealth by Pasifika, and the larger and multi-generational families Pacific tend to live in, should be reflected in the content and make-up of those delivering these schemes.

- **Review of the Orama Nui Strategy**—It is likely that a lot of public resource and money was spent developing this strategy. The Salvation Army calls for the review of this important strategy to determine what was achieved, what actions were implemented and what was/is the impact of this strategy for Pacific families. We propose that the Ministry of Pacific Peoples undertakes this work, especially since Kainga Ora is in full operation.

- **We need data**—Throughout this Paper, we have acknowledged the data gaps we have encountered. Also, securing accurate and relevant ethnic-specific data is a challenge. Organisations like The Salvation Army Te Ope Whakaora have a massive reliance on precise public data. Even though the Census 2018 figures are slowly being released, we have grave concerns about the integrity of this data. We submit that the Government needs to ensure that this ethnic-specific data is robust. This is connected to the recommendation above because without good data, then real pictures cannot be developed and subsequently strong impact for Pacific people and housing is less likely to happen. A Pacific data project in housing, and possibly across Government, would inform a new overarching strategy for Pasifika and housing. Connected with this is what we highlighted in Paragraph 2.7 above about developing a system to effectively count and monitor those who are homeless or in extreme housing need.

- **Pasifika Housing Unit**—The Salvation Army fully supports the establishment of the Maori Housing Unit inside MHUD in 2018. This development, coupled with the Maori Housing Strategy and the Minister for Maori Housing, are crucial to help address the major housing issues facing tangata whenua. We strongly recommend a similar approach is undertaken for Pasifika people and their housing needs. This could be a Government Pasifika housing unit or team that could be established to develop the overarching strategy and implement culturally appropriate actions to try and reduce Pacific housing hardship across the continuum? We call on the Ministry of Pacific Peoples to investigate the viability of this organisation and advance ways that this cross-Government group could work with Pacific communities and CHPs to change this disturbing picture currently
in place in New Zealand around Pacific peoples and housing.

- Pasifika Housing Continuum—In Section Two, we highlighted the IMSB’s Maori version of the continuum. We recommend that a Pasifika-relevant and appropriate continuum be developed to record these realities, and also capture the unique views on housing, development, money and so on that Pasifika people generally share.

### 3.3 ISSUE: INNOVATION

While we have noted above that an overarching strategy and possible Pasifika Housing unit are needed to develop impactful actions, we contend that there are some innovations operating now that could be resourced better or expanded to create real change for Pacific people.

#### RECOMMENDATIONS

- **Matanikolo Project**—This project (which translates as Gateway to the Lord, in Tongan) has been operating since 2014 and is a collaboration between Airedale Property Trust, the Social Housing Unit, Te Wāhanga Kāinga Pāpori (Growth Fund), Lotofale’ia Mangere Tongan Methodist Parish, and the Methodist Church of New Zealand, Te Haahi Weteriana O Aotearoa. This project was specifically designed for Pasifika families facing housing hardship, and used land from a local Tongan church secured in 1993 to begin the project. By 2014, 22 houses for Pacific families were completed. Stage Two of the Matanikolo Project has begun, focused on building pensioner flats for elderly Pacific people. As one case study describes; The new homes in Mangere are now fully occupied and there is a strong sense of a close neighbourhood developing. The realisation of the Matanikolo Project means that the parish families no longer need to reside in cramped, damp and poorly-insulated houses that unfortunately are a feature in the Mangere community.79

- How can innovation like this that is clearly relevant and appropriate for Pacific people be scaled up or replicated? How can the Government and other stakeholders, like the various partners of Matanikolo, come together for these initiatives?

- A major challenge for Pacific communities in projects like this is the relative lack of capital asset base Pasifika have. We have noted the inequalities in income earlier in this Paper. Here, it is enough to note that Pacific do not generally have the land that Maori and other ethnicities have. Usually the main significant land owned collectively by Pacific people is the land their churches are on. With this reality, if ‘church land’ is used, then it is crucial that similar projects are undertaken in a way that (1) does not put unnecessary financial pressure on Pacific church members, (2) does not jeopardise this ‘church land’ asset base and (3) partners with
stakeholders and organisations that are reputable and have a proven track record in housing developments. Another issue is the capacity and expertise needed for Pacific community groups and/or churches to run social or public housing projects who have little or no record of public housing provision. We submit that this must be considered and addressed in the development of a new peak strategy and series of deliverable outcomes and actions.

- **Existing innovative home ownership programmes**—We recommend that existing programmes that are achieving tangible results for Pacific people are resourced better and replicated. This is more important since the Government’s recent affordable home ownership announcements. We alluded to this earlier, but we want to echo that the role of the CHPs is crucial here. Despite some early challenges, the Tamaki Regeneration collaboration with the Housing Foundation is starting to reap rewards. Another issue is the capacity and expertise needed for Pacific community groups and/or churches to run social or public housing projects who have little or no record of public housing provision. We submit that this must be considered and addressed in the development of a new peak strategy and series of deliverable outcomes and actions.

- **Financial capability at the core of Pacific housing**—We submit that financial mentoring and budgeting must be at the core of any action or outcome related to Pacific people and housing. This is already happening with the products offered by the CHPs and other community outreaches and groups. Groups such as the FinCap Trust and the Commission for Financial Capability have a major role here at different points of the continuum. But the building financial sector must be better resourced so these mentors and facilitators can offer ongoing expert advice.

### 3.4 ISSUE: URBAN REDEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

The new Kainga Ora entity has a remit to oversee major urban redevelopment projects across the country. Many of these projects, especially in Mangere, Porirua and Mt Roskill, are redeveloping state land and houses in areas with significant Pacific populations. The issue for many from these communities is the concern they have about the master planning, consultation and engagement (or lack of) in their communities. In its submission to the Kainga Ora Bill, the Mangere Housing Community Reference Group that is attempting to hold the Mangere project leaders to account stated its series
concerns about the process before the project began and with how the Hobsonville Land Company was rolling out its agenda. The group then added that the community where the redevelopment is taking place should be at the core of the project and argued that this was not the case in Mangere. These comments are symptomatic of the concerns many from these communities have with these large-scale projects. The Salvation Army has echoed these concerns publicly and to different Ministers and bureaucrats. We are not completely opposed to these projects because we know well the housing hardships people face in our nation, especially Maori and Pasifika. But we strongly advocate for the local communities here and will always challenge any hints of gentrification by stealth in the communities we work and serve in.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

- We call for the new Kainga Ora Board to have true community representation, including people with real experience and expertise in local communities, with public housing, and with CHPs.

- We submit that the community voice should be central to any development like this. Organisations like the Mangere Group and Porirua Promise should be mandated to engage at key strategic parts of the planning phases to ensure communities are not railroaded in these projects. The Mangere Group in its submission to the Bill also discussed its Mangere Guardians proposal that sought to ministerially locate community-voice groups like this at the strategic level with HLC (and now Kainga Ora). There must be a mechanism where communities are actively engaged in these projects from the early parts of the planning and mapping phases.

- We submit that the focus of these projects should also be on regeneration, and not bricks and mortar redevelopment. The Salvation Army is actively engaged in local community development across the country. Therefore, we are acutely aware of the things that build up or damage a community. The often-problematic journey in Tamaki illustrates this to us. But the ‘fruit’ being borne now shows that a regeneration focus is more likely to contribute to good consistent community development.
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