

# Unpacking the Housing Affordability Crisis: Structural Drivers and Policy Pathways in New Zealand

Nadia Zablah Humbert-Labeaumaz

## Contents

<b>Abstract</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Introduction</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Findings and Analysis</b>	<b>5</b>
Land, Regulation, and NIMBYism . . . . .	8
Fragmented Construction Sector and Inefficient Supply . . . . .	8
Systemic Market Failure . . . . .	10
<b>Discussion</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Recommendations</b>	<b>12</b>
Reducing Speculative Investment . . . . .	12
Securing Bank Deposits . . . . .	13
Promoting Renting as a Viable Option . . . . .	13
Aligning Supply with Demand . . . . .	14
Increasing Supply Speed . . . . .	15
<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Appendices</b>	<b>16</b>
Appendix 1. Plan Summary . . . . .	16
Appendix 2. Examples of Implementations of Similar Policies Worldwide	18
<b>References</b>	<b>19</b>

## Abstract

This paper analyzes the structural causes of New Zealand's housing affordability crisis, which has made homeownership increasingly inaccessible, particularly in Auckland (the world's seventh least affordable city). While demand is partly driven by demographic shifts and cultural preferences for homeownership, the root causes lie in speculative investment, distorted fiscal incentives, and supply constraints. Historical tax advantages, low interest rates, and restrictive urban planning have inflated prices and diverted capital away from productive sectors. The paper argues that the crisis is not a simple shortage but a systemic market failure. It proposes an integrated policy framework to restore balance: taxing capital gains, securing bank deposits to limit moral hazard, reforming tenancy laws to make renting viable, relaxing density regulations, and streamlining building approvals. Together, these fiscal, regulatory, and urban policies could reduce volatility, reorient incentives toward social efficiency, and rebuild affordability for future generations.

## Introduction

Since 1990, successive housing booms have pushed New Zealand property prices to levels increasingly out of reach for many aspiring first-time buyers. While existing homeowners have benefited from rising equity, newcomers face a market where the cost of ownership absorbs a disproportionate share of household income. In economic terms, this violates the equimarginal principle, which holds that rational agents allocate their limited resources across competing needs to maximize overall utility and satisfaction. When housing consumes nearly all disposable income, individuals can no longer balance spending efficiently across other essential goods and services, making homeownership economically unsustainable for many Kiwis.

A housing market is deemed “unaffordable” when the median house price exceeds three times the median annual household income. None of the eight largest cities in New Zealand meets this criterion. Although this trend is national, it is particularly acute in Auckland, where the house-price-to-income multiple is approximately nine, ranking it the seventh least affordable city in the world, above London and Toronto (Demographia, 2019).



### House-price-to-income multiple in Auckland and New Zealand

Figure 1: House-price-to-income multiple in Auckland and New Zealand

As a result, the homeownership rate has fallen to levels unseen since the 1950s, with an increasing share of New Zealanders excluded from the property market.

This paper provides a holistic analysis of the current housing crisis. It first examines the economic, structural, and behavioural forces that produced this situation, then proposes policy options to restore affordability and reduce long-term systemic risk.



Homeownership rate. Source: Stats NZ

Figure 2: Home ownership rate. Source: Stats NZ.

## Findings and Analysis

A century ago, the government intervened to provide affordable first mortgages, giving rise to the “Kiwi Dream”. Today, homeownership remains deeply embedded in the national psyche, while renting is widely perceived as a second option for those who “did not make it”. Consequently, demand for housing is structurally high, reinforced by demographic change as average household size declines, increasing the number of households.

However, this organic demand does not fully explain the steep rise in prices. During the 2000s, the housing affordability index skyrocketed for buyers but remained stable for renters. This divergence contradicts the narrative of a simple supply shortage and instead points to a systemic imbalance involving all major macroeconomy actors. Property has increasingly become a preferred investment vehicle for both domestic and foreign buyers, fuelling a speculative bubble further amplified by technology-enabled globalization.



**Housing affordability index (1000 is the base index for renters in 2003).**  
**Source: MBIE**

Figure 3: Housing affordability index. Source: MBIE.

This behaviour stems from historical events and policy choices. After the 1987 New Zealand Stock Exchange crash, investor confidence in financial markets eroded, prompting many to view property as a safer, more tangible investment. Over time, this preference became self-reinforcing: homeowners grew attached to their properties and reluctant to sell, even when doing so might not be financially optimal — a tendency explained by the endowment effect, whereby individuals overvalue assets they already own. Policy choices intensified this dynamic through tax incentives such as mortgage-interest deductions and exemptions from an enforceable capital gains tax. Simultaneously, a persistently low Official Cash Rate (OCR) has been keeping borrowing costs down, further fuelling demand and pushing prices even higher.

Originally, these incentives were intended to promote broad-based homeownership. In practice, they have proved perverse: boosting demand, raising prices, and disproportionately benefiting investors and higher-income households over middle-class prospective buyers. They also encouraged excessive leverage, increasing systemic vulnerability. In parallel, banks channelled large shares of credit into residential mortgages rather than productive investment, limiting support for the broader economy (Zablah Humbert-Labeaumaz, 2020).




Figure 4: Overview of the New Zealand housing market. Buyers have been divided between investors (firms that are trying to maximize profit) and households (that want to maximize utility). Also, firms include banks, investors and developers

In a well-functioning market, rising prices act as a signal for firms to increase output — what Adam Smith termed the “invisible hand.” Over time, supply should expand toward equilibrium. In New Zealand’s housing market, this self-correcting mechanism broke down: firms were unable to move up the supply curve due to deeper structural limitations explored below.

## Land, Regulation, and NIMBYism

The most fundamental constraint is the fixed stock of land. While land scarcity is unavoidable, existing restrictive urban planning rules prevent the efficient use of existing land, contributing to Auckland's exceptionally low density. Intended to preserve quality of life in the cities, these rules have the perverse effect of restricting access to housing and pushing development to the urban fringe, increasing emissions, commute times, and social stress.

In theory, inner-city homeowners could support reforms that relax zoning and density regulations. In practice, they benefit directly from the resulting high property values and quality of life. With little incentive to accept change, many adopt a “*Not In My Backyard*” (NIMBY) stance — opposing developments that threaten property values or alter neighbourhood character. This political resistance reinforces existing inequalities by preventing the housing supply from adjusting where it is most needed.




Figure 5: Density of cities with population close to Auckland.

## Fragmented Construction Sector and Inefficient Supply

New Zealand's construction sector is highly fragmented, dominated by small firms that operate independently rather than as part of vertically integrated supply chains. This fragmentation limits their ability to scale production efficiently or absorb cost fluctuations. As a result, the price elasticity of housing supply is extremely low: even large price increases do not translate into a proportional rise in new construction. Regulatory barriers further slow development, with lead times often ranging from 2 to 10 years (New Zealand Productivity Commission, 2012). Worsening the situation, some developers also prefer to bank land, restricting supply in anticipation of future price rises.





Figure 6: 2013 population density heatmap in Auckland. Source: Auckland Council.

Furthermore, the construction businesses do not allocate their resources effectively, creating a massive mismatch between demand and supply. In 2013, 70% of households had fewer than two members, while 70% of new houses offered four or more bedrooms. Building large standalone houses is, in fact, more profitable for developers because of density-related regulations. As a result, prices increase from unnecessary competition between couples without children and families.



Figure 7: Housing supply vs demand between 2006 and 2013. Source: Stats NZ.

## Systemic Market Failure

Overall, the market has failed to provide a socially optimal distribution of houses. Individual incentives led to an irrational outcome for the group: a speculative bubble that makes housing unaffordable for locals and induces a chain of displacements (ripple effect) associated with a set of undesirable social consequences. The government should intervene appropriately to support households with low incomes that are *de facto* excluded from the market and prevent this bubble from growing further. Indeed, as it grows, it becomes more speculative, prompting people to take more risks with debts, which makes the recession more painful when the bubble eventually bursts.

## Discussion

New Zealand’s housing affordability crisis reflects the interaction of economic, cultural, and institutional forces that have evolved over several decades. The simultaneous rise of speculative demand, favourable tax treatment, and credit availability has turned housing into a financial asset rather than a social necessity. This dynamic, reinforced by cultural expectations of homeownership as a marker of success, has amplified price volatility and widened social divides between existing homeowners and those excluded from the market.

On the supply side, the system has failed to adjust to rising demand. Land scarcity, restrictive planning regulations, and the fragmented nature of the construction sector have limited the responsiveness of housing supply. Even when prices increased, production failed to accelerate due to high entry barriers and long development lead times. As a result, the self-correcting mechanisms expected in a market economy have broken down, allowing imbalances to persist.

The consequences extend beyond housing. Rising property prices have concentrated wealth in the hands of homeowners and investors, fuelling intergenerational inequality and economic fragility. This has created a feedback loop: as households increasingly perceive property as the safest form of investment, capital flows further into housing rather than productive sectors, weakening long-term growth potential. The housing crisis therefore represents not only a market failure but a deeper structural imbalance within New Zealand’s economic and social model, where speculation, policy distortion, and inequality reinforce one another over time.

## Recommendations

In response to the crisis, the government launched its Kiwi Build programme in 2018, aiming to build 100,000 “affordable” homes to match demand. As discussed above, the main issue is not a shortage of houses but a set of investment-friendly incentives and an inelastic supply. Moreover, even though Kiwi Build homes are generally in the lower quartile of the market prices in Auckland, they are closer to the median elsewhere, which is far from being affordable (Ninness, 2019).

It would be more relevant to reduce the demand first and then boost the supply towards an equilibrium, where locals of all socioeconomic statuses have access to affordable housing. This section presents a plan to redress the crisis, following this strategy. A comprehensive summary is available for convenience in Appendix 1. The design of this plan has considered the effectiveness of the policies overseas (see Appendix 2) as well as other available data.

### Reducing Speculative Investment

The government’s priority should be to reduce incentives for speculators. Subsequently, they will likely look to sell and demand and supply will begin to rebalance.

An obvious fiscal policy would be to tax capital gains on every house sale, regardless of the owner’s initial intent, except for owner-occupiers. However, the government should be cautious with its implementation. Indeed, brutally taxing capital gains reduces supply by discouraging people from selling (Aregger, Brown, & Rossi, 2013). On the other hand, if such a policy were to be carefully planned and advertised, the “fear of missing out” would rush current investors into selling. Prospect speculators would also walk away, to the benefits of owner-occupiers.

Moreover, an educational campaign could explain that diversified investments are safer and potentially more profitable. In this respect, purchasing a house is not ideal, especially in unaffordable cities like Auckland, due to the opportunity cost of giving up other investment options.

Finally, one could argue that raising the OCR would be a relevant solution to limit borrowers’ access to finance. However, the Consumer Price Index in New Zealand is equal to 1.7%, which is already below the 2% target (Reserve Bank of New Zealand, 2019). A contractionary monetary policy would further hurt inflation and, therefore, wages and employment.



Figure 8: NZ inflation between 2000 and 2019. Source: Stats NZ.

### Securing Bank Deposits

Given the current banks' dependency on mortgages, a drop in house prices would significantly increase the risk of bank failure, similar to the situation during the 2008 crisis. Under the current law, the Reserve Bank can theoretically shut down a failing bank and force a recapitalization by zeroing all its depositors' accounts. Realistically, the government will probably bail out the bank to prevent a ripple effect on the whole economy.

As a result, the New Zealand property market can be considered "too big to fail." Because so much of the financial system depends on mortgage lending, a major drop in house prices would threaten banks' stability and, by extension, the wider economy. This creates a moral hazard: investors and banks continue to take excessive risks in the housing market because they expect that, if things go wrong, the government—and ultimately taxpayers—will intervene to protect them. To break this cycle, the government should establish a deposit insurance scheme requiring banks and depositors to pay a small premium to guarantee deposits. Such a system would protect savers without shielding banks from the consequences of their own risk-taking. In Europe, for example, deposits are insured up to 100,000 € per account.

### Promoting Renting as a Viable Option

The contrast between France and New Zealand regarding renting is striking:

	France	New Zealand
Minimum lease duration	Three years	-
Tenant notice	30 to 60 days	21 days (if periodic)
Landlord notice	Must wait for the end of the lease	42 to 90 days (if periodic)

French regulations enable flexibility for tenants, avoiding the anxiety characterizing New Zealand’s system. Otherwise, the quality of French rental properties is excellent due to draconian rules and the systematic use of bonds to perform minor repairs between tenancies. In New Zealand, the overall quality of rental houses is poor because tenants lack incentives to maintain them properly, and most landlords view them merely as speculative investments.

After addressing the speculative issue, New Zealand could benefit from implementing a policy that bridges the gap with the French model. This policy would encourage landlords to think carefully before purchasing additional properties, although renting would still remain a relatively low-risk, stable investment option for those seeking steady returns. Also, tenants (including low-income and unemployed people) would stay longer in a place they could call “home”, increasing their involvement in the community.

## Aligning Supply with Demand

Once demand is down to a sustainable level, the government should focus on supply. The priority should be to align supply with demand by improving the allocation of current resources.

Loosening density regulations should remove the incentive to build oversized houses and allow for meeting people’s needs. Moreover, coupled with well-designed urban planning (e.g. “walkable neighbourhoods” with green areas), it would have other positive outcomes regarding pollution and inhabitants’ well-being. It is also advisable to adopt a preventive Keynesian approach to help smooth the business cycle and sustain long-term stability in the housing market. In practical terms, this means using public investment (particularly in infrastructure and construction projects) to offset downturns in private sector activity. Because housing supply policies often depend on large-scale infrastructure such as roads, utilities, and public transport, maintaining steady government investment would ensure that supply continues to expand even when demand temporarily weakens. In periods of growth, this approach would also help prevent overheating by planning infrastructure in advance rather than reacting to market imbalances once they occur.

To overcome the expected resistance from current inner-city homeowners, the government may increase rates to include externalities, such as pollution and the well-being of outer-city homeowners. The rational decision may then change to be in favour of higher density if the tax to pay outmatches the willingness to accept the new policy.

## **Increasing Supply Speed**

The last item on the agenda is to address supply speed in the building sector to absorb variations in demand better.

First, the government should dramatically simplify regulations to reduce the time needed to obtain the required permits to build a house. Also, creating negative incentives on land banking (i.e. taxing vacant land) would make this capital more productive. In Pittsburgh, for example, land taxation has proved crucial in the city's economic development, as it stimulated building activity while avoiding rate increases.

At this stage, the government should also use ambitious programmes, like Kiwi Build, to encourage Kiwi construction companies to gather and combine their effort. They could achieve economies of scale at several levels (typically labour and technical levels) by spreading fixed costs over a larger number of goods. These new large vertically integrated firms would then have excess capacity, allowing them to be highly reactive and competitive in the long term.

## **Conclusion**

New Zealand's housing crisis arises from an unsustainable mix of speculative demand, policy distortion, and limited supply responsiveness. Addressing it demands coordinated fiscal, regulatory, and cultural reform aimed at restoring affordability and economic balance. Short-term corrections may reduce household wealth, but the long-term gains, regarding greater equity, resilience, and social well-being, justify decisive action. Sustainable growth depends on treating housing not as a speculative asset but as essential infrastructure for the nation's future prosperity.

## Appendices

### Appendix 1. Plan Summary

#	Policy	Agent	Expected behaviour	Potential unintended consequence	Risks mitigation plan
1	Taxing capital gains	Investors	Sell and change investment strategy	Lock-in and refuse to sell, continue investing if the tax is not dissuasive	Plan and advertise, perform educational campaigns
2	Setting up 'Deposit Insurance'	Banks, Investors, Households	Reduce speculation and inconsiderate risks	-	-
3	Reinforcing tenancy regulations	Investors, Households	Reduce speculative purchases, increase demand in rentals, improve rental houses quality	Shortage of rental properties (less attractive for investors)	Reinforce maintenance expectations and retain bond if required
4	Loosening density regulations	Developers	Provide homes that meet kiwis' needs	Resistance from inner-city homeowners, pollution and a decrease in overall well-being	Threaten to increase rates, invest in urban planning



#	Policy	Agent	Expected behaviour	Potential unin- tended conse- quence	Risks mitigation plan
5	Simplifying permits procedures	Developers	Build houses faster	Natural hazard (e.g. earth- quakes, storms), pollution	Perform a Cost- Benefit Analysis
6	Taxing vacant land	Developers	Stop land banking, build houses faster	Inefficiency due to the high cost of building	See #5 and #7
7	Undertaking develop- ment pro- grammes	Developers	Team up to create strong con- struction firms	Monopolistic market (low likelihood)	Favour competi- tion, ask for a minimum number of candi- dates, assign projects to different firms
<b>Overall</b>		Investors, Develop- ers, House- holds, Rest of the world	Balance demand and supply	Drop house prices, bank failure	See #2

## Appendix 2. Examples of Implementations of Similar Policies Worldwide

Policy	Places
Taxing capital gains	France, Switzerland (Aregger, Brown, & Rossi, 2013), Germany
Setting up ‘Deposit Insurance’	Europe
Reinforcing tenancy regulations	France, Germany (Bruce, 2017)
Loosening density regulations	USA (Han & Sun, 2019)
Simplifying permits procedures	Sweden, Japan (Malyshev, 2006)
Taxing vacant land	Brazil, Colombia, Democratic Republic of Congo, Mexico, Philippines, United Kingdom (Haas & Kopanyi, 2017), USA (Seattle, Hawaii, Pittsburgh (Oates & Schwab, 1997))
Development programmes	France (Chomard, 2017)

## References

- Aregger, N., Brown, M., & Rossi, E. (2013). *Transaction Taxes, Capital Gains Taxes and House Prices*. Swiss National Bank, Zurich.
- Auckland Council. (2014). *Measuring Auckland's Population Density*. Auckland. <http://knowledgeauckland.org.nz/assets/publications/Measuring-Aucklands-Population-Density-26052014-Complete.pdf>
- Bruce, B. (Director). (2017).\_\_ Who Owns New Zealand Now?\_\_ [Motion Picture].
- Chomard, L. (2017, November 22). *La candidature d'un groupement d'entreprises : ce qu'il faut savoir*. Legibase. <https://marches-publics.legibase.fr/actualites/focus/la-candidature-dun-groupement-dentreprises-ce-quil-86023>
- Demographia. (2019). *15th Annual Demographia International Housing Affordability Survey: 2019*. Demographia. <http://www.demographia.com/dhi.pdf>
- Eaqub, S., & Eaqub, S. (2015). *Generation Rent*. Bridget Williams Books Limited.
- french-property.com. (2019). *Tenancy Agreement*. French Property. <https://www.french-property.com/guides/france/rent/tenancy-agreement>
- Haas, A., & Kopanyi, M. (2017). *Taxation of Vacant Urban Land: From Theory to Practice*. International Growth Center. [https://www.theigc.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/201707TaxationVacantLandPolicyNote\\_Final.pdf](https://www.theigc.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/201707TaxationVacantLandPolicyNote_Final.pdf)
- Han, S., & Sun, B. (2019). *Impact of Population Density on PM2.5 Concentrations: A Case Study in Shanghai, China*. Sustainability.
- IRD. (2019, April 04). *Selling property*. IRD. <https://www.classic.ird.govt.nz/property/property-selling/selling-property.html>
- Kennedy, S. (2019, July 13). *These Are the Countries Most at Risk of Housing Bubbles*. Bloomberg. <https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2019-07-12/canada-new-zealand-show-signs-of-housing-bubble-says-study>
- Malyshev, N. (2006). *The Evolution of Regulatory Policy in OECD Countries*.
- MBIE. (2018). *Housing Affordability Index*. MBIE. <https://www.mbie.govt.nz/building-and-energy/tenancy-and-housing/housing-affordability-measure/latest-results-for-the-housing-affordability-measure/housing-affordability-index/>
- New Zealand Productivity Commission. (2012). *Housing Affordability*. Auckland. [https://www.productivity.govt.nz/sites/default/files/Final%20Housing%20Affordability%20Report\\_0\\_0.pdf](https://www.productivity.govt.nz/sites/default/files/Final%20Housing%20Affordability%20Report_0_0.pdf)
- Ninness, G. (2019, June 15). *KiwiBuild's problems mean it should be tweaked rather than scrapped*. Interest.co.nz. <https://www.interest.co.nz/property/100218/there-probably-no-need-schemes-such-kiwibuild-outside-auckland>

Oates, W. E., & Schwab, R. M. (1997, March). The Impact of Urban Land Taxation: The Pittsburgh Experience. *National Tax Journal*, 50(1), 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.1086/ntj41789240>

Reserve Bank of New Zealand. (2019). *Inflation*. Reserve Bank of New Zealand: <https://www.rbnz.govt.nz/monetary-policy/inflation>

Stats NZ. (2006). *Trends in migration between regions*. Stats NZ: [http://archive.stats.govt.nz/browse\\_for\\_stats/population/Migration/internal-migration/trends-in-migration.aspx](http://archive.stats.govt.nz/browse_for_stats/population/Migration/internal-migration/trends-in-migration.aspx)

Tenancy Services. (2019). *Giving notice to end a tenancy*. Tenancy Services: <https://www.tenancy.govt.nz/ending-a-tenancy/giving-notice-to-end-tenancy/>

Zablah Humbert-Labeaumaz, N. (2020). *Breaking the Credit Barrier: Structural Challenges of SME Financing in New Zealand*. <https://nadiahl.com/research/debt-sme-nz/>