

Comparing International Housing Systems AECOM research on international examples of housing delivery

- Informs the SPUR Bay Area Regional Strategy
- Identifies 'Big Moves'
 Improve Bay Area's ability to meet housing need
- Focused on cities which are considered successful in meeting their housing need
- Both supply and demand side interventions

Comparing International Housing Systems Tokyo – Key Findings

- 1. Relaxed planning and zoning rules
- 2. Top-down decision making
- 3. Government provided and backed funding
- 4. Large-scale housing and infrastructure delivery agency
- 5. Housing as a home, not a commodity

Comparing International Housing Systems Tokyo – Urban Renaissance Agency

A national agency that aims to stimulate economic growth and urban development, through:

- Urban rejuvenation
- Providing high quality housing
- Disaster redevelopment
- Tackling suburban environments and aging populations
- Significant enabling infrastructure works



Comparing International Housing Systems Singapore – Key Findings

- 1. Significant proportion of land under government ownership and control
- 2. Strict control on land sales and price of land
- 3. Extensive provision of government housing
- 4. Home ownership focused tax/pension systems
- 5. Flat governance structure

Comparing International Housing Systems Singapore – Central Provident Fund (CPF)

- Unique tax and pension system that actively encourages home-ownership
- Employee (20%) and employer (17%) mandatory contributions of salary
- Contributions are set aside in a long-term savings style account
- Accumulated wealth can be used for deposits and monthly repayments of Housing Development Board housing (leasehold)
- 'Right-Size' your property to release equity both size and also length of lease



Comparing International Housing Systems Melbourne – Vacancy Tax

Victoria wide 'Vacancy Tax' on all properties left vacant for
 12 months or more

- Potential tax revenue of AU\$78MM per annum (estimated)
- Seeks to encourage property owners to rent out or sell vacant properties –
 in particular the inner and middle rings of the city
- Estimated that approximately 25,000 units are considered to be vacant in Melbourne