**STAKEHOLDER PERCEPTIONS OF TOURISM
DEVELOPMENT IN MARAHAU/NEW ZEALAND:
A ROLE FOR PARTICIPATORY APPROACHES AND GIS**

by

Julia Christiane Hasse

**A thesis
submitted to the Victoria University of Wellington
in fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in Tourism Management**

Victoria University of Wellington

2001

Marahau adjoining the Abel Tasman National Park

(Source: Taylor, 2000)

ABSTRACT

Tourism research is increasingly focusing on community participation and stakeholder collaboration in tourism planning. It is argued that sustainable development outcomes require the integration of community perspectives into the planning processes, and that the views of different stakeholders must be communicated effectively to interested parties. These core issues are explored in this thesis.

I draw upon advances made in participatory research in development studies and introduce these to tourism planning. The thesis also introduces participatory approaches and GIS (PAGIS) as a tool that can be blended into a framework that facilitates a better understanding of stakeholders' perceptions towards tourism, and therefore has the potential to improve community participation and stakeholder interaction in tourism planning.

The case study used in this thesis is Marahau, a small community in New Zealand located at the gateway to an icon of New Zealand's tourism industry, the Abel Tasman National Park. The community has undergone rapid transformation from an agricultur-based economy to an expanding tourism destination. The recent increase in visitor numbers, tourism businesses, and permanent residents in the community have resulted in major management and planning issues concerning the future of Marahau.

This research highlights the changes that tourism development has brought to the community and presents the various perceptions of stakeholders in this particular setting. The research shows that to plan for more sustainable forms of tourism development the subjective perspectives and the roles of all stakeholders need to be understood and integrated into a responsive planning framework. PAGIS can increase the number and diversity of people able to participate in decision-making. PAGIS integrates 'expert' and 'local' knowledge that can result in more responsive planning procedures to enhance tourism's potential to act as a force for more sustainable development.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This thesis would have not been possible without the support, encouragement and friendship of many other people. My greatest thanks and appreciation goes to my two supervisors Dr. John McKinnon and Prof. Simon Milne for their guidance throughout this entire process, for their patience and for making me feel that I could always count on them.

Thanks to Dr. Stephen Doorne, who helped me out in parts of my thesis and to Dr. Irena Ateljevic for her friendship and insightful discussions about life. I also want to thank Prof. Douglas Pearce and Dr. Bob Garnham. Special thanks to my father Dr. S. Jagdev Sawhney in Bonn, Dr. Sue Muloin in Australia, Anna Dowling and Adrian Dickison in Wellington for their time to help me edit this thesis. I am very grateful for that!

My appreciation goes to the Victoria University of Wellington for their financial support through the postgraduate scholarship, the thesis-related support from the School of Business and Public Management and the administrative support in the first years of my research from the Institute of Geography. I would like to express my appreciation to Maureen Penning, the Scholarship Officer for prompt support in any matter. Special thanks also to all my friends and colleagues at Victoria University of Wellington, to Lee Davidson, Dr. Laurie Jackson, Martin Carroll, Kala Retna, Dr. Brad Jackson, Dr. Zusanna Lonti, Arun Elias, Suli Tuvuki, Stephen Engle, Jovo Ateljevic and many others for their friendship, understanding, advice and support throughout the Ph.D. process.

A big thank you to the community of Marahau for a very memorable time and experience outside the University environment, for the coffees, teas, cookies and even relish, I received during the interviews and visits. I really enjoyed my time there. I hope that my work will make a valuable contribution to your future. Thanks to Jan Caird for her help in getting started, to Robert Pfalzer for his friendship, to Mike Bannock for his insightful discussions, to Tom, Ingrid and Peter and to all the other lovely people in Marahau. A particular thanks to Monika Diesing for her friendship during my stay in Marahau. I also want to thank Markus Beier from Germany for his support, without it I would still be interviewing visitors.

Particular thanks for the highly appreciated support from Tasman District Council and Department of Conservation staff: Dennis-Bush King, Susan Pipes, Julie Cooper, Alan Price, Brendon Clough and Colin Wishard in providing the GIS information and other relevant documents for my research. Thanks to Katie Greer for her support and friendship. Also, I wish to express my special thanks to Paul Davis from Latitude Nelson for his support, cooperation, discussions and most significantly for having introduced me to the community of Marahau.

My deep thanks to my parents in Germany, who encouraged me throughout this time and supported me with chocolate, coffee, e-mails and postcards. I also wish to thank the city of Wellington, being a place that I consider very special in regards to its constant weather challenges, intriguing beauty, vibrant and colourful appearance. I value the special time I spent here.

Finally, I would also like to express a very special thanks to all my friends in New Zealand and worldwide for their friendship, understanding, support in all sorts of ways and patience during the last couple of years and everyone else who made my stay in Wellington an unforgettable experience. A very special thanks here to Dirk Berlin, Kirsten Hennrich, Bill Hager, Heiko Philippi, Caren Schröder, Peter Bailey, Rich Graham, Dr. Stephen Bannister, Michelle Oldham and to my lovely flatmate Bronwyn Williams for their friendship and support in all sort of ways in ‘good and bad’ times. Also, to special thanks to Helen McNaught and Peter Hill for their friendship and a wonderful Christmas 2000 and to Chris Cosslett for some wonderful times and experiences in Marahau and Wellington.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	III
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	IV
LIST OF FIGURES	X
LIST OF TABLES	XI
APPENDICES	XII
GLOSSARY	XIII
CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 TOURISM DEVELOPMENT AND STAKEHOLDER PARTICIPATION	1
1.2 CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK.....	3
1.3 AIMS AND OBJECTIVES	4
1.4 SIGNIFICANCE OF STUDY	5
1.5 STRUCTURE OF THESIS	7
CHAPTER II: MARAHAU - THE GATEWAY TO PARADISE.....	10
2.1 INTRODUCTION	10
2.2 CONTEMPORARY CONTEXT OF TOURISM.....	11
2.3 THE ‘STORY’ OF MARAHAU	14
2.3.1 A Regional History	15
2.3.2 The ‘Mecca’ for Visitors to New Zealand.....	18
CHAPTER III: RE-ADDRESSING COMMUNITY AND TOURISM DEVELOPMENT	22
3.1 INTRODUCTION	22
3.2 THE INVENTION OF DEVELOPMENT	23
3.2.1 The Major Paradigms	24
3.2.2 The Impasse	26
3.2.3 The ‘Post-Impasse’	28
3.3 EARLY APPROACHES TO TOURISM PLANNING	30

3.4 SOME NEW DIRECTIONS	33
3.4.1 The Contested Terrain of Community	33
3.4.2 Community Tourism Approach.....	35
3.4.3 Social Impact Studies	37
3.4.4 The Sustainability Approach in Tourism Planning	40
3.4.5 Participatory Development	43
3.4.6 Collaboration Approach to Tourism Planning.....	50
3.5 TOWARDS A PARTICIPATORY STAKEHOLDER APPROACH.....	51
3.5.1 Alternative Geographical Information Systems	52
3.5.2 GIS in Tourism Planning	54
3.5.3 PAGIS.....	55
CHAPTER IV: PARTICIPATORY METHODOLOGY	58
4.1 INTRODUCTION.....	58
4.2 STRATEGIES OF INQUIRY	58
4.3 RESEARCH DESIGN	59
4.3.1 Participatory Mapping	60
4.4 RESEARCH PROCESS	62
4.4.1 Stage 1 - Community Survey and Tourism Business Survey.....	63
4.4.2 Stage 2 - Visitor Survey and Other Stakeholders	66
4.4.3 Stage 3 - Presenting the Results	68
4.5 ANALYSIS OF DATA.....	70
4.5.1 Qualitative Analysis	71
4.5.2 Designing PAGIS	72
CHAPTER V: LOCAL GOVERNMENT	76
5.1 INTRODUCTION.....	76
5.2 THE ROLE OF ‘TOURISM NEW ZEALAND’	77
5.3 TOURISM AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT	78
5.3.1 The Resource Management Act.....	81
5.3.2 Participation in Local Tourism Development	86
5.4 ‘EXPERT’ KNOWLEDGE IN PAGIS.....	88
5.5 THE TASMAN DISTRICT COUNCIL.....	90
5.5.1 Tasman Resource Management Plan.....	92
5.5.2 Regional Policy Statement and Annual Report	97

5.5.3 Marahau Strategic Development Review	99
5.6 THE REGIONAL TOURISM ORGANISATION	101
5.7 THE DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION	105
5.7.1 Conservation Management Strategy	109
5.8 THE CONTESTED FORESHORE	112
CHAPTER VI: TOURISM INDUSTRY AND VISITORS	117
6.1 INTRODUCTION	117
6.2 THE COMPOSITION OF THE TOURISM INDUSTRY	118
6.2.1 Proposed Local Tourism Development	124
6.2.2 ‘Great Service’ and ‘Well organised’	127
6.2.3 ‘Quality Experience’ instead of ‘Volume Tourism’	129
6.3 VISITORS’ CHARACTERISTICS	133
6.4 MARAHAU ‘STEPPING IN AND OUT’	141
6.4.1 ‘Gateway’ to the Abel Tasman National Park	143
6.4.2 ‘Quiet’ and ‘Non-Commercialised’	145
6.5 THE ‘TASMAN DANCE’	147
6.5.1 ‘Stunning Beaches’ and ‘Lovely Coastline’	150
6.5.2 ‘Getting more Crowded’	152
6.6 ‘KEEP IT AS IT IS’	157
CHAPTER VII: THE COMMUNITY	161
7.1 INTRODUCTION	161
7.2 THE COMPOSITION OF THE ‘COMMUNITY’	161
7.2.1 Marahau and Sandy Bay Residents’ and Ratepayers’ Association	167
7.2.2 Local Iwi	168
7.3 ‘LOCAL’ KNOWLEDGE IN PAGIS	169
7.4 COMMUNITY - ‘A CONFUSING WORD’	172
7.4.1 Marahau a ‘Heterogeneous Community’	173
7.4.2 The ‘Community Focus’	175
7.5 THE PAST - ‘LAID BACK, SMALL, FARMING COMMUNITY’	177
7.5.1 ‘Marahau Gradually Changes’	179
7.5.2 ‘Tourism Suddenly Took off’	182
7.6 THE PRESENT - ‘TURNING POINT’	183
7.6.1 ‘Some Quiet Time’	185

7.6.2 ‘Overpopulated in Summer’	187
7.7 THE FUTURE - ‘NICE PLACE’ OR ‘GHOST TOWN’	189
7.7.1 ‘Low-Key Development’	192
7.7.2 ‘Management’ and ‘Control’	193
CHAPTER VIII: CONCLUSION	196
8.1 BRIDGING TOURISM AND DEVELOPMENT	196
8.2 KEY RESEARCH FINDINGS	196
8.3 RESEARCH CHALLENGES AND THE FUTURE.....	200
8.3.1 Towards a Role for Participatory Approaches and GIS	202
8.4 IMPLICATIONS AND CONTRIBUTIONS	204
REFERENCES	208
APPENDICES	224

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.1: Overview Map of New Zealand and Location of Case Study Site Marahau	xiv
Figure 1.2: Conceptual Framework for Structure of Dissertation	4
Figure 2.1: Location Map of Case Study Site Marahau, New Zealand.....	11
Figure 2.2: Total Guest Nights: Nelson Region from June 1999 – June 2000	14
Figure 2.3: Estimated Number of Visitors to the Abel Tasman National Park 1988-2000	21
Figure 3.1: Model of Sustainable Tourism Values and Principles	42
Figure 3.2: Two Paradigms: Things and People	44
Figure 3.3: A Typology of Participation (adopted from Pretty 1998).....	46
Figure 3.4: Participatory Methods: Means to what Ends?.....	49
Figure 3.5: Participatory Research and GIS Framework.....	55
Figure 4.1: Aerial Photograph of Marahau used as a Base Map for Interviews.....	61
Figure 4.2: Stakeholder Map (adopted after Freeman 1984).....	63
Figure 4.3: Example of a Participatory Mapping Exercise.....	65
Figure 4.4: Location of Interview with Visitors to Marahau.....	68
Figure 4.5: The Presentation of Results to the Community of Marahau	69
Figure 4.6: The Layer System of PAGIS	73
Figure 4.7: Attributes and the Comments in the Database	74
Figure 4.8: Visual Display of the Information and Comments	75
Figure 5.1: Promotion Picture of the Abel Tasman National Park.....	78
Figure 5.2: Areas of Management Responsibility of National, Regional and District Government	80
Figure 5.3: Responsibilities of Different Authorities under the RMA/Type of Consents Required.....	85
Figure 5.4: Visual Representation of ‘Expert’ Knowledge – TDC in PAGIS.....	89
Figure 5.5: Visual Representation of ‘Expert’ Knowledge – DoC in PAGIS	89
Figure 5.6: Map of the Tasman District	91
Figure 5.7: Workshop Outcomes and Possible Solutions for Marahau.....	100
Figure 5.8: The Key ‘Structural’ Issues for Marahau.....	100
Figure 5.9: The Regional Positioning of Nelson	102
Figure 5.10: Strategic Objectives for the Tourism Industry identified by Latitude Nelson	104
Figure 5.11: Nelson/Marlborough Conservancy and Management Unit of DoC in Motueka.....	108
Figure 6.1: Overview Map of Tourism Businesses and ‘Proposed Local Development’ in Marahau ...	119
Figure 6.2: Visual Display of Tourism Business Layer in PAGIS.....	120
Figure 6.3: Tourism Businesses and Products in Marahau	121
Figure 6.4: Proposed Site for Resort Development.....	125
Figure 6.5: Distribution by Nature of Experience of Visitors	133
Figure 6.6: Place of Origin - Domestic	134
Figure 6.7: Place of Origin - International Visitors.....	135
Figure 6.8: Age Profile of Domestic vs. International Visitors.....	136
Figure 6.9: Occupation Profile of Domestic vs. International Visitors	136
Figure 6.10: Income Profile of Domestic vs. International Visitors.....	137
Figure 6.11: Number of Nights of Domestic vs. International Visitors	137

Figure 6.12: Purpose of Visit Profile of Domestic vs. International Visitors.....	138
Figure 6.13: Group Makeup Profile of Domestic vs. International Visitors	139
Figure 6.14: Mode of Travel Profile of Domestic vs. International Visitors.....	139
Figure 6.15: Type of Accommodation Profile used by Domestic vs. International Visitors.....	140
Figure 6.16: The Sandy Bay Road in Marahau – Main Road	141
Figure 6.17: Places Visited by Domestic vs. International Visitors	148
Figure 6.18: Activities Profile of Domestic vs. International Visitors	148
Figure 6.19: Abel Tasman National Park looking south towards Marahau.....	149
Figure 6.20: Coquille Beach in the Abel Tasman National Park close to Marahau	151
Figure 6.21: Kayakers on Akerston Beach in the Abel Tasman National Park.....	154
Figure 7.1: Graph of Stakeholder Typology of the Marahau Community	162
Figure 7.2: Age Profile of Community of Marahau	163
Figure 7.3: Ethnicity Profile of the Marahau Community.....	163
Figure 7.4: Family Status Profile of the Marahau Community	164
Figure 7.5: Educational Profile of the Marahau Community	164
Figure 7.6: Occupation Profile of the Marahau Community	165
Figure 7.7: Tourism Business Profile of the Marahau Community.....	165
Figure 7.8: Income Profile of the Marahau Community	166
Figure 7.9: ‘Incomers’ to Marahau between 1935-2000	166
Figure 7.10: Figures showing the Subcategories of ‘context’, ‘location’ and ‘issue’	170
Figure 7.11: Visual Display representing ‘Local’ Knowledge in PAGIS	171
Figure 7.12: Database representing ‘Local’ Knowledge in PAGIS	171
Figure 7.13: Fires Station in Marahau at Sandy Bay Road	176
Figure 7.14: Looking onto Marahau from Toko Ngawa in the early 1990s.....	181
Figure 7.15: Tractor on Marahau Beach pulling a Water Taxi.....	186
Figure 7.16: Kayakers, Swimmers and Water Taxi on Akerston Beach in the Park.....	188

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1: Domestic Visitors to Nelson	13
Table 2.2: International Visitors to Nelson	13
Table 5.1: Local Government Agencies with Tourism-Related Responsibilities.....	81
Table 6.1: Number of Respondents Involvement in Tourism in Marahau	120
Table 6.2: ‘Likes’ about Marahau and the Abel Tasman National Park	142
Table 6.3: ‘Dislikes’ about Marahau and the Abel Tasman National Park	153
Table 6.4: ‘Improvements’ for Marahau and the Abel Tasman National Park	157
Table 7.1: Total Population Resident in Marahau and Number of Dwellings	162

APPENDICES

Appendix 4.1: Human Ethics Approval	224
Appendix 4.2: Introduction Letter to Community of Marahau	225
Appendix 4.3: Consent Form for Respondents	226
Appendix 4.4: Questionnaire for Marahau Community	227
Appendix 4.5: Visitor Survey for Short Interview	228
Appendix 4.6: Visitor Survey for In-Depth Interview	229
Appendix 4.7: Representing the Data - Letter to Community.....	231
Appendix 4.8: CD-Manual for PAGIS	232
Appendix 4.9: PAGIS CD-ROM	280
Appendix 6.1: Gender Profile of Domestic vs. International Visitors.....	239
Appendix 6.2: ‘Likes’ about Marahau and the Abel Tasman National Park.....	239
Appendix 6.3: ‘Dislikes’ about Marahau and the Abel Tasman National Park.....	242
Appendix 6.4: ‘Improvements’ for Marahau and the Abel Tasman National Park.....	243
Appendix 7.1: Gender Profile of the Marahau Community	245
Appendix 7.2: ‘Likes’ about Marahau	245
Appendix 7.3: ‘Dislikes’ about Marahau	247
Appendix 7.4: ‘Hopes’ for the future of Marahau	248
Appendix 7.5: ‘Fears’ for the future of Marahau	252
Appendix 7.6: PAGIS – TABLE: Context, Location, Issue and Comments.....	255

GLOSSARY

ATNP	Abel Tasman National Park
DoC	Department of Conservation
ESRI	Environmental Systems Research Institute
FIT	Free Independent Traveler
GIS	Geographical Information System
IDS	Institute of Development Studies Sussex
IIPT	International Institute for Peace through Tourism
IISD	International Institute for Sustainable Development
MATO	Marahau Association of Tourism Operators
MfE	Ministry for the Environment
MIGIS	Mobile Interactive Geographical Information Systems
MSBRRA	Marahau Sandy Bay Ratepayers' and Residents' Association
MSDR	Marahau Strategic Development Review
NCC	Nelson City Council
NZTB	New Zealand Tourism Board
NZTS	New Zealand Tourism Strategy
PA	Participatory Approaches
PAGIS	Participatory Geographical Information Systems
PCE	Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment
PLA	Participatory Learning Appraisal
PPGIS	Public Participation Geographical Information Systems
PRA	Participatory Rural Appraisal
PRPS	Proposed Regional Policy Statement
RMA	Resource Management Act
RPS	Regional Policy Statement
RRA	Rapid Rural Appraisal
RTO	Regional Tourism Organisation
TDC	Tasman District Council
TNZ	Tourism New Zealand
TRMP	Tasman Resource Management Plan
VUW	Victoria University of Wellington
WCE	World Commission on Environment and Development
WTO	World Tourism Organisation

Figure 1.1: Overview Map of New Zealand and Location of Case Study Site Marahau

(Source: Tourism New Zealand, 2000)

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

*“The pressure is growing for a planning strategy to cope with the crowds that flock the Abel Tasman National Park”
(Williams, 2001).*

1.1 TOURISM DEVELOPMENT AND STAKEHOLDER PARTICIPATION

There is a growing appreciation that tourism development must occur within acceptable limits with regard to the industry’s impacts on society, culture, and the natural environment. This has led to increasing attempts, both theoretical and methodological, to promote the development of tourism that is economically viable, environmentally sensitive, and commensurate with the aspirations of the communities in which tourism takes place (Milne, 1998). In the past two decades, increasing attention has been paid in the tourism planning literature to the importance of facilitating community participation and stakeholder interaction in the overall management of shared resources. It is argued that unless residents are empowered to participate in the decision-making process, tourism development will not translate community values into ‘more’¹ sustainable directives. This view of development promotes devolution of power from central political systems to the community level (Chang, 1997; Milne, 1998; Mowforth and Munt, 1998).

This perspective on development focuses on community as an alternative to the individualism of the 1980s². It emerged in the 1990s and is concerned with the framework of ‘communitarianism’ in the public policy context. The communitarians argue that “modern society has seen the destruction of a sense of community [...], and over-development of the demand for the individual rights are the cost of a sense of responsibility and obligation” (Parsons, 1995, 502). Thus the idea of ‘community’ as a response to the free-market individualism is not new and as a concept ‘community’ has a variety of constructions.

Murphy (1985, xvi) argues that the community is the obvious place to start analysis and planning of tourism because “the local people involved in tourism activity represent the

¹ The term ‘more’ is to register the abundant use of intensifiers, which actually point to things presently lacking or being deficient.

² The major scholars of this philosophy are Walzer (1983), Sandel (Ed., 1984) and Taylor (1985) (cited in Parsons 1995, 51).

industry's shop floor, where visitor and host meet, where its impacts are felt most keenly, and where the hopes of corporate and government planning will lie". The focus on the local scale offers a more optimistic view of tourism in contemporary research. The change emerged because of the growing interest in community development and the demand for sustainable growth, with the result being a greater concern for, and awareness of, the role locals play in determining their own fate (Chang, 1997). As a result, in more recent years, tourism researchers consider community-based approaches to tourism development a requirement for successful and sustainable tourism development (Din, 1996; Simmons, 1994; Taylor, 1995; Tosun and Jenkins, 1998; Woodley, 1993).

Recently, a new challenge has emerged in the practice and discussion of community-based tourism development and planning. This approach seeks to determine faults in the planning process and to identify ways forward. Issues of coordination, collaboration and partnership are now at the forefront of much research on tourism development (Hall, 1999; Tewdwr-Jones and Allmendinger, 1998). The integrated approaches to tourism planning are neither top-down nor bottom-up. They may rather be regarded as an interactive or collaborative approach, which requires participation and interaction. Getz and Jamal (1994, 152) suggest that "in a complex tourism domain, [...] no single individual, agency or group can resolve strategic tourism issues by acting alone".

New approaches and tools need to be devised to facilitate consensus and communication between heterogeneous groups of stakeholders (Jamal and Getz, 1995; Reed, 1999; Simmons, 1994). It is also necessary to focus on the inter-connected nature of community, tourism businesses and government in local settings (Milne, 1998). While tourism researchers and planners often support the idea that tourism should benefit the community, they rarely explain how to mobilise local involvement. Most importantly, there are few clear indications as to how the views of different stakeholders can be communicated effectively to interested parties (Din, 1996).

In this thesis, I contribute to the discussion on community participation and stakeholder integration in tourism development (Getz and Jamal, 1994; Hall, 1999). The specific argument advanced is that tourism development needs to take into account the perceptions of multiple, interdependent stakeholders (e.g. local communities,

indigenous groups, tourism industry, public sector and visitors), who have a role and interest in the planning decisions that they influence or are affected by (Hasse, 2000b). The interest in stakeholder analysis comes from the concern that not only the community, but also the government and the visitors as well as other individuals or groups have a stake in a particular setting. While the focus in the tourism literature has largely been on looking at one particular stakeholder at a time, all stakeholders need to be identified and included in the process of negotiating for more sustainable forms of development. Therefore, this thesis draws upon the advances made in development theory in embracing a more participatory approach to tourism planning. In addition, I attempt to design a participatory GIS (PAGIS) that integrates participatory approaches and Geographical Information Systems to offer another way of facilitating community input into tourism planning and development. I argue that PAGIS can provide an innovative tool that enhances interaction and communication between other stakeholders. It can also increase the number and diversity of people participating in spatial decision-making.

1.2 CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

This thesis incorporates a combination of conceptual elements that cut across a series of distinct levels (see Figure 1.2, p.4). At its most elementary level, it presents a refined approach to community-based tourism development and multiple stakeholder participation. On a more abstract level, the theoretical perspective taken in this thesis looks at the interpretive approach that acknowledges that understanding is a dialogue between the data (other places and other people) and the researcher who is embedded within a particular intellectual and institutional context (Duncan and Ley, 1993). In comparison to traditional positivist approaches, the interpretive approaches are based on different assumptions about the nature of the world and the criteria used for constructing and evaluating knowledge. The interpretative research shows that ‘reality’ is ultimately a human construction and, therefore, subjective (Smith, 1988).

On a more disciplinary level, this research deals with the constructed concept of ‘community’ and participatory development in the tourism literature. The more systematic level deals with applying stakeholder analysis, adopted from management theory, to deal with processes and procedures to set up a responsive planning framework for tourism planning. This academic field of tourism development has a real world

focus, with the community of Marahau, New Zealand chosen as a case study (see Figure 1.1, p.x). The methodological level applies participatory approaches and GIS as combined tools to facilitate and strengthen the planning process. The participatory approaches from the interpretative perspective do not only have a methodological significance, but also have philosophical implications.

Figure 1.2: Conceptual Framework for Structure of Dissertation

Theoretical Perspective	→	Interpretive Approach
Disciplinary Approach	→	Tourism and Participatory Development
Systematic Level	→	Stakeholder Analysis
Case study	→	Marahau, New Zealand
Methodological Approach	→	Participatory Approaches and Geographical Information Systems

1.3 AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

The overall aim of this thesis is to address the question of how to achieve more sustainable forms of tourism development for local communities. This research provides a case study for outlining processes and procedures that are the basis for developing a framework to address the issues of tourism in the community of Marahau. Marahau is a small community, located in the North of the South Island in New Zealand, at the gateway to the Abel Tasman National Park³, which is one of the icons of the tourism industry in New Zealand (see also Figure 2.1, p.11). It faces increasing pressures from growing visitor numbers to the Park, increase in permanent population and proposed tourist developments.

This research focuses on linking tourism and development in the context of community-based planning by examining stakeholders' roles and perceptions in the context of the specific socio-economic, political and cultural processes in which they are embedded. The thesis adopts a stakeholder analysis and employs participatory approaches and GIS as methodological tools.

³In this thesis the Abel Tasman National Park is referred to as the 'Park'.

Objectives:

- To *integrate* advances in development theory, in regards to participatory development, and to link these to tourism planning;
- To *gain* a better understanding of the underlying forces relating to tourism planning and development in the context of the socio-economic, political and cultural, as well as historical structures;
- To *identify* and *empirically investigate* the roles, and perceptions of, stakeholders towards tourism and its future development in Marahau and the Park;
- To *introduce* an innovative way to approach the achievement of community participation and stakeholder interaction and communication;
- To *develop a framework* that integrates participatory approaches and Geographical Information Systems (PAGIS) to represent the complexities of stakeholder perceptions, and provide a tool that has the potential to facilitate stakeholder communication and interaction;
- To *reveal* the possibilities of integrating and representing qualitative data collected in participatory mapping exercises into a GIS.

1.4 SIGNIFICANCE OF STUDY

A holistic approach is taken in this thesis to investigate community-based tourism development and to extend and challenge existing approaches. At the same time I discuss ways in which tourism, development and community have been reflected in contemporary literature. In identifying gaps and shortcomings, I suggest ways to overcome these by drawing upon the literature of development studies, especially upon participatory approaches. The focus is relatively tight on the marriage between tourism and development theory as applied in New Zealand. Marahau is an appropriate community to explore the theoretical concepts and methodological approaches to develop ways of negotiating and identifying more sustainable future directions for communities. The community is currently confronted with the first signs of the social impacts of tourism due to an increase in visitor numbers, tourism businesses and an increase in permanent residents. Marahau is also important because it displays characteristics common to a number of communities faced with increasing tourism development, these include:

- Marahau had been a traditional New Zealand farming community until the economic restructuring in 1984.

- The technological advances through improved communication and development of the roads to Marahau made the community more accessible.
- Marahau's geographical advantage is its location at the entrance to the Abel Tasman National Park.
- Tourism has grown to be an important sector in Marahau and for the regional economy.
- In Marahau there has also been an increasing number of local tourism businesses and a continuing expansion of existing tourism operations.
- At this stage, tourism businesses in Marahau are locally-owned and small-scale, with benefits spreading throughout the community.
- There is a proposed tourism development for a large-scale beach resort.
- There have been an increasing number of permanent residents in recent years, many coming from overseas.

New ways of approaching and engaging stakeholders in the planning process are studied in applying participatory approaches and GIS to integrate and represent qualitative data. Moreover, PAGIS is designed as a 'problem-structuring' tool that can be adopted to facilitate stakeholder interaction and communicate in planning processes. Also, GIS is used in this research to explore the analytical techniques to represent community perceptions and other stakeholder information, therefore, linking 'local' knowledge with 'expert' knowledge. It is proposed to contribute to the debate of 'GIS and Society' that emerged in the 1990s by looking more critically at the implications of GIS on society.

A key focus of this thesis is in providing an understanding of the importance of stakeholders' roles in, and perceptions of, tourism development. Although locally context dependent, the social processes examined here can be generic without being restricted to Marahau and may be applicable at places elsewhere. Many aspects are related to the experiences of the participants in the community of Marahau and the socio-economic, political, cultural and historical context of the region. The results are kept as detailed as possible in the words of the respondents to ensure that the specificity, richness and relevance of issues in Marahau are not lost through interpretation. Moreover, recent research has been focused on doing research *on* rather than *with* communities (Cornwall, 1996). The emphasis here is on local people and the future development of their community. This includes presenting the results back to the

community and providing them with a tool to communicate their perceptions to local government or other stakeholders.

This thesis reflects my belief that all people should have the right to determine their own visions for their future. In applying theory to real life it is important to keep in mind that the situation is continually changing and complex. Finally, it is important to note that the thesis does not attempt to define and assess what development is, or what tourism is, nor to find another definition of community, sustainability or to reinvent them. There is also no necessity to claim that the approach I have taken to this topic is the only possible and right one. It is just another way of approaching the topic with limited resources.

1.5 STRUCTURE OF THESIS

The thesis comprises eight chapters. In the current chapter the broader issues, concepts and approaches fundamental to the research have been outlined. The focus is on the processes and procedures to set up a planning framework for more sustainable tourism development. This is to be achieved through stakeholder analysis and the design of PAGIS as a methodological tool that can be used to facilitate stakeholder communication and interaction.

Chapter Two tells the ‘story’ of Marahau, providing a backdrop for discussing the conceptual ideas in chapter three and presenting the findings in chapter five to seven. I introduce the contemporary context of tourism in New Zealand by highlighting the economic importance of the industry. The ‘story’ of Marahau includes a regional history and introduces the Abel Tasman National Park as a ‘Mecca’ for visitors to New Zealand. This reveals the major issues Marahau is facing in the context of tourism development.

Chapter Three reviews the literature that provides the conceptual framework followed in this research. The theoretical ideas are presented by drawing on a wide range of literature from diverse subject fields. First, I raise some theoretical insights relevant to the understanding of development by investigating participatory approaches as a current direction in development theory. It assesses the path tourism planning has taken to arrive at sustainable and collaborative approaches. This includes a brief reflection on the

contested concepts of ‘community’ and ‘sustainability’. I introduce stakeholder analysis adopted from management theory as an important way to guide the investigation and address the deficiencies identified. Finally, I discuss the role of GIS and its applications in tourism planning. Further, I introduce the purpose of alternative GISs that are applied to public participation and present the role of PAGIS.

Chapter Four outlines the methodological approach adopted in the empirical investigation of stakeholders’ roles in, and perceptions of, tourism in Marahau. The strategies of inquiry focus on applying a multiple research approach that includes participatory mapping to guide the investigation. Specifically, I present the research process and analysis in greater detail, this includes a discussion of the making of PAGIS. I introduce the design of a CD-ROM to make the spatial data available to the community and other stakeholders. This CD-ROM contains more detailed information of the conclusions drawn from the case study. These conclusions are reflected upon in chapters five, six and seven.

Chapters Five, Six and Seven present the findings and analysis of each stakeholder group identified within this research. These are represented in PAGIS as ‘expert’ or ‘local’ knowledge and discussed in each section. In *Chapter Five*, I describe the role of local government and introduce the guiding legislation for tourism planning in New Zealand, the Resource Management Act. Tourism New Zealand is mentioned as a player in the context of destination marketing. This is followed by a discussion of the local government agencies relating to Marahau and their role and responsibilities in tourism development. It also presents the ‘expert’ knowledge of the local government agencies in PAGIS.

In *Chapter Six*, I reflect upon the tourism industries that have a stake in the Park and Marahau. This chapter includes the investigation of visitors’ characteristics and their perceptions of the place. In *Chapter Seven*, I discuss the composition of the Marahau community and present the results of their perceptions of the past, their views on tourism in the present, as well as their hopes and fears for the future of tourism development in their community. This chapter also presents the perceptions of the indigenous community in the area. The representation of ‘local’ knowledge in PAGIS is also described.

Chapter Eight concludes with a reflection, synthesis and assessment of the findings and makes recommendations drawn from the results for achieving more sustainable tourism development. It also reflects on the methodological approach and presents an evaluation of the application of participatory approaches. The chapter discusses some research challenges and reflects upon the application of PAGIS to tourism development and the possibilities to advance the tool in the future.

CHAPTER II: MARAHAU - THE GATEWAY TO PARADISE

2.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter provides an account of tourism development in the community of Marahau and the Abel Tasman National Park (see Figure 2.1). I outline the contemporary importance of tourism for New Zealand and the Nelson region. Then, I discuss the socio-economic, historical and cultural context of the Nelson region, with an emphasis on Marahau.

Figure 2.1: Location Map of Case Study Site Marahau, New Zealand

(Source: Department of Lands and Survey, 1984)

The historical overview commences with the story of Maori settlement. This has a direct relevance for the contemporary debate on Maori involvement in tourism associated with the Park. The 'story' continues with European arrival and settlement in

the Nelson region. The discussion highlights the first recreational activities in the region and how Marahau moved from traditional resource extractive industries towards tourism in the late 1980s.

The chapter includes a review of the history of the Park, and how Marahau became the community at the 'gateway' to the Park. The increase in visitor numbers and tourism businesses is also highlighted. I further introduce the current debate on the contested foreshore of the Park and the management issue that resulted from the increase of visitor numbers and tourism operations.

2.2 CONTEMPORARY CONTEXT OF TOURISM

Tourism has become an important and widely recognised actor in the New Zealand economy since the 1980s (Britton *et al.*, 1992; Hall *et al.*, 1997b; Pearce and Simmons, 1997). Today, tourism "plays a significant and increasing role in the New Zealand economy" (Statistics New Zealand, 1999, 11). Tourism is one of New Zealand's largest foreign exchange earners and directly contributed NZ\$4.2 billion (4.7%) to New Zealand's GDP in 1997. This can be compared with the direct contribution to GDP by agriculture of 5.9%, construction of 4.5% and communications of 3.5% (Statistics New Zealand, 2001).

The total spending by all tourists accounted for NZ\$9.1 billion for the year ended March 2000. In 1995 it was shown that NZ\$4.3 billion was spent by international and NZ\$3.5 billion by domestic visitors. Spending by international visitors totalled 15.8% of the total foreign exchange earnings representing New Zealand's largest 'export' industry for 1995 (New Zealand Tourism Board, 2000; Statistics New Zealand, 1999). For the year 2010, the Tourism Strategy Group predicts a growth of 81% to 3.2 million international visitors. The target is an increase of international visitor spending to NZ\$9.4 billion in 2010. The Tourism Strategy Group also predicts that an additional 100,000 people will be employed in the tourism industry (Tourism Strategy Group, 2001).

There are currently more than 16,500 small companies involved in tourism in New Zealand (New Zealand Tourism Board, 1999, 2000). An estimated 86,000 (1997) full-time equivalent employees were engaged in directly producing goods and services consumed by tourists. An estimated 63,000 (1997) full-time equivalent persons were

indirectly engaged in supporting tourism. Tourism permeates every sector of the economy with flow on effects that are far greater than direct foreign exchange earnings. Tourism expenditure impacts on all industries, providing opportunities for growth and additional employment (New Zealand Tourism Board, 1999; Statistics New Zealand, 2001).

The Nelson region, in which Marahau and the Abel Tasman National Park are located, is widely recognised as the sunniest area in the country with a mild climate and a wide variety of tourism attractions. The region comprises Nelson City and Tasman District. Tourism has grown significantly over the last decade and it is one of the ‘big four’ industries in the region along with forestry, fishing and horticulture. Three further product categories emphasise how international lifestyles have changed local industry. These are extracts and essences, remedies and therapy and the wine sector all making a noteworthy contribution to the region and its attractions. There are over 400 tourism businesses in the Nelson region (Nelson City Council, 1998).

The earnings from tourism as the fastest growing industry are almost on a par with forestry in the Nelson region. The tourism industry contributes an estimated NZ\$150 million to the region’s economy producing seven percent of its GDP each year. The tourism industry employs an estimated 2,277 people (full-time equivalent positions) representing an increase from 1,200 people in 1994, with further growth expected in the future (Latitude Nelson, 2000; Nelson City Council, 2001). The region hosts 230,000 domestic and 161,000 international visitors each year. Domestic visitors account for the bulk of peak visitor inflow, but in the shoulder season⁴ the balance shifts to a 60:40 ratio in favour of international visitors. In 1994, domestic visitors spent an estimated NZ\$75 million and international visitors NZ\$45 million during their stay in the Nelson region (Latitude Nelson, 2000; Nelson City Council, 2001; Tourism Nelson, 1995). It is suggested that these figures are much higher in 2001 due to the growing number of visitors to New Zealand and increases in visitor spending.

⁴ The seasons for Marahau are a ‘top of peak season’ also known as ‘silly season’ from 26th December until 20th January and the shoulder seasons between April and May, as well as between October and November. The winter season is May to September (this is also the time when some businesses close down). The Park is full for almost six months per year (Pfalzer, 2001).

The majority of domestic visitors to the Nelson region come from the South Island of New Zealand, especially the Canterbury region. The North Island is present with Auckland and Wellington visitors, as the region's largest and fastest growing markets (see Table 2.1). This can be explained by the improved air access to Nelson, which is showing signs of a change in the nature of domestic travel. The region is receiving a high number of international visitor numbers from Australia, the United States and Europe. Nelson is also beginning to experience visitation from less traditional markets, such as Japan, Singapore and South Africa, however, total numbers remain small (see Table 2.2) (Latitude Nelson, 2000).

Table 2.1: Domestic Visitors to Nelson

Origin of Domestic Visitors	Year ended March 2000
Canterbury region	33%
Otago region	5%
Rest of South Island	28%
Wellington	10%
Auckland	8%
Rest of North Island	9%
Other	7%
Total	100

(Source: Latitude Nelson, 2000)

Table 2.2: International Visitors to Nelson

Origin of International Visitors	Year ended March 2000
UK	20%
Australia	19%
Germany	10%
USA	10%
Nordic	7%
Netherlands	7%
Switzerland	4%
Canada	5%
Japan	2%
Singapore	1%
Other Europe	3%
Other	12%
Total	100

(Source: Latitude Nelson, 2000)

There are several significant trends, which influence the region's tourism and need to be taken into consideration when planning for tourism in the future. Some of these trends have been identified by the regional tourism organisation as relating to the travel boom in the Asia-Pacific region and the global increase in long-haul travel (Latitude Nelson, 2000). The trends are also indicating an increasing interest by visitors in the quality of the environment, a growing demand for different cultural experiences, an increase in more frequent, short break holidays and a growth of free independent travel by individuals, families and small groups (Latitude Nelson, 2000). In the last two years visitor numbers have also increased due to the weak New Zealand dollar. Furthermore, tourism is very seasonal in the Nelson region, which creates additional issues for the management and planning for the tourism sector (see Figure 2.2, p.14).

Figure 2.2: Total Guest Nights: Nelson Region from June 1999 – June 2000

(Source: Latitude Nelson, 2000)

2.3 THE ‘STORY’ OF MARAHAU

The community of Marahau is located on the east-facing coastline of Tasman Bay, 70 km northwest of Nelson and 18 km north of Motueka (see Figure 2.1, p.11). It is located at the southern entrance of the Abel Tasman National Park and is on a loop road off the main highway over a winding hill road, which gradually descends into Marahau/Sandy Bay. According to earlier Pakeha⁵ writers the Maori name Marahau has slightly different meanings, such as ‘the place of winds’ (Moncrieff, 1965), ‘wind on the garden’ (Peart, 1998) or ‘windy garden’. Bloomfield (1999) states that the original name of Marahau was Otuwhero, meaning ‘the open place’.

The ‘story’ of Marahau is that of a small coastal community undergoing rapid transformation from agriculture-based industries into an expanding tourism destination selling a place-related experience, focused on the Park. The changes date back to the mid-1980s and the broader context of macroeconomic transformations in New Zealand. Tourism growth really started during the 1980s due to the Park’s growing popularity and the general increase in international visitor numbers to New Zealand. To date, Marahau is serving an increasing number of visitors without significant planning frameworks and regulatory controls. At the same time, there has been a growth in

⁵ The word ‘Pakeha’ describes white/non-Maori New Zealanders.

permanent population due to alternative lifestylers moving into Marahau and other people returning for retirement and other reasons (see also Chapter VII).

2.3.1 A REGIONAL HISTORY

The rich oral history of Maori in the Nelson region goes back some 800 years. The mild climate and sheltered coastline attracted Maori tribes. Maori cosmology and creation myths tell the story of predecessors of the earliest inhabitants. One legend tells the story of a voyage made by Aorangi that ended in a storm where the *waka*, the crew and their cargo turned to stone and created the South Island and gave it the ancient name *Te Waka o Aorangi* to the South Island. The *tau ihu* of the *waka* formed Farewell Spit, Golden Bay, Tasman Bay, the Marlborough Sounds and Cloudy Bay (Smith, 1997).

The story of Maori settlement probably goes back beyond the late 17th century, when Maori settled in the region about the same time Abel Tasman visited in 1642 (McAloon, 1997). There are signs of 'lookout' posts all the way up the coast suggesting that shells strewn were found on the ground and a few artifacts beside them. Also, a considerable number of Maori tools have been found (Moncrieff, 1965). It is recorded that in Marahau the Ngati Raura and Te Atiawa built villages, which remained until the end of the 18th century (Peart, 1998). The 1820s were a period of considerable instability with inter-tribal feuding in New Zealand and the Te Atiawa gained land at Marahau during thus time. In 1840 it has been recorded that an estimated 500 Maori were living at Sandy Bay in Marahau (Smith, 1997). Little information exists about these early inhabitants' lifestyles, but it is evident that cultivated crops were a major feature of Maori life, especially the kumara and taro. The kumara is sensitive to frost, and the mild climate of Tasman Bay was a prime spot for cultivation.

Hunting and gathering were also part of Maori life, as well as gathering shellfish, which were readily available in the estuaries and inlets along the coast. Excavated middens show a wide variety of fish species were eaten (McAloon, 1997). The estuaries and swamps provided duck and pukeko as well as seabirds, while whitebait congregated at the river mouths. Maori fortresses were built in strong defense positions on seaside cliffs and steep hills (McAloon, 1997). The bays of the Abel Tasman coastline were easy accessible by sea and comparatively sheltered with flat sand pockets suitable for

horticulture. These sites have been recorded around the coast, with the majority of occupation sites, such as middens and ovens, located in the bays (Smith, 1997).

While the bays were not entirely deserted when European explorers arrived, most of the early Maori inhabitants had departed. The period of European discovery followed with subsequent settlement and exploration of the natural resources. The first European visitor was the Dutch navigator Abel Janszoon Tasman. He arrived in 1642 and was followed by the French explorer, Sebastian Dumont D'Urville in 1827. The European settlement in the northern South Island resulted from the activities of the New Zealand Company in 1841 that decided to investigate Tasman Bay as a suitable site for their second colony. More immigrants arrived during 1843 and 1844. The first sections at Marahau/Sandy Bay were purchased in 1857. In 1863, David Drummond purchased around 300 acres of Marahau bush land for milling (Smith, 1997). The Drummonds left before 1892 most probably after the millable timber had been felled and a flood in 1891 had wiped out the villages in the Marahau Valley (McAloon, 1997; Smith, 1997).

McAloon (1997) describes the years between 1893 and 1918 as the breakthrough years when life in rural New Zealand changed dramatically. Improved farming techniques were introduced, the land was manured more frequently, crops rotated more systematically and better livestock bloodlines and breeds were introduced. By the turn of the century, farming was growing through the introduction of refrigeration and the frozen meat industry. By 1914, Nelson's rural communities were thriving as never before and acres of land had been settled and turned into farms. Sheep and lambs were raised specifically for the freezing works, dairy farming focused on the butter and cheese export market, and hops were grown for nation-wide consumption (McAloon, 1997).

From the 1840s Maori and Pakeha farmers around Riwaka experimented with growing tobacco. In the 1880s the production was extended slightly inland, where the climate is well suited to the commercial production of a wide range of horticultural crops. The National Tobacco Company contracted farmers and, by 1933, almost 90% of the New Zealand's tobacco was grown in the Nelson region and Marahau. This lasted until government restructuring of the industry in 1981, when protected tariffs were removed, the price dropped and the number of licensed growers reduced radically (McAloon,

1997). By 1983, kiwifruit became the most popular alternative to tobacco growing in the region and is still grown in small patches in Marahau (Bank of New Zealand, 1983).

At the turn of the century, road access became important in local farming communities around Tasman Bay. Access in 1880 to Marahau was provided by a bridle track from Riwaka through Woolf's Valley. There was also an access track from Torrent Bay to Marahau in the 1890s⁶. Life was not easy during those times when most country roads were still narrow and muddy, and became impassable in bad weather (McAloon, 1997; Smith, 1997). During the 1930s, the area became less isolated as transport improved. Road building had become a national priority after World War One. Before that communication by roads was still backward in many areas and motor transport was generally in its infancy. Also, aviation became an established part of the transport network in the 1930s and the Nelson City airport was opened in 1938. The interisland ferry between Picton and Wellington began after 1962 and improved access to the North Island. During the 1950s and 1960s telephone and electricity arrived and Marahau went 'into the mainstream' (Bloomfield, 1999, 44; McAloon, 1997).

After the Second World War Marahau had cricket teams and dance parties and organised community activities. In Marahau there was the community initiative called the 'Marahau - Sandy Bay Progress League' that operated until the end of the sixties (Bloomfield, 1999). This organisation was active in lobbying for the Sandy Bay Hill road to open in 1954, for electricity to be brought to the district, for building the bridge over the Marahau River in 1952, and also for raising money to build a community hall in 1954. Also, more families were moving back into Marahau in the wake of the Second World War (Bloomfield, 1999). In addition, holiday homes were sought after in Marahau and communes and rural collectives became noticeable in rural Nelson in the mid-1970s. Those people were attracted by the remoteness, the climate of the region and the availability of cheap and marginal land (McAloon, 1997).

The 1950s and 1960s were prosperous times across New Zealand and the popularity of Nelson grew as a holiday destination. For tourists the main attractions were the beaches. The Abel Tasman National Park, gazetted in 1942, became gradually more important for the region as an attraction for domestic visitors (McAloon, 1997, 218). Since the

⁶ There were early efforts to build a road from Awaroa to Marahau (Smith, 1997).

early 1960s tourism continued to grow in Nelson City with visitors mostly coming from Christchurch and Dunedin. The early beginning of regional tourism was related to the appeal of Nelson City as a residential and tourist town. This had been recognised for some time and assiduously promoted by the city council and local businessmen. The term ‘Sunny Nelson’ was used more and more and the promotion of Nelson’s tourist and lifestyle attractions became more intense. The visitors were mostly middle-income people and came either as families, groups of late teenagers or people in their early 20s in an annual migration ‘as predictable as the godwits’. Half of all those visitors to Nelson went to Kaiteriteri and some to Takaka, Pohara and Totaranui (McAloon, 1997, 218). These are key sites adjoining the Abel Tasman National Park and continue to be primarily places for New Zealand holidaymakers.

The Nelson economy was not excluded from the recession of the 1980s and this was particularly noticeable outside the city. The New Zealand Labour Government in 1984 removed agricultural subsidies and farmers needed to cut costs and that meant that the demand for goods fell and rural servicing employment dropped as well. The “restructuring of state services after 1984 accelerated rural change, but in many places new opportunities replaced old patterns” (McAloon, 1997, 228). Tourism was one of the new opportunities for Marahau and has mostly replaced the agricultural sector with the major attraction being the Park.

2.3.2 THE ‘MECCA’ FOR VISITORS TO NEW ZEALAND

The Abel Tasman coastline⁷ is described as the ‘Mecca’ of New Zealand’s tourism. It is of particular importance to the tourism industry in the Nelson region (Frater *et al.*, 1998). Perrine Moncrieff, whose immediate objective was to stop the forest in the area and around Totaranui from being milled, initiated the formation of the national park. The distinctive natural environment provided strong reasons for the Park’s formation and the association with the tricentenary of Abel Tasman’s landfall gave the movement additional merit. At first Moncrieff turned her private land in the Astrolabe Roadstead into a scenic reserve and then proposed that 15,000 hectares of Crown land should be designated a national park. Moncrieff organised the first petition for the creation of a national park in October 1941. The petition coincided with proposals made in 1937 by

⁷ There are other authors, who have written about the Park: ‘The Enchanted Coast’ (Host, 1976) or ‘People came Later’ (Moncrieff, 1965). They contain more valuable and detailed information.

the regional Nelson Labour Party that if a coastal road was put in between Kaiteriteri and Totaranui, the rest of the area should be made a scenic reserve. Queen Wilhelmina of the Netherlands was invited to become the National Park's patron. The Park was opened on the 19th of December 1942, the anniversary of Tasman's visit. The occasion was marked by a *powhiri* from Maori, the presence of the personal representative of Queen Wilhelmina of the Netherlands and the dedication of the Tasman memorial (Dennis, 1990; McAloon, 1997; Moncrieff, 1965).

At 22,530 ha, the Park is New Zealand's smallest national park and is renowned for its world-famous coastal track, its golden beaches and sculptured granite cliffs. It has a mild climate and is a good place to visit at any time of the year (Department of Conservation, 2000). The 51 km coastal track is considered as one of New Zealand's Great Walks, which is suitable for all ages and can usually be walked in three to five days. The Park can also be accessed by kayak, or through commercial water transportation (Department of Conservation, 1999). The vegetation is still recovering from a century of massive modification from farming, milling, and quarrying. It is also unique in that patches of private land and holiday homes remain within the Park's area (Dennis, 1990; Department of Conservation, 1996c).

The potential for tourism at the coastline of the Abel Tasman was recognised early and on Good Friday 1886 the steamer 'Waitapu' took an excursion to Totaranui from Collingwood (Host, 1976). The Anchor Company ran excursions from Nelson to Bark Bay in the Koi until 1904 and the launches 'Terepa' and 'Kotare' took visitors on excursions along the coast (Smith, 1997, 29). In the period before 1942, in the summer months yachtsmen and hardy campers spent their holidays on the quiet beaches at the Abel Tasman coastline and went 'down the Bay' for a brief periods of time. These early forms of tourism in the Park were mainly domestic visitors coming from Nelson or Motueka. The coastal landscape attracted recreational users at a time when exploitation of the area's natural resources such as quarrying and milling was diminishing. Many of the boating visitors would use places along the coast where they would camp on shore and form attachments to favourite spots, which led to the establishments of holiday homes (also called baches in New Zealand). The main transportation was by launches for families, who owned blocks of land and had built a *whare* or house on them, for

campers of 'tough fibre' and yachtsman. In these days there were no speedboats. As Moncrieff (1965, 125-126) wrote:

“Before the day when most people owned a car any out-of-the-way bush was of no interest to town dwellers, though [a few] with more foresight realised that distance would mean nothing before many years had passed”.

The original Settlers' Track between Marahau and Awaroa fell into disuse and had become rough and overgrown by the 1930s. In those early days without tracks it took up to a week to walk from Marahau to Awaroa. Tramps were only recommended for experienced trampers, but by 1955 the clearing of the original track between Marahau and Torrent Bay had been completed (Smith, 1997).

Today, the area is confronted with management issues that stem from the increasing number of visitors and tourism businesses operating on the foreshore and in the Park. The visitation peaks are at Christmas, New Year and Easter, which are New Zealand public holidays and during the Nelson Anniversary Day⁸. During February and March ten years ago the Park was almost empty during the week, now it is “constantly buzzing with commercial craft and a daily dose of walkers and kayakers” (Canard, 2000). During the three-month high season there are an estimated 1,200 visitors per day in the Park (Clough, 2000). Although there are no exact records kept, 178,000 visitors per year have been estimated based on hut and campsite pass sales, data from concessionaires and track counters with day walkers (see Figure 2.3, p.21).

The majority of visitors enter the Park at the southern end through Marahau or Kaiteriteri by motorboat, water taxi, kayak or on foot. In addition, yacht and boat users account for a further 50,000 people and kayakers for another 18,000 people per year (Williams, 2001). The steady increase in commercial and independent sea-kayakers, private and commercial motorboat users and the introduction of jet skis along the Abel Tasman coastline has resulted in problems of seasonal crowding and conflicts between resource users along the coastline. This concentrates mainly along the Astrolabe Roadstead area closest to Marahau, which runs from Guilbert Point to Te Karetu Point (Hawke, 2000) (see Figure 2.1, p.11).

⁸ A public holiday for Nelsonians is held every year on the nearest Monday to the first of February: 1996 – 29th January; 1997 – 3rd February; 1998 – 2nd February; 1999 – 1st February; 2000 – 31st January; 2001 – 29th January. The date commemorates the arrival at Nelson of the first ship carrying immigrant European settlers on 1st February 1842 (Allan, 1965).

Figure 2.3: Estimated Number of Visitors to the Abel Tasman National Park 1988-2000

(Source: Clough, 2000, 2001)

In this context it is important to note that the seasonality of visitation to the Park plays a major role. Canard (1999), an ex-tourism operator, states that the Park is under utilised for 65% of the year. He makes some interesting projections on the increase of visitor numbers for the future, which shows some of the problems the region and the Park might face. The projections indicate that with an increase of visitors by seven percent a year, based on visitor numbers in 1999 of 165,000, in five years (2004) visitor numbers will increase to 231,000. The growth results only from international visitors due to the promotional activities from the tourism industry, the regional tourism organisation and Tourism New Zealand. Those visitors are most likely to arrive between November and March at an average of 440 people per day. This would be the “total capacity of the entire existing Abel Tasman water taxi service at full stretch. In five years we could be accommodating double the numbers of day visitors to the Abel Tasman”. This would mean a 40% increase in regional visitors, and a 100% increase in pressures on the Park (Canard, 1999). The increasing number of visitors, tourism businesses and permanent populations bring sudden new pressures to bear on the area that causes profound development problems in the community of Marahau itself.

CHAPTER III: RE-ADDRESSING COMMUNITY AND TOURISM DEVELOPMENT

3.1 INTRODUCTION

There are two problems of fundamental importance when approaching the discussion of community-based tourism development. These concern the multidisciplinary nature of tourism research and the absence of adequate theoretical foundation for understanding tourism (Britton, 1991; Mowforth and Munt, 1998; Przeclawski, 1993). Przeclawski (1993) points out the complex nature of tourism and its suitability for interdisciplinary research. The chapter draws on a wide range of literature in tourism, development studies, sociology and management.

This chapter provides the theoretical framework for investigating the relationship between tourism, development and community. I begin by outlining the ‘invention of development’, because it is important to understand where the concept of development was constructed and what it constitutes. This is followed by a short overview of the major paradigms of development theory to provide the background for understanding the emergence of its ‘impasse’ (Schuurman, 1996a, 1) and to trace where development thinking stands currently. I then discuss the ‘post-impasse’ of development theory and its linkage to the age of post-modernity and changes in the global political economy.

I discuss early approaches tourism researchers have taken in the context of community-based tourism development. This provides the backdrop to investigate the ‘new directions’ derived from the ‘post-impasse’ debate of development thinking applicable to tourism research. This offers more depth on the importance of theory and more qualitative methods in tourism research. Therefore, the investigation leads to a broader discussion on the three concepts of community, participation and sustainability. I highlight the contested terrain of community, provide an overview of the community approach and the emergence of social impact studies in tourism. One of the key concepts in the community approach is participation, which leads to the introduction of participatory development and its approaches. Attention will be given to the question of whether development discourse has anything to offer tourism studies.

This discussion leads to an investigation of the sustainability approach, which has evolved in tourism research (Butler, 1998; Hall and Lew, 1998; Mowforth and Munt,

1998; Wahab and Pigram, 1997), and the more recent collaborative approaches adopted in community-based tourism planning literature (Hall, 1999; Jamal and Getz, 1995; Getz and Jamal, 1994). I then introduce a participatory stakeholder approach to focus on some of the issues identified during the literature review drawing upon the advances made in development thinking. This leads to the theoretical debate on alternative GISs, the application of GIS in tourism research, and the role of participatory GIS (PAGIS) for tourism planning.

3.2 THE INVENTION OF DEVELOPMENT

Despite common usage of the term ‘development’ in tourism studies there is no coherent answer to its meaning and thus there are a vast range of definitions. In turning to the development literature the term according to Rist (1997, 1) “recedes like the horizon just as you think you are approaching it”. Numerous debates over the past fifty years have not settled the case. It is the course of the evolution of development theory that made it rather complex and, therefore, the problem of coming up with a definition to theorise about it is a never-ending task (Hettne, 1990). The strength of development discourse comes from “its power to seduce, in every sense of the term: to charm, to please, to fascinate, to set dreaming, but also to abuse, to turn away from the truth, to deceive” (Rist, 1997, 1).

Scholars argue that development has to be studied in a particular context, because it is socially constructed within a particular culture and history. Its meaning may be perceived only in the context of particular relations (Cowen and Shenton, 1996; Johnston *et al.*, 1998; Rist, 1997; Sachs, 1992). Johnston (1998, 130) explains that “development is historical, diverse, complex and contradictory; it is the central feature of the human condition. To reduce it to a number of asocial characteristics and their interaction is to trivialise the experience of real societies and the struggle of their people to make a living”.

In virtually all its usage, development implies change or progress (Gardner and Lewis, 1996). Hettne (1990, 2) suggests that the concept of development theory subsumes theories of societal change, which attempt to integrate different social science approaches to the development problem. The main concerns of development theory are change, structural transformation and cultural, political, social and economic evolution

(Hettne, 1990). For Cowen and Shenton (1996, iix) development in the modern world is a “discontinuous process in which destruction and renewal are simultaneous, as much as sequential”. Rist (1997) emphasises that development shouldn’t be seen as a panacea to every problem in the world.

In the tourism literature Pearce (1989) has made a contribution to linking development to tourism. To trace the relationship between tourism and development it is important to understand where the concept of development was constructed, and what it constitutes. It is important to stress that development theory is not uniquely applicable and confined to developing countries. It also has relevance to industrial Western societies (Hettne, 1990; Rist, 1997).

3.2.1 THE MAJOR PARADIGMS

This section identifies some of the major theoretical approaches adopted in development theory. The so-called ‘crisis’ in development (Hettne, 1990) or ‘impasse of development theory’ (Schuurman, 1996a) during the 1970s and the beginning of the 1980s provides the background for the further discussion of the two major paradigms of development, modernisation and dependency theory (Slater, 1995).

The late 1940s and early 1950s can be seen as a Eurocentric period. There were profound economic and political changes through the Enlightenment discourse, the concept of ‘modern’ was given a more specific meaning, and the West became the model for measuring social progress (Gardner and Lewis, 1996; Slater, 1995). This mode of development thinking is referred to by Slater (1995) as the orthodox Occidental vision and is expressed in *modernisation theory* and *neo-liberalism*. The modernisation paradigm, which is characterised by endogenism and evolution, is a Western development theory. It was constructed during the 1950s and 1960s during the Cold War, shifting global relations and the decline of colonialism (Escobar, 1995). The body of theory was essentially based upon an uncritical vision of the West, a perspective that ignored the histories of non-West or traditional societies and that nations could only become developed by taking up relations with the West (Slater, 1995). This perspective on development was imposed upon non-Western countries and onto their traditions and cultures and initiated the debates in economics that led to development thinking. Modernisation theorists have assumed that local cultures and traditionalism are

obstacles to development. Therefore, these perspectives were either ignored by planners or treated as a constraint to development. Modernisation theory does not distinguish between different groups within societies, because it is assumed these to be homogeneous and that all will enjoy the benefits of growth (Gardner and Lewis, 1996; Hettne, 1990).

The second major mode of development thinking is essentially a critique of modernisation theory. It emerged in the late 1960s and early 1970s as a Marxist and neo-Marxist challenge to the capitalist view of modernisation and became known as *dependency theory* (Schuurman, 1996a; Slater, 1995). The Eurocentric modernisation view was challenged by Latin American social scientists, and a theory dealing with the problems of ‘underdevelopment’ was introduced. This dependency approach became part of a general structuralistic orientation in development theory. Endogenism was replaced by exogenism and closely linked to indigenisation of development thinking (Hettne, 1990). By indigenisation Hettne (1990, 6) means the “changes in problem-orientation, theory and methodology”.

The dependency theorists drew upon Marxist concepts of capitalism as inherently exploitative, therefore, development is essentially an unequal process (Gardner and Lewis, 1996). According to Schuurman (1996b, 5) the main consensus of dependency theory draws upon a diverse range of earlier schools. The following are common aspects of dependency theory:

- Underdevelopment is a historical process and it is not necessarily intrinsic to the Third World;
- The dominant and dependent countries together form a capitalist system and underdevelopment is an inherent consequence of the functioning of the world system;
- The ‘periphery is plundered of its surplus’, which leads to development of the core and underdevelopment of the periphery;
- Multinationals impose a universal consumption pattern, without taking local needs into account and they use capital-intensive techniques in areas with large labour resources;

- Multinationals use a variety of methods to transfer capital and involve themselves in national political and economic affairs, via (among others) their relationship with the local bourgeoisie (Schuurman, 1996b, 5).

The mid-1970s were also the beginning of a trend in development theory that had a strong focus in the content of development. This was formulated in terms of 'alternative' or 'other development'. This line of thought mainly in Western industrialised countries was a reaction to certain inherent trends in conventional development or 'over-development' leading to ecological imbalance and psychological alienation (Hettne, 1990, 6). The modernisation paradigm has continued to dominate mainstream thought and practice in contemporary development contexts. Gardner and Lewis (1996) point out that today there is no single theoretical model which can explain development, nor is there 'one solution' to the problems stemming from development. The contemporary understanding draws upon a variety of theoretical sources and suggests a variety of approaches (Gardner and Lewis, 1996).

3.2.2 THE IMPASSE

The 1980s are seen as the 'lost decade to the field of development theory' with an increasing number of publications outlining the 'impasse in development theory' (Schuurman, 1996a, 1). During this period discussions began about the failure of 30 years of conventional, technocratic, top-down development programmes in many countries. Some of these factors are the post-modern criticism of theory formation in social science, and the growing awareness that the emphasis on economic growth results in consequences for the natural environment as well as the loss of the socialist paradigm. Hettne (1990, 34) reasons that "development theory must be understood as a rediscovery of basic themes in classical social science related to social change and transformation; that this process of discovery has only just started; and that the ultimate outcome may be more unified social science". The illusion that western European countries had reached the highest stage of development has been discredited and it became clear that there is no state of 'being developed', only a continuous process of change and this passes as 'development' or 'nondevelopment' depending on the perspective (Hettne, 1990, 16). This development impasse was especially concerned with Marxist and neo-Marxist thinking challenged by fundamentalist, multidisciplinary trends in the academic world and a neo-conservative trend in politics. In evaluating the

shortcomings of development at the end of the 1980s there was also an increasing trend towards ‘participatory development’ (Chambers, 1983; Friedmann, 1992; Hettne, 1990; Nelson and Wright, 1997).

The economic crisis in western European countries in the late 1970s and early 1980s had also been a crisis of the welfare state, which is an integral part of modern capitalism (Hettne, 1990, 17). Schuurman (1996b, 11) provides the following reasons to explain the economic crisis:

- The realisation that the gap between poor and rich countries continued to widen;
- The realisation that developing countries are preoccupied with short-term policies aimed at keeping their head above water in terms of debt;
- The growing awareness that economic growth has had, and is having, a catastrophic effect on the environment;
- That growth equals development is also invalid for industrialised countries;
- The delegitimisation of socialism as a viable political means of solving the problem of underdevelopment;
- The conviction that the world market is an over-arching whole which can’t be approached using development policies orientated only at a national level;
- The growing recognition of differentiation within the developing countries that could no longer be handled by global theories assuming homogeneous worlds;
- The advances in post-modernism within social sciences, where there has been a tendency to undermine ‘the great narratives’ (capitalism, socialism, communism, etc.) by arguing that there is no common reality outside the individual.

The critique of development in Western societies was also reflected in 1972 through the United Nations conference in Stockholm on the human environment. It turned the attention to the problem of development in the context of pollution, exhaustion of natural resources and cumulative growth in population and production (see Meadows *et al.*, 1972). This could be considered the birth of the modern ecological movement creating a creeping doubt in the development of industrial countries (Mowforth and Munt, 1998). According to O’Riordon (1989, 395) this emerging environmentalism “offers a profound critique of contemporary society and that its message is too important to be ignored”. It was the search for alternative development that triggered the World Commission on Environment and Development (WECD) in 1983 “to propose a

long-term environmental strategy for achieving sustainable development by the year 2000 and beyond” (World Commission on Environment and Development, 1987, ix). The publication of the Brundtland Report is another landmark in the discussion on alternative forms of development with a clear focus on sustainability (Friedmann, 1992).

At end of the 1980s, the neo-liberal development doctrine of structural adjustment, privatisation, deregulation, and free market-based development had not been touched by the ‘crisis’ in development (Schuurman, 1996a). The idea that economies had to be ‘opened’ and state structures be ‘rolled back’, because they are rigid barriers to successful development, became increasingly popular in many countries. The public sector had been viewed as ‘a brake on development’, as inefficient, and as an institutional stagnation (Slater, 1995). In addition, the restructuring of international capitalism that followed the 1973 Middle East oil crisis led to a redefinition of the role of the state, ending of Keynesianism and the idea of the welfare state (Schuurman, 1996a). The role of community participation in the neo-liberal strategies is to ‘roll back the state’ resulting in cost-sharing and cost-reduction. Hence, community participation is only part of a wider strategy to promote savings in the public sector (Mayo and Gary, 1995). As a development ideology, “neo-liberalism most resembles the well-known modernisation paradigm, but in fact it has less to offer because the role of the state has been minimalised” (Schuurman, 1996a, 12). The development theorist has to look at the state, what it is, what has been its role in development, what substitutes there are, and its implications for development theory (Hettne, 1990, 28).

3.2.3 THE ‘POST-IMPASSE’

Slater (1995, 63) argues that the contemporary development literature is departing from a constructed past, to debates that are punctuated by the prefix ‘post’ moving from post structuralism to post-modernism, or from post-Marxism to post-development. The post-impasse development theory, according to Schuurman (1996b), had begun over the impasse in neo-Marxist development theories.

Marxist perspectives began to fade away following the dissolution of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Central planning and bureaucratic direction taking are yielding to more flexible, decentralised, fine-boned structures of decision-making. The

post-modern view focuses on the end of the dominance of unitary theories of progress and beliefs in rationality, and their replacement by the concept that there is no single objective account of reality, and everyone experiences things differently. The post-modern approach insists on diversity and cultural relativity, stressing that there is no common problem and thus no common solution. Recent critical currents of theory development have been particularly concerned with questions of identity, subjectivity, knowledge and power. As a result, the past universal epistemologies were undermined by a post-modern scepticism about grand theories and supposedly immutable structures, which asserts philosophical relativism and multiple realities (Chambers, 1997a; Friedmann, 1992; Slater, 1995).

The critique was that crucial real-world questions have not been addressed by academics and the gulf between academic enquiry and development policy and practice has widened (Booth, 1996). Investigation of diversity in development has initiated new interest at all levels. The former influential theories ignored the complex diversity of the real world of development and the styles of research (Booth, 1996; Gardner and Lewis, 1996). New tendencies were emerging out of the most significant gaps and weaknesses in research, which were connected with the highly generalised and economic explanatory framework of Marxist and neo-Marxist origin that dominated social science in the West during the 1970s. These theories neglected the human aspects of societies that “action and interaction, history, culture and the ‘social construction of reality’” are significant aspects (Booth, 1996, 50).

The emphasis on the market as a means of expression of free choice and of relative value provides the ground for the recent attempts to liberalise economies and de-bureaucratise the state. Curtis (1997) defines the role of the state in three main perspectives: the state is not all-knowing and its agents are no longer invaluable for development to occur; the state is not all-powerful in progress only from a plurality of sources of power into dialogue and the state is not wealthy in itself. It is therefore necessary to promote shared and personal wealth at many levels and in many institutions of society (Curtis, 1997, 122-123). The interest in the micro-level that emerged during that time is of interest in this research context. This was at first characterised by the emphasis on rural development. Accepting the importance of global forces, the investigation into rural development has been for different responses to, and

different outcomes from, the central tendencies of change. These new directions revealed the complex interaction between individuals and groups endowed with different and changing amounts of knowledge and power (Booth, 1996).

Post-impasse development theory has led to an increasing gap between localised micro studies and the kinds of understanding of larger structures that are needed to place them into their context (Booth, 1996). Social research should “be more responsive to the concerns of those who formulate, execute, benefit or suffer from development policies, programs and projects” (Booth, 1996, 65). Analytical theoretical frameworks of post-impasse development theory must involve the relationship between power, actors and structure, inequality and diversity became the main constructions of post-impasse development theories (Schuurman, 1996a). These key concepts of post-impasse development theories have popularised such approaches as participatory research and community development.

3.3 EARLY APPROACHES TO TOURISM PLANNING

The early approaches to tourism planning, which are still present in contemporary tourism research, establish the background for linking tourism and development theory. The first period of tourism approaches is described as ‘*boosterism*’ (1950s and 1960s) and is taken as the point of entry to investigate the path of tourism studies. It was after the Second World War that researchers started to systematically analyse the phenomena of tourism and leisure (Wolf and Jurczek, 1986, 10). Tourism research started to focus on the nature and place of tourist geography in the late 1960s, triggered by the emerging mass-market package tours that became typical for the European travel industry. This was made possible due to advances in aircraft technology during the Second World War, and with the Boeing 707 jet introduced in 1958 the age of mass travel by air had arrived. The ‘boosterism’ approach to tourism planning is a “simplistic attitude that tourism development is inherently good and has automatic benefit to the host. Residents of tourist destinations are not involved in the decision-making, planning and policy surrounding tourism development” (Hall *et al.*, 1997a, 19).

The ‘*economic or industry-related approach*’ (1960s and 1970s) to tourism is seen as a means to promote growth and development in certain areas. The emphasis in planning is based on the economic impacts of tourism and its efficient use to create employment

and income benefits for communities or regions (Hall, 2000; Hall *et al.*, 1997a). This economic interest in tourism dominated the approach to planning during the 1970s and 1980s as nations worldwide promoted their national assets for the international tourist market. The paradigm of political governance was economic growth, and tourism was seen as an agent for this role. Politicians still consider tourism as a source of national wealth and prosperity. Unresponsive and stagnant economies in the developed world and the rapidly integrating economies of the developing world saw tourism embraced as a panacea with a political agenda promising all things to all people (Hall, 2000).

The so-called '*physical or spatial approach*' (1970s and 1980s) in tourism planning is characterised by the assumptions that tourism is a resource user, a regional and spatial phenomena, and development is defined in environmental terms. This led to the increase in studies on environmental impact assessment, perceptual studies and more regional planning for tourism (Hall *et al.*, 1997a). The recognition that tourism affects the 'host' community became more obvious in the 1970s after several years of promoting tourism as a solely positive feature. This began mainly through the review of negative impacts of tourism on communities⁹ with Turner and Ash (1995, 10) describing tourists as "the Nomads of Affluence are creating a newly dependent social and geographical realm: The Pleasure Periphery".

A contribution in regards to the ordinal tourism classification systems has been devised to help describe tourists and modes of tourism consistently, which is based on tourist party volumes (Smith 1977). Stage models and impact studies also emerged during the 1970s and 1980s as important tools in tourism analysis. Doxey (1975) argues that there is a cycle in community attitudes towards tourism. He suggests a scale to assess the host-guest relationship and interaction. This is defined as:

- 1) Euphoria: hosts enthusiastic and thrilled by tourist development.
- 2) Apathy: tourists are seen as a source of profit and individuality is lost.
- 3) Annoyance: residents voice misgivings about the tourist industry while policy makers see solutions in increasing infrastructure.
- 4) Antagonism: irritations become transferred to tourists through speech and behaviour.

⁹ These include important contribution of: Young (1973): Tourism: Blessing or Blight; Smith (1978): Host and Guest; Krippendorf (1975): Die Landschaftsfresser; De Kadt (1979): Passport to Development and Turner and Ash (1975): The Golden Hordes.

Finally, residents have little choice but to accept that their lifestyles and environments are irreversibly changed (Doxey, 1975).

Another stage model was developed by Butler (1980) and is concerned with the evolution of tourist areas. It suggests that tourist destinations evolve through distinct stages of development. These stages are exploration, involvement, development, consolidation, stagnation and then the tourist destination or resort either declines or rejuvenates. The model can be explained as that the initial tourist activity is characterised by small scale exploratory initiatives by tourism businesses followed by a period of slow growth. This results in growth of capacity, initiating a 'development' phase, beginning with the 'discovery' of the resort by tourists. At this point, large-scale development for mass tourism is attained, leading to a consolidation phase and stagnation when the resort nears its capacity level and loses its novelty within the mass tourism market. This is followed by a period of decline or rejuvenation as the area's position in the regional and global tourism market is reassessed (Butler, 1980).

The stage concept or life cycle concept is purely descriptive and offers few indications as to how transitions between stages of evolution occur. Such models tend to assume that the entire community response is the same towards tourism and consider communities as powerless victims of tourism. Despite its problems, the cycle concept remains a rich source of research hypotheses exploring the dimensions of the development process (Pearce *et al.*, 1996). The purely economic approach to tourism planning has been challenged since the 1980s, because of its lack of responsiveness towards social issues of tourism development. Although tourism is still perceived as an avenue of capitalist accumulation and as a major contributor to economic restructuring of places (Britton, 1991), there is an ongoing shift towards the need of addressing the social effects of tourism.

This brief discussion serves to illustrate the close relationship of earlier tourism approaches to the modernisation and dependency development paradigms discussed earlier. The critique of those approaches in tourism is connected to discussions in social sciences and geography, which critiqued the purely economic approach and the stage models as top-down, neglecting the social impacts of tourism on local communities. They also failed to acknowledge the diversity and complexity of communities, visitors

and the importance of wider contextual issues relating to tourism development (Pearce *et al.*, 1996).

3.4 SOME NEW DIRECTIONS

The bulk of tourism research has been driven by prescription, efficiency and economy rather than ideals of equality and social justice (Britton, 1991). Britton (1991, 451) suggests that for understanding tourism there needs to be “theorisation that recognises, and unveils, tourism as a capitalistically organised activity driven by the inherent and defining social dynamics of that system, with its attendant production, social and ideological relations”. Here, I concentrate on three main constructs, which are part of the post-modern challenge of development theory and important for tourism research: community, participation and sustainability.

The growing interest in participation in development is related to the failure of mainstream models of economic development. The ideas of alternative development were shaped during the last 20 years and the empowerment approach is fundamental to them. The starting point is the locality, although local action is constrained by socio-economic and political forces. This means that an alternative development is fundamentally a dialectic between ideology and practice. The state needs to play a major role in alternative development, because it must begin locally, it can’t end there (Friedmann, 1992).

Development occurs on different scales and, most importantly development is lived by the people in the communities in which it takes place (Murphy, 1985, see Milne, 1998). The recent call for more participation in tourism planning can be seen as a form of alternative development (Friedmann, 1992; Mowforth and Munt, 1998). However, there has been little effort made to understand what these alternative forms of development are and how to achieve these. The progress made in development studies might help to understand some of those issues.

3.4.1 THE CONTESTED TERRAIN OF COMMUNITY

Milne (1998) argues that the concept of community needs to be ‘unpacked’ and inserted more effectively into tourism’s academic discourse. Harington (1997, 18-19) views community as a socially constructed reality. It is an expectation, a standard against

which things are weighed, justified or accounted for. He argues that there will always be a contested understanding about community, and therefore, describes the term community as being “its own euphemism [...] it seems to be [...] a backbone concept of core material, but capable of disintegrating as we seek to study it closely” (Harington, 1997, 17). The multiple usage of the term community has led to the description of it being ‘chameleon-like’ (Capenerhust, 1994, 146). Harington (1997) points out there is the risk of using ‘community’ as a romantic, nostalgic loaded term, calling on imagery of better times evoking a nostalgic sense of the past as glorious or presenting the present as a turmoil. This can compound into an understandable yearning for connectedness by people whose traditions have been squashed by the isolation impact of for example modernity or tourism (Harington, 1997).

According to Jackson and Penrose (1993, 2), socially constructed means there is human intervention, therefore, “social construction theory is concerned with the ways in which we think about and use categories to structure our experience and analysis of the world”. The social construction perspective provides new insights into the ways that stakeholder perceptions are understood and how this improves the planning for tourism developments. As Penrose and Jackson (1993, 202) observe “the social construction perspective is valuable precisely because it allows apparently immutable categories to be dissected and critically evaluated”. That remark reveals that perceptions are deeply rooted in the dominant ideologies of particular societies and that the construction of categories has assumed shapes in different socio-economic, historical and geographical contexts (Penrose and Jackson, 1993).

The term ‘community’ is widely used in tourism and is applied in a wide range of contexts. Community has been defined in various ways such as: “a social network of interacting individuals, usually concentrated into a defined territory” (Johnston *et al.*, 1998, 81) or “an aggregation of people at a particular locale [and] characterised by social interaction, involving intimacy, emotional depth, moral commitment, social cohesion and continuity in time” (Bernhard, 1973). Joppe (1996, 475) argues “community is self-defining in that it is based on a sense of shared purposes and common goals. It may be geographical in nature or a community of interest, built on heritage and cultural values shared among community members”. These definitions

illustrate two persistent themes: firstly community as a place in a geographical sense, and secondly referring to common social aspects of community.

It is possible to discern two main sub-streams in which ‘community’ has been analysed in the tourism literature (Milne, 1997). One prioritises structures external to the community and considers local residents as largely passive forces in the development process (Britton, 1991, 1996; see Milne, 1997). In this case the community is seen to be ‘serving’ industry’s needs rather than vice versa. This, in turn, fosters the notion that communities are rather helpless victims in the face of an onslaught over which they have relatively little control. The other approach emphasises local agency and sees communities and their constituent members playing an active role in determining tourism outcomes (Drake, 1991; Murphy, 1985, 1988; see also Taylor, 1995). This latter approach views communities as being capable of planning and participating in tourism development, of making their voices heard when they are concerned, and of having the capability to control the outcomes of the industry to some degree.

3.4.2 COMMUNITY TOURISM APPROACH

Tourism planning has become more responsive to broader social and environmental needs (De Kadt, 1979; Krippendorf, 1982). The often-quoted works of Murphy (1983, 1985, 1988) and Krippendorf (1987) argue for new approaches to tourism planning. Krippendorf (1987) discusses the range of negative impacts on ‘host’ communities and the environment, while Murphy (1985, 1988) outlines a *community-driven tourism approach*.

The assumption that there needs to be more local control, the search for balanced development and alternatives to ‘mass’ tourism led to the increase of research in understanding community attitudes towards tourism and the impacts of tourism on localities. These were the initial steps to define the planner as a facilitator and not as an expert (Hall *et al.*, 1997a). The discussion of new planning and policy approaches to tourism is also expressed by Poon (1992) as ‘new tourism’. It focuses on new consumers, new technologies, new production systems, new management practices and changes in the industry’s frame of background conditions. Poon (1992) also argues that ‘host’ communities are not just passive recipients of tourism impacts, but are able to generate new initiatives, which better manage visitors and tourism infrastructure.

The ‘community approach’ in tourism development has received major attention during the last two decades. Community-based tourism planning has become a common concept and several models of have been put forward (Murphy, 1985; Taylor, 1995). Murphy (1985) points out that tourism is seen as a means of diversifying the local economy. Attempts to incorporate local interests and a degree of local control over the nature and extent of development in tourism have been suggested as the ‘community approach’ (e.g. Murphy 1985). The emphasis is:

“To ensure that the industry and community survive and prosper over the long haul it will be necessary to develop at a scale and pace appropriate to local conditions. In this way tourism can become a true community enterprise, one, which possesses mutually beneficial possibilities – synergism” (Murphy, 1988, 97).

In recent years there is an emerging desire of people to take control over their own lives, which has been reflected in the increased participation of local communities and individuals in the decision-making process. Recent tourism literature suggests that co-operation, participation and involvement of communities are integral to the tourism industry and the product (Taylor, 1995). Haywood (1988, 106) argues for more participatory approaches to tourism planning, due to the fact that tourism has its greatest impacts on communities themselves. He further suggests that:

“Well developed and stronger tourism planning at the community level is vital if any region or country wishes to deliver exciting and novel tourist experiences in which there is an emphasis on quality and high value-added components at the destination point” (Haywood, 1988, 106).

Regarding the scale at which tourism planning is most appropriate, Murphy (1985, 169) develops a model that incorporates different spatial levels. At each level there are different degrees of public participation in the planning process, but at the local level public participation should be the greatest, because according to Murphy it is “where the action takes place” (Murphy, 1985, 172). Community involvement needs to be applied at all stages of development, and is essential to overcome major conflicts that may result in hostility and disagreement with existing or upcoming planning initiatives, which might hinder sustainable development efforts (Murphy, 1988, Taylor, 1995). However, the notion of a shared vision for tourism development may be a highly ‘romanticised view of communal responsiveness’ (Taylor, 1995). The involvement of local residents is often “regarded as the key to sustainable development yet these same residents are

expected to be part of the tourism product and to share the benefits as well as they will inevitably share the costs” (Taylor, 1995, 487).

For tourism to be a successful strategy, the concerns of the entire community should be identified and considered (Jurowski, 1996)¹⁰. Input into the planning of tourism development can help “identify potential problems, successes, and failures, hence, assessing local perceptions and expectations of tourism can greatly facilitate decisions relating to the development and promotion of tourism” (Bourke and Luloff, 1996, 277). Haywood (1988, 108) strives for a more responsible and responsive approach to tourism planning, because “public participation has the potential to provide ‘social bargaining tables’ that can turn conflicting views into truly integrated awareness of the wider implications of debated issues”. The participation literature suggests that “community input helps to develop better plans, which are more responsive to local needs and have a better chance of community acceptance” (Loukissas, 1983, 19).

Although Murphy’s model is a landmark in tourism planning literature and conceptualises sustainable tourism from a community’s perspective, it does not offer a distinct process by which the complex and conflicting issues facing community can be identified (Getz and Jamal, 1994). Hall (2000) suggests that the community approach to tourism planning is a ‘bottom-up’ form of planning, which emphasises development *in* the community rather than development *of* the community. Since the 1980s the importance of the concept of local participation in community-based tourism development has been increasingly acknowledged in the tourism literature, but it does not reveal the ways in which conflicting views on tourism development are dealt with and how consensus between groups can be achieved (Capenerhust, 1994).

3.4.3 SOCIAL IMPACT STUDIES

In the past two decades numerous researchers and practitioners have recognised that tourism has, in addition to economic and environmental impacts, social and cultural impacts on the community. A major contribution has been made by Mathieson and Wall (1982) providing an overview of economic, physical and social impacts of tourism. An

¹⁰ Ritchie (1993) has itemised key research issues to facilitate ‘resident-responsive tourism’. His analysis divides research into strategic policy research, evaluation research, management research, action research and operational research. Ritchie’s list identifies several items of concern to an analysis of community reaction to tourism and a research agenda to encourage and facilitate resident-responsive tourism (see Pearce, 1996 *et al.*, 10)

understanding of these impacts is crucial for long-term and more sustainable tourism development. This acknowledges that it is at the local level that people have to deal with the effects of tourism, where land is allocated for development, facilities are built, and where permanent residents have to accommodate their wishes with the needs of visitors (Capenerhust, 1994; Collier, 1997). Research into stage models and host attitudinal change has formed the basis of social impact studies that still remain largely focused on the impacts of tourists on communities (Pearce *et al.*, 1996).

There have been various approaches to identify the perceptions or attitudes of residents towards tourism. These include studies of socio-demographic characteristics of residents, their place of residence, economic dependency, their involvement in tourism, their knowledge of tourism, their amount of contact to tourists and their length of residency¹¹. Dividing communities according to socio-demographic features revealed little difference in the perceived impacts of tourism (Capenerhust, 1994; Liu and Var, 1986; Perdue *et al.*, 1990; Pizam, 1978). Perceived negative impacts of tourism and hostility towards visitors decreased with an increase in distance from tourism hotspots and longer residency in the community (Belisle and Hoy, 1980; Brougham and Butler, 1981; Liu and Var, 1986; Pizam, 1978) and by native-born residents (Davis *et al.*, 1988). A significant finding in these studies is that the positive disposition towards tourism increased with a group's economic dependency. Following social exchange theory people who personally benefit from or depend on tourism, perceive greater economic and fewer social and environmental impacts from tourism than others (Capenerhust, 1994; Haralambopoulos and Pizam, 1996; Milman and Pizam, 1988; Perdue *et al.*, 1990; Pizam, 1978).

In more recent social impact studies there is an increasing trend to adopt conceptual models (Lankford and Howard, 1994; Perdue *et al.*, 1990) and apply advanced statistical models (Lindberg and Johnson, 1997). Also, longitudinal studies are put forward to investigate perceptions of residents towards tourism. For example, Getz (1994) suggests a longitudinal study because it is especially relevant to identify and measure the evolution of social and cultural impacts in response to tourism development. Perceived economic and congestion impacts have a greater effect on attitudes towards tourism in the United States than have perceived crime and aesthetic

¹¹ See Pearce *et al.* (1996, 21-23) for a summary of key findings.

impacts (Lindberg and Johnson, 1997). Other research on residents' attitudes towards tourism is linked to their perceived power relative to the tourism industry and their influence over tourism development (Lankford and Howard, 1994), the relationships between perceived personal and community benefits (Prentice, 1993) or the competition of residents for scarce resources (Capenerhust, 1994).

This last approach represents the fears of local people of losing control over their environments. Residents perceive that community identity is changing or being lost when their attitude towards visitors becomes "at best ambivalent, at worst hostile" (Capenerhust, 1994, 151). White (1971), who calls it the 'last settler syndrome', provides an interesting explanation for the reason of perceived impacts of tourism. He describes how people tend to want particular environments "to remain free from any further impairment [that means] each wants his particular [place] to remain just as it was when he or she arrived. The most recent settlers want to be the last settlers" (cited in Nielsen *et al.*, 1977, 574).

There are few consistent relationships or patterns observed by social impact studies. There is hardly any reference to current attitude theory and research. The studies are often conducted in a quantitative way by using different attributes that identify the individual in the community and by applying different statistical methods. They can also be criticised for treating tourism as a homogeneous phenomenon and tourists as a single group in the same way the stage models were criticised for treating the community as a single group (Pearce *et al.*, 1996). One outcome of these studies is the recognition that a previously perceived homogeneous community characterised by a particular response to tourism is made up of a variety of groups and individuals, all of whom will perceive tourism impacts differently (Capenerhust, 1994; Dogan, 1989; Murphy, 1985). This represents a shift to viewing the community as a heterogeneous group of people. The majority of resident segmentation studies cluster communities by their attitudes and common characteristics (Capenerhust, 1994; Lawson *et al.*, 1998).

The perceptions, attitudes and values of residents may change greatly with different variables. As discussed it shows that communities are diverse, dynamic and changing. Pearce *et al.* (1996) identified three major problems in this area of research. First, there are definitional and measurement problems with the concept of tourist, tourism and

community. There has been no attempt to investigate the nature of the tourism phenomena and to look at the differences of residents and few attempts to investigate the differences of tourists. It also has not been considered carefully in tourism research what the concept of a community incorporates. The second problem is the lack of opportunity for respondents to rate or assess the importance of these impacts. The respondents often also have no opportunity to add to or comment on the list provided by survey studies. The final problem identified is the overall lack of theoretical approaches in tourism research (Pearce *et al.*, 1996).

In regards to impacts that relate to the visitors, the notion of social carrying capacity is introduced and refers to the acceptable level of social encounters before the quality of the recreation experience of visitors is negatively affected. This concept is frequently mentioned in the tourism planning literature. The origins go back to the last century, when concerns were expressed over levels of wildlife population that could be supported by the environment. It refers to the maximum number of individuals of a defined species that a given environment can support over a long term. The notion of limits is fundamental to the concept of carrying capacity. The basic idea is that the amount of impact is related to the amount of use and that decreasing the amount of use will decrease the impacts. Likewise, Mathieson and Wall (1982, 21) mentioned that carrying capacity:

“Is the maximum number of people who can use a site without an unacceptable alteration in the physical environment and without an unacceptable decline in the quality for the experience gained by the visitors”.

Social carrying capacity is a subjective concept, reflecting the value judgments and preferences of individual visitors (Moore, 1994; Shelby and Heberlein, 1986, Hendee *et al.*, 1990). This concept refers to the number of people who visit an area and has an implication not only for environmental qualities, but also for the quality of the visitor experience. Investigating the perceptions of visitors reveals the social carrying capacity (Manning, 1986).

3.4.4 THE SUSTAINABILITY APPROACH IN TOURISM PLANNING

During the 1980s, the concept of sustainability was addressed as a result of the post-impasse in development and the post-modern discourse. It has become the dominant leitmotif of planners, researchers and businesses. Adams (1996) describes sustainable

development as a ‘flag for many ships’, because this concept does not enjoy an accepted theoretical foundation. Adams (1995, 207) argues that:

“The phrase is undoubtedly popular, it seems to command widespread support, to release considerable emotional appeal, and to provide a way for sometimes very different interests to express something of their attitude to nature and the development process”.

The understanding and implementation of sustainability is unique to a particular context. Hall (2000, 1) observes that “despite the plethora of discussions about sustainability in tourism we often seem no closer to finding solutions to the problem of tourism development”.

The Brundtland Report influenced the concept of sustainable development (World Commission on Environment and Development, 1987). A frequently used definition is “development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs” (World Commission on Environment and Development, 1987, 43). A key element of sustainability and sustainable development is a call for broad participation, of the widest possible presentations in policy fora. It deals with developing consensus around national and local government initiatives, communicating new initiatives to the public, and encouraging a sense of individual responsibility for action. Myers and Macnaghten (1998, 351) argue that:

“This approach to the problems of communicating sustainability has failed to take into account the ways people interpret texts in terms of existing commonplaces, and the ways they define the rhetorical situation in terms of their daily lives, immediate worlds, and cyclical time”.

Sustainable development is also considered a ‘truism’ with some commentators suggesting, “its very strength is its vagueness” (Redcliff, 1987, 4). It is difficult to implement the principles of sustainability discussed above in a free market economy because the “very concept of sustainability is fraught with ambiguity” (Lane, 1994, 103). Sustainable development encompasses development strategies:

“Ranging from light-green to dark-green, from romantic and nostalgic conservation to utopian socialism, from absolute-zero growth in the economy to maintaining the present world economic growth rate. As a result, the ‘green’ notion of sustainable development could be incorporated without any effort into both the ‘blue’ development model (neo-liberal) and the ‘red’ development model (socialist, and these days social democratic)” (Schuurman, 1996a, 22).

The question is, if sustainable development offers a new paradigm or simply is “a green wash over business as usual” (Adams, 1996, 207).

In tourism planning there is the assumption that economic, environmental and socio-cultural values have to be included into a holistic and integrated approach (see Figure 3.1). Planning for tourism needs to integrate local needs with the understanding of the political dimension (Hall *et al.*, 1997a). There are active debates concerning sustainable tourism development (see Hall and Lew, 1998; Milne, 1998), “although a rhetoric of sustainability is now widely used by government, nongovernmental organisations, and business in addressing the public, there is no evidence of a broad shift of behaviour in response to it” (Myers and Macnaghten, 1998, 333). The literature in the area of sustainable tourism development is very extensive and highly contested. Although a key conclusion of these debates is that there is a need to manage tourism in a more sustainable manner with still little evidence to suggest that this is being achieved.

Figure 3.1: Model of Sustainable Tourism Values and Principles

(Source: Hall, 2000, 14)

Tourism has become a recognised element of many government-planning strategies, with the public sector acknowledging that it is vital to integrate sustainable approaches to tourism planning within a policy context. The policy context is influenced by various economic, social, and cultural characteristics of society and the structures of government embedded in a political system (Hall *et al.*, 1997a). The rapid pace of tourism development, the nature of tourism and the corresponding absence of any single agency responsibility for tourism-related development often mean an ad hoc approach is adopted by public sectors rather than predetermined strategies in response to impacts of tourism on destinations (Hall, 2000). Furthermore, ignoring interest groups (e.g. ratepayers, resident action groups) can upstage governmental efforts (Joppe, 1996, 477).

A significant problem surrounding the coordination of tourism planning and policy is in having a number of governmental stakeholders involved directly or indirectly with policy development in terms of different departments and agencies, responsible ministers, and legislative bases for action (Hall, 2000). Therefore, Taylor and Warren (1998) identify the need for better coordination within local areas and between local, district and regional groups, as well as adjoining regions. Governments can foster or hinder development and influence the way it is developed, but “the effects of its actions will be felt most clearly at the local level” (Joppe, 1996, 477). This new model it is to involve a change from planning *for* tourism to planning *with* the population (Ceballos-Lascurain, 1996, 15). A move towards sustainable development requires new ways of thinking about the nature, and the purpose of development and growth, and the role of the individuals, governments and the private sector in developing sustainable futures. This way of thinking is slowly entering the forefront of tourism studies (Hall, 2000).

3.4.5 PARTICIPATORY DEVELOPMENT

A shift in development thinking emerged alongside the concept of ‘participation’ in the past two decades. Although the dominant economic top-down paradigm continues to play a role in the 1990s, many changes have occurred. The new approaches reflect changes in methods and behaviours that make participation in recent years a critical concept of development (Chambers, 1997b). The shift moved from a professional paradigm focusing on ‘things’ in the 1950s and 1960s, emphasising big infrastructural and industrialisation works, towards a paradigm focusing on ‘people’ since the 1990s (see Figure 3.2, p.44). The basis of these shifts is that top-down approaches became

more bottom-up and resulted in the uniform becoming diverse, the simple becoming complex, the static becoming dynamic, and the controllable becoming uncontrollable (Chambers, 1997b, 33).

According to Sancar (1994), the idea of broad public participation began as an extension of the progressive, reformist planning of the 1950s with top-down government programmes for public improvement. The emerging criticism of the insensitivity and ignorance of professionals and government towards development in local communities led to the participatory planning approach to deal with the needs of local people through involvement in the building process. As a result of politics in the 1980s citizen participation became an economic necessity in most Western countries (Sancar, 1994). Participation is a rich concept that means different things to different people in a variety of settings. For some, it is a matter of principle, for others, a practice, while for others, an end in itself. All these interpretations have merit, because participation is both a popular objective in many projects and an important process of development (Nelson and Wright, 1997; Rocheleau and Slocum, 1995).

Figure 3.2: Two Paradigms: Things and People

Point of departure and reference	Things	People
Mode	Blueprint	Process
Keyword	Planning	Participation
Goals	Pre-set, closed	Evolving, open
Decision-making	Centralized	Decentralized
Analytical assumptions	Reductionist	Systems, holistic
Methods, Rules	Standardized Universal	Diverse Local
Technology	Fixed package (table d'hôte)	Varied basket (à la carte)
Professionals' interactions with clients	Motivating Controlling	Enabling Empowering
Clients seen as	Beneficiaries	Actors, partners
Force flow	Supply-push	Demand-pull
Outputs	Uniform Infrastructure	Diverse Capabilities
Planning and Action	Top-down	Bottom-up

(Source: Chambers, 1997b, 32)

The popularity of participation also has its origin in the recognition that if local people take part in the project they more likely to take a stake in the development. The development professionals changed their ideology to the belief that people should be empowered and have more control over their own lives (Chambers, 1997b, 33). There are two main perspectives on participation, the first views participation as a means to increase efficiency. The notion here is that if people are involved they are more likely to support new development directions. The second perspective sees participation as a fundamental right, in which the aim is to initiate empowerment (Pretty, 1998). The typology developed by Pretty (1998), shown in Figure 3.3, p.46, suggests participation shouldn't be used without appropriate clarification (Pretty, 1998, see Mowforth and Munt, 1998). There are many labels and schools of participatory approaches in research and development theory. Participation has, therefore, basically three meanings: a cosmetic labelling to look good, co-opting to secure local action and resources, and an empowering process to enable local people to take command and do things themselves. The rhetoric of development is fast changing and the reality of development practice lags behind the language (Chambers, 1994a).

Arnstein (1969) claims that citizen involvement in planning represents a redistribution of power from the managers to the public. She developed a 'ladder of citizen participation' that describe the eight steps of involvement and power sharing typically found in planning. The ladder of participation suggests that there are three levels of involvement of authorities with citizens. These range from non-participation to tokenism to full sharing power (see Arnstein, 1969). Jackson (1999, 6) argues that all levels of public involvement may be appropriate under certain circumstances and for specific stakeholders, but it is "important first to identify and analyse stakeholders and the issues and then determine the objective of participation, based on that analysis".

The development practice has long been dominated by the positivist paradigm, which seeks to "discover the true nature of reality to predict and control natural phenomena. Knowledge about the world is summarised in the form of universal, or time- and context-free generalisations or laws" (Pretty and Scoones, 1997, 157). This reductionist analysis can't address the complexities of the real world systems. The results will always have to be open to interpretation. For development to be sustainable, planning will have to begin with the people who know most about their own livelihood system. It

will have to value and develop their knowledge and skills. Therefore, more adaptive planning is required that meets local needs by reshaping the practice and theory of development planning (Pretty and Scoones, 1997).

Figure 3.3: A Typology of Participation (adopted from Pretty 1998)

<i>Typology</i>	<i>Characteristic of each type</i>
1 Manipulative participation	Participation is simply a pretence: 'peoples' representatives on official boards, but they are unelected and have no power
2 Passive participation	People participate by being told what has been decided or has already happened: involves unilateral announcements by project management without any listening to people's responses; information shared belongs only to external professionals
3 Participation by consultation	People participate by being consulted or by answering questions: external agents define problems and information-gathering processes, and so control analysis; process does not concede any share in decision-making; professionals under no obligation to account for people's views
4 Participation for material incentives	People participate by contributing resources (e.g. labour) in return for food, cash or other material incentive: farmers may provide fields and labour but are not involved in testing or the process of learning; this is commonly called participation, yet people have no stake in prolonging technologies or practices when the incentives end
5 Functional participation	Participation seen by external agencies as a means to achieve project goals, especially reduced costs: people may participate by forming groups to meet project objectives; involvement may be interactive and involve shared decision-making, but tends to arise only after major decisions have already been made by external agents; at worst, local people may still only be co-opted to serve external goals
6 Interactive participation	People participate in joint analysis, development of action plans and strengthening of local institutions: participation is seen as a right, not just the means to achieve project goals; the process involves interdisciplinary methodologies that seek multiple perspectives and use systemic and structured learning processes. As groups take control of local decisions and determine how available resources are used, so they have a stake in maintaining structures and practices
7 Self-mobilisation	People participate by taking initiatives independently of external institutions to change systems: they develop contacts with external institutions for resources and technical advice they need, but retain control over resource use; self-mobilisation can spread if governments and NGOs provide an enabling framework of support. Self-mobilisation may or may not challenge existing distributions of wealth and power

(Source: Mowforth and Munt, 1998, 241)

There are a variety of ways the term participatory development is applied and interpreted by individuals, researchers or organisations. Nelson and Wright (1997, 1) distinguish between "participation as a means (to accomplish the aims of a project more efficiently, effectively and cheaply) as opposed to participation as an end (where community or group sets up a process to control its own development)". There are debates in the literature on whether participation is a means or an end, or both. The type of participation implies the possibility of different power relationships between members of the community and the state and other organisations (Rocheleau and Slocum, 1995). If participation is seen as an end, the extent of empowerment and involvement of local people is less limited (Nelson and Wright, 1997).

An integral part of participation is the concept of empowerment. It is a contested concept, with the idea that some can act on others to give them power or enable them to realise their own potential (Nelson and Wright, 1997). Chambers (1997a) introduces four perspectives of empowerment in participation. The first is that *differentiating groups and interests* can empower people in several ways. It can give them collective awareness and confidence to confront others and argue their case. The empowerment depends on who is empowered and how their power is used. The second perspective is about *methods and process*. This means that people can learn through participatory approaches, through expressing what they know and share it and become more aware through their analysis and reach new understanding. They can gain skills and confidence through the process. The third is about having *community-level organisations* in the process, because empowerment can be weak and short-lived unless it is embodied in institutions. The fourth perspective is about *conflict and negotiation*. The approaches can change attitudes and resolve problems or clarify priorities and the diagrams are promising as a means to defuse tension by making agreed facts visible and differences explicit. The identification, expression and resolution of conflicts of interest are another frontier for participatory methods (Chambers, 1997a). For participation in "the full empowering sense of reversals, is not for one place or one set of people, but is itself a paradigm – a pattern of ideas, values, methods and behaviour – which can apply to almost all social activity and spread in all directions" (Chambers, 1997b, 42).

Slocum and Thomas-Slayter (1995, 4) regard empowerment as a process through which individuals, as well as local groups and communities identify and shape their lives and

the kind of societies in which they live. Empowerment serves equity and well-being and is not a static condition. It is interactive between groups, organisations and individuals and empowerment requires and implies change in power relations and behaviours (Chambers, 1997a, 1997b). The notion of change by empowering people to take control at the local level inevitably leads to conflicts if external institutions are unwilling to give up some of their existing power (Pretty and Scoones, 1997).

Participation may also involve shifts in power, which can occur within communities, between people and policy-making and resource-holding institutions, and within the structure of these organisations. The research then becomes a process of exchange where “the participants are transferring knowledge to the researcher; and the researcher is conveying not only research skills, but theoretical frameworks and comparative information which helps the participants analyse the local situation” (Wright and Nelson, 1997, 51). The majority of community research is mostly conducted *on* participants rather than *with* or *by* them. Participatory research methods offer opportunities to bring research and action, researcher and participant together in quite a different way (Cornwall, 1996; Nelson and Wright, 1997; Wright and Nelson, 1997)

Participatory approaches¹² fall under the general heading of Participatory Learning Approaches (PLA). According to Chambers (1997a, 102), PLA is a label¹³ given to:

“A growing family of approaches and methods to enable local people to share, enhance and analyse their knowledge of life and conditions and to plan, act, monitor and evaluate. Its extensive and growing menu of methods includes visuals such as mapping and diagramming”.

These approaches are an interactive way of giving local people a way to participate in decision-making that will affect their quality of life. Participatory approaches acknowledge that people’s realities are local, complex, diverse, dynamic and unpredictable (Chambers, 1997a).

There are two main categories of participatory techniques: the diagramming that includes making maps, models and seasonal calendars, and the ranking techniques and scoring exercises which include matrix ranking to explore local criteria for choices and preferences (Cornwall, 1996) (see Figure 3.4, p.49). The participatory approach

¹² Such approaches are called: Rapid Rural Appraisal (RRA), Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA) in the late 1980s and recently has been renamed into Participatory Learning Approaches (PLA).

¹³ Richards (1995) wrote up a ‘quick and dirty’ critique and warns that we live in a label-conscious world.

emphasises the process rather the product of research and involves the recognition of the ways in which dominant actors and forms of knowledge render others subordinate (Chambers, 1997b; Cornwall, 1996).

Participatory approaches have a lot to offer to the policy-making process and generates important and often surprising insights into current issues thus contributing to better-informed policy making which better serves the needs of local residents and communities. More fundamentally, these approaches can strengthen the understanding of those in authority and begin to change attitudes and agenda (Chambers, 1997a). Therefore, participatory approaches could be applied in the context of tourism development in local communities. These approaches have besides methodological importance, philosophical implications providing a different light on the contested nature of concepts such as community and sustainability.

Figure 3.4: Participatory Methods: Means to what Ends?

Mode of participation	Involvement of local people	Relationship of research and action to local people
Cooption	token; representatives are chosen, but no real input or power	on
Compliance	tasks are assigned, with incentives; outsiders decide agenda and direct the process	for
Consultation	local opinions asked, outsiders analyse and decide on a course of action	for/with
Cooperation	local people work together with outsiders to determine priorities, responsibility remains with outsiders for directing the process	with
Co-learning	local people and outsiders share their knowledge, to create new understanding, and work together to form action plans, with outsider facilitation	with/by
Collective action	local people set their own agenda and mobilize to carry it out, in the absence of outside initiators and facilitators	by

(Source: Cornwall, 1996, 96)

3.4.6 COLLABORATION APPROACH TO TOURISM PLANNING

The issues of *coordination*, *collaboration* and *partnership* are currently discussed in tourism research attempting to find new solutions to problems in tourism destinations.

Collaboration is defined as processes:

“Through which parties who see different aspects of a problem can constructively explore their differences and search for solutions that go beyond their own limited visions of what is possible. The process leads to shared richer, more comprehensive understanding of the problem that enables participants to find new solutions that no one party could have envisioned or enacted on alone” (Gray, 1989, 5).

In the tourism context, Jamal and Getz (1995) define collaboration for community-based tourism planning as:

“A process of joint decision-making among autonomous, key stakeholders of an inter-organisational, community tourism domain to resolve planning problems of the domain and/or to manage issues related to the planning and development domain”.

The assumption is that sustainable tourism can be achieved through the recognition that the public and private sector, the community and the natural environment are interdependent stakeholders in a complex tourism system, where no individual or group can resolve strategic tourism issues by acting on their own (Getz and Jamal, 1994; see Jamal and Getz, 1995). Local authorities must combine private sector interests with local resident needs, to maintain the economic health of the community for sustainable development. The tourism destination is described as ‘turbulent’, therefore, conflict over planning and development exists, and a mechanism for sharing ideas and developing directions is required (Jamal and Getz, 1995; Reed, 1999).

It is increasingly important in tourism planning to involve all stakeholders affected by tourism. Although the process might often be difficult and time-consuming, the involvement may have significant benefits, including a greater sense of local ownership of the plan (De Araujo and Bramwell, 1999; Hall, 1999; Yuskel *et al.*, 1999). Participation in tourism planning has the potential to help promote sustainable development by increasing efficiency, equity and harmony (Timothy, 1998).

The different groups and individuals that come together in tourism development, bring different and often incompatible values, agendas and strategies to the situation (Reed, 1999). For Jamal and Getz (1999, 290) the “collaboration space can be contested terrain

where power and legitimation interrelate with process structures and activities, influencing meaning constructions and outcomes”. A multi-stakeholder process, labelled as a consensus approach, is no assurance that interests and concerns of all stakeholders will be considered in the decision-making process, or that implementations will follow smoothly (Jamal and Getz, 1999).

Coordination for tourism occurs both horizontally (between different government agencies) and vertically (between different levels of government) (Hall, 1999, 277). In a collaborative or interactive approach towards tourism planning:

“The emphasis is on planning with as wide a set of stakeholders as possible thereby attempting to meet the public interest rather than planning for a narrow set of stakeholders or private interest as under a corporatist perspective” (Hall, 1999, 280).

Collaboration theory has caused some change in thinking about planning, but the assertion that a shift is occurring seems to be exaggeration (Tewdwr-Jones and Allmendinger, 1998). Selin (1999) argues that much of the literature dealing with emerging partnership in the tourism fields had been descriptive in nature and the rhetoric inflated. Therefore, the need for a deeper understanding of tourism partnerships and collaboration is needed. There is a need for methods to be devised for finding common ground for facilitating consensus and for implementing the results of the collaboration process (Din, 1996; Jamal and Getz, 1995; Reed, 1999; Simmons, 1994).

3.5 TOWARDS A PARTICIPATORY STAKEHOLDER APPROACH

The changing realities in the 21st century need to be viewed within the context of the post-modern paradigm and the post-impasse in development theory. By integrating participatory approaches and stakeholder collaboration, it may be possible to achieve more sustainable forms of tourism development. The application of a stakeholder approach towards a community-based planning process is lacking at present in most of the world. Specifically important is the development of more applicable participatory approaches for collecting, analysing and representing information to multiple stakeholders. It is essential for research to grapple with the complexity, dynamic and changing nature of these stakeholders and their localities and how that might influence the decision-making for more sustainable forms of tourism development. The political dimensions of tourism planning at national, regional and local levels, which ultimately determine the level of control of community planning, need to be taken into account.

Therefore, I introduce the concept of a participatory stakeholder approach to address some of the issues related to tourism development at the community level.

The stakeholder analysis adopted here is intended to complement rather than replace existing methods and approaches in tourism planning. This thesis employs Freeman's (1984, 46) definition of stakeholders being "any group or individual who can affect or is affected by the achievement of the [development] objectives". It is important to raise the question, who are the stakeholders and what are their stakes? Traditional stakeholder theory emerged from looking at organisations and their survival, while contemporary stakeholder theory is characterised by being concerned with different views of stakeholders (Elias *et al.*, 2000). Freeman (1984) suggests a 'stakeholder concept', e.g. to approach the problem by drawing up a generic stakeholder map, which while oversimplified, allows each category to be broken down into several smaller categories.

There are three levels of stakeholder analysis: *rational*, *process* and *transactional*. At the *rational level*, the stakeholders and their stakes need to be identified. These are illustrated on a map called 'generic stakeholder map' (Freeman, 1984). A two dimensional grid categorises stakeholders by their stake or interest and in terms of their power. At the *process level*, it is important to understand the relationship of the organisation with its stakeholders. The *transactional level* considers the set of transactions between the organisation and its stakeholders according to the stakeholder map and the organisational process of stakeholders. Because the composition and roles of stakeholders might change, stakeholder analysis has to be continuous and an integral part of any planning process (Freeman, 1984).

3.5.1 ALTERNATIVE GEOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION SYSTEMS

Independently, participatory research and GIS have received increased attention as tools that can assist communities to create a basis for future planning (McKinnon *et al.*, 2001). Little attention, however, has been paid to the potential benefits of combining these methods as an approach for integrating stakeholder knowledge, values, and perceptions in the tourism planning process.

There is no universal definition for GIS. In operational terms GIS is a decision- support system, capable of storing a great deal of information that can subsequently be analysed

and displayed in multiple layers of spatially referenced data (Burrough, 1986). Maguire (1991) suggests three principles: GIS focuses on cartographic display of complex information; GIS is a sophisticated database system; and GIS is a set of procedures and tools fostering spatial analysis and decision-making. These systems support the close linkage between cartographic information and associated databases containing the attributes for lines, points or polygons and is able to integrate data from various sources, such as cartography, remote sensing and field surveys into a common geographical framework (Robinson, 1998, 357).

GIS is flexible and enables the comparison of information, identifies gaps or shortcomings from different sources. It also links different systems of understanding, analyses spatial patterns and highlights preferences (Burrough, 1986). GIS can also be used to carry out combined spatial and attribute queries across various layers and present the results of this operation in an easily comprehensive manner. Therefore, GIS enables researchers “to advance beyond simple cause-and-effect models or stimulus-response models [to address] complexities of the real world” (Robinson, 1998, 339). The outputs of a GIS are maps and diagrams that assist in the visualisation process. Visualisation frequently represents an:

“Iterative process whereby the same set of numerical results is summarised in a variety of graphical forms or where maps are viewed from a series of perspectives and then used as a basis for further interpretation and generation of hypotheses” (Robinson, 1998, 369).

Strong criticism of GIS has evolved since the 1990s, mainly because of its impacts on the wider community. Pickles (1995) has highlighted how GIS influences the way in which space is being conceptualised, represented and materialised in the environment. The understanding and representation of multiple realities of space and environment in a GIS have been of concern. Mark (1993) raised questions about whose view of the world is being represented in a GIS. GIS is biased towards scientific maps as metaphors and excludes generally qualitative forms of knowledge such as sketch maps, cognitive and mental maps, narrative and oral histories, which are crucial to understand issues related to place (Harris and Weiner, 1998).

More recently, the GIS debate has expanded to address issues of access to GIS and public concerns, which resulted in the growth of Public Participation GIS (PPGIS) or GIS/2. There are a growing number of projects described in the so-called ‘GIS and

Society' literature that have implemented 'public participation', 'community integrated', 'mobile interactive' and 'participatory' GIS (Harris and Weiner, 1998; Hasse, 2000a; McKinnon *et al.*, 2001; Obermeyer, 1998). These represent a direct outgrowth of the research on societal effects of the technology and seek to develop a GIS that will be adaptable to increase the number and diversity of people who are capable of participating in spatial decision-making (Obermeyer, 1998).

Harris and Weiner (1998) argue that GIS is a contradictory technology that simultaneously marginalises and empowers people and communities. The effects of GIS are contingent upon a particular mix of historical, socio-economic, political, and technological conditions in particular places (Harris and Weiner, 1998; Roche, 1999). Some researchers are broadening the applications of GIS by looking into interactive approaches, such as Mobile Interactive Geographical Information System (MIGIS) (McKinnon *et al.*, 2001). This approach takes GIS into the field and strengthens and enhances the process of participatory planning and development by linking participatory methods and GIS. Stakeholders can be involved in research, planning and in the compilation of results for presentations to other stakeholders. MIGIS relies on community support and muted expert facilitation and can provide a common ground for local people, government administrative and planners to discuss key issues (McKinnon *et al.*, 2001).

3.5.2 GIS IN TOURISM PLANNING

Little information is available on how GIS can support the process of facilitating participation and broaden understanding between various stakeholders in tourism. The GIS applications in tourism are usually conventional ways of analysing and displaying spatial information. To date, data analysis in tourism research has been mostly without the use of GIS and "limited use is being made of GIS by tourism planners" (McAdam, 1999, 77). McAdam (1999) argues that GIS can bring significant value to decision-making through data analysis, modelling and forecasting, because most of the issues relating to tourism planning are spatial, complex and multi-dimensional, where GIS can offer the techniques to manage the planning more effectively.

The research that has applied GIS for tourism largely reflects the traditional application to tourism planning. Christodoulakis *et al.* (1998) review similar, but more technically

involved efforts to provide map-based information about tourist destinations over the Internet. Elliot-White and Finn (1998) provide an overview of GIS marketing applications. Their discussion of geodemographics and lifestyle analysis sees GIS benefiting “post-modern tourism marketing” and the growing need that tourism organisations have “to communicate with smaller groups of customers” (Elliot-White and Finn, 1998, 78). More recently, GIS applications have been designed to assess tourist time-space behaviour. These studies attempt to measure tourism flows to provide better insights into tourist movements within New Zealand in order to assess regional tourism demand (Forer and Simmons, 1998, see also Forer and Stephen, 1998). Van der Knaap (1999, 56) has used GIS to analyse tourist time-space patterns and to support sustainable development in tourism planning. He proposes to understand the use of the physical environment by tourists and apply exploratory spatial data analysis and dynamic cartography, as well as to construct and analyse tourist recreation complexes using network analysis techniques.

GIS also provides planners with a tool that can help to identify “a variety of levels of environmental development, providing a range of satisfactory experiences, and thereby reducing pressure on [...] fragile and limited resource[s]” (Kearsley, 1990, 137). Most basically, sites for potential tourism development can be identified by mutually evaluating environmental and infrastructural parameters with GIS (Boyd *et al.*, 1994; Joerger *et al.*, 1990). Locating future tourism development, however, strongly depends on the evaluation of social preferences for land use. Boyd *et al.* (1994) study reveals that defining objectives and criteria that can be mapped for ecotourism development is not straightforward, because tourist interpretations of ecotourism are complex and diverse. There are innovative attempts to integrate human values in GIS mapping perceptions of wilderness through a weighed overlay process - a landscape analysis of change (Kliskey, 1994; Kliskey and Kearsley, 1993).

3.5.3 PAGIS

PAGIS is used as an acronym to describe an approach that intends to provide a framework, which combines participatory approaches with GIS in its contextual environment (see Figure 3.5, p.56). The principal idea of PAGIS is to store, manage, analyse and display the spatial information and the narratives of people that were collected in participatory mapping exercises.

Figure 3.5: Participatory Research and GIS Framework

GIS provides a useful tool to facilitate this process of planning and therefore, managing tourism development. The integration of methodological and theoretical concepts to integrate participation and GIS are still lacking. The innovative and alternative GIS applications discussed offer insights into the development and implementation of a participatory GIS for tourism planning (see Hasse, 2000a). Participatory GIS is, therefore, “an attempt to utilise GIS technology in the context of the needs and capabilities of communities that will be involved with, and affected by development projects and programs” (Abbot *et al.*, 1998, 27).

GIS is not only a tool to store, analyse, and display data but, to take it a step further, it can actually facilitate participation processes and is a means to broaden the understanding and communication between various stakeholders. PAGIS can help to integrate more complex forms of qualitative knowledge, such as values, emotions and perceptions of a place. Also, capturing and encoding local, aspatial and qualitative knowledge presents a significant challenge, because “cognitive information is geographically imprecise and is not expressed comfortably within a point/line/polygon paradigm” (Harris and Weiner, 1998, 216). GIS also requires information to be ascribed to a rigid coordinate system. It can be extremely difficult to assign grid locations to public discourse that deals with areas with fuzzy boundaries.

GIS communicates information visually “in a manner that is intuitive to the people who have created them” (Abbot *et al.*, 1998, 30). Participatory GIS provides a politically and

representationally powerful mechanism for delivering local concerns to regional and state institutions (Abbot *et al.*, 1998). Other reviews of participatory GIS projects suggest that planning is improved when community preferences for resource use are integrated with biophysical, economic, and social data layers most commonly used in GIS (Tabor and Hutchinson, 1994).

Participatory GIS can offer a structural framework for visualising, situating, and integrating numerous stakeholders' perspectives on issues in tourism development. By involving locals in the construction of a GIS that demonstrates their concerns, participatory GIS has the potential to stimulate dialogue and reflection, raise awareness between stakeholders, bring spatial information into the public consciousness, and strengthen a sense of local involvement in the decision-making process. It has also the potential to advance discussions about tourism planning based upon a shared vision for change.

The PAGIS approach places an emphasis on the combination of various qualitative and quantitative research tools. The spatial information can be analysed in the GIS through various queries, to reveal different views of stakeholders on common resources and identify similar as well as opposing views. A major component of PAGIS is the presentation of collected information back to the community in visualised form. This enables and reinforces an interactive approach to community-based development. It also provides an opportunity for participants to ensure that the views and information presented truly represents community's needs and interests. GIS has the potential to empower people or communities and give them a stake in the process of planning to determine their future. By having reflected on these alternative GIS applications and outlining the importance of participatory approaches in development, I suggest that PAGIS can thus be beneficial for tourism planning.

CHAPTER IV: PARTICIPATORY METHODOLOGY

4.1 INTRODUCTION

The first part of this chapter introduces the strategies of inquiry adopted in this thesis, including the research design and the participatory mapping approach. It describes the process chosen to identify key stakeholders and their perceptions of, or role in tourism development in Marahau and the Park. The first stage of the research process was a comprehensive community survey that included interviews with tourism business involved in the Park. The second stage presents the visitor survey and interviews with representatives of local government and other stakeholder groups. The last stage describes the approach taken to represent the collected data back to the stakeholders.

The second part of this chapter introduces the data analysis, which was guided by a grounded theory approach. The usage of the computer software package NVivo™ also supported the process of data analysis. This part describes the design of PAGIS that represents the spatial data collected from the community survey as ‘local’ knowledge and the other data from local government as ‘expert’ knowledge.

4.2 STRATEGIES OF INQUIRY

The research process is guided by a mainly qualitative investigation informed by the interpretative paradigm. The participatory strategy that shaped this research is committed to an emerging more holistic, pluralist and egalitarian worldview. This view emphasises that people are “creating their own reality through participation” (Reason, 1994, 324). There is a need for more participatory and collaborative relations in decision-making processes. In this context, the qualitative researcher is self-conscious and draws upon their experiences as a resource of inquiry. This strategy of inquiry facilitates connections among lived experiences and larger social and political structures (Denzin and Lincoln, 1994).

The inquiry is guided by a case study approach investigating the perceptions of various stakeholders at the local level. This approach appreciates the complexity of the phenomenon under investigation (Stake, 1994; Yin, 1989). It is also the “preferred strategy when ‘how’ and ‘why’ questions are being posed, when the investigator has

a real-life context” (Yin, 1989, 13). Yin (1989) identifies three prejudices against a case study approach. The first one is the lack of rigor, which can be avoided by a thorough approach and detailed planning beforehand. The second is that case studies “are generalisable to theoretical propositions and not to populations or universes. In this sense the case study “does not represent a ‘sample’, and the investigator’s goal is to expand and generalise theories (analytical generalisation) and not to enumerate frequencies (statistical generalisations)”. The third prejudice is the complaint that a case study approach takes too long and result in massive unreadable documents. This can be avoided through transcribing the interviews and notes immediately as well as adopting the grounded theory approach to analyse the data (Yin, 1989, 21).

However, employing a case study approach emphasises that “any given instance is likely to be particular and unique [...] thus to study the particular is to study the general [and] any case will necessarily bear traces of the universal” (Denzin and Lincoln, 1994, 201). The Marahau case study displays characteristics common to a number of communities in New Zealand. Therefore, whilst the particularities of Marahau and the Park may not be confined to the place, the wider context of tourism development in New Zealand is still a challenge for local communities. This study reassigns a focus on a single-study to support a level of detail for the development of the theoretical arguments.

4.3 RESEARCH DESIGN

Multiple methods are used to address the complexity of the situation. Eyles (1988) suggests that researchers employ a range of quantitative and qualitative methods relevant to interpretative research inquiry. Generally, researchers do not agree on how to define, implement, and evaluate qualitative research methods, because they represent a wide cross-section of scientific paradigms, academic disciplines and fields of study (Denzin and Lincoln, 1994; Patton, 1990). The combination of methodologies in the study of the same phenomena has also been called methodological triangulation and is starting to emerge in tourism research as a ‘new’ method (Opperman, 2000). The triangulation strategy allows qualitative and quantitative methods to be viewed as complementary rather than exclusive. The advantage of triangulation can lead to a reduction in methodological and data bias; it can support flexibility, cross-validation of the data, theoretical relevance and confidence in the research results (Denzin, 1989). I

have employed a strategy for multiple sets of data, requiring different methods of investigation at different stages of the research process.

4.3.1 PARTICIPATORY MAPPING

Participatory methods can be used to conduct a more open-ended, participatory and visual approach to an interview (Cornwall, 1996). The semi-structured interview is also viewed as central to participatory approaches and is always conducted in an ‘informal’ manner, preferably in the surrounding of the respondent. The interview is based on providing some key questions to explore unexpected topics or issues (Mitchell, 1997).

Independently, for designing a participatory GIS, spatial information is required. For that reason, the application of mapping as a participatory approach was an essential part of my research strategy. Many researchers advocate the utilisation of maps in the participatory development process with local communities. The mapping can take place at any location and the participants can create a new map or responses can be drawn onto an existing map. Mapping can be done with individuals or groups of people, which can encourage discussions (Jones, 1996; Pretty *et al.*, 1995). Mapping also offers a powerful strategy for involving local people and bringing about critical awareness of issues through the process. The process of constructing a visual representation is in itself an analytical act (Cornwall, 1996).

The map can aid the process of understanding meanings or concepts in more depth through ‘interviewing the diagram/map’, meaning to prompt for more background information and explanations on any upcoming issue during the interview process (Chambers, 1997a). In most cases visualisation offers a way to ‘break the ice’ and a mutual learning process can take place (Jones, 1996; Pretty *et al.*, 1995). The map as an “alternative medium of communication and visualisation can involve participants in a research process driven by their own concerns and interests, in their own ways, using their own categories and criteria” (Cornwall, 1996, 98). However, the use of a wide range of visual methods within the interview can enhance the process and facilitate a dialogue between researchers and participants by improving the understanding about the locality or issue talked about (Chambers, 1997a; Cornwall, 1996). In the context of my research I chose an aerial photograph as a base map to conduct the participatory

mapping exercises, because it provides the greatest visual detail of the community area (see Figure 4.1).

Figure 4.1: Aerial Photograph of Marahau used as a Base Map for Interviews

(Source: Aerial Survey Ltd., 1995)

Anderson *et al.* (1994) applied aerial photographs, coloured stickers and a simple questionnaire to encourage local people to think about changes occurring around their town and consider future development.

They found that:

“The methodology was attractive to all ages, didn’t require respondents to have facility in writing or speaking, was challenging but enjoyable and was an educative experience for participants and researcher alike” (Anderson *et al.*, 1994, 41).

Groten (1996) also suggests using enlarged aerial photographs, as an excellent tool for communication and planning.

For the purpose of my research the participatory mapping was part of a qualitative interview. The qualitative interview is described as a “tool of research, an intentional way of learning about people’s feelings, thoughts, and experiences” (Rubin and Rubin, 1995, 2). Rubin and Rubin (1995) point out that there is some variation in the degree to which the researcher directs the conversational agenda. For this research, I chose an unstructured format that suggests the subject for discussion, with the researcher having a few questions in mind.

4.4 RESEARCH PROCESS

The research process began with the investigation of secondary data. In order to obtain approval from the community to undertake my research in Marahau, I made a preliminary visit. I met the representatives of the Marahau and Sandy Bay Residents’ and Ratepayers’ Association and the Marahau Association of Tourism Operators during a short visit on the 13th of January 1999 to discuss my research intentions. In these informal meetings I gained more detailed information on some of the issues in the community, gained familiarity with Marahau and collected some background documentation on historical and contemporary facts.

I also conducted preliminary interviews with representatives of local government and the regional tourism organisation in the Nelson region. In collecting additional reports, policy statements and other documentations, I gained a better understanding of the policy issues surrounding tourism development in Marahau and the Park. During this preliminary visit, I identified the stakeholder groups in more detail, which were further refined in the wake of the interviews (see Figure 4.2, p.63). For each stakeholder group I developed a separate strategy to investigate their role, involvement and perception of tourism development in Marahau and the Park. The research strategies were approved through the ‘Human Ethics Approval’ from the University (see Appendix 4.1, p.224).

Figure 4.2: Stakeholder Map (adopted after Freeman 1984)

4.4.1 STAGE 1 - COMMUNITY SURVEY AND TOURISM BUSINESS SURVEY

The first stage was crucial in gaining entry into the community. I took up residence in Marahau for four months between March and July 1999. This time is considered the shoulder and winter season for tourism in Marahau, when community members have more time for interviews than in the peak season or so-called 'silly' season. In the initial stage, I talked informally to residents in Marahau to gain a general overview of the research setting and some of the dynamics in the community.

After that, I created a list of all residents and ratepayers by combining the listings in the telephone book, the list of the Residents' and Ratepayers' Association and the list provided by the local council. Then I distributed an introductory letter to all residents and ratepayers. It explained my role, gave an overview of the research objectives, ensured confidentiality, and invited the community to participate in the research (see Appendix 4.2, p.225). This provided the basis for later contacting each community member by phone to see if they were interested in participating in an interview. A few residents themselves contacted me to make an appointment. Generally the response was very positive, with only a few refusals encountered. I used a snowballing approach to identify the next person or household to be interviewed.

During my stay, I employed participatory in-depth interviews with members of the community and owners of tourism businesses. In addition, I engaged in informal interviews and conversations with locals, adopted participant observation, and visited the tourist sites in Marahau and the Park to collect photographic evidence. I also collected tourism brochures as an important source of information on the composition of the tourism industry and the narrative structures used to attract and direct tourism.

The *community survey* was administered through a semi-structured interview, which was divided into three main phases. In the first phase I handed the respondents a consent form (see Appendix 4.3, p.226), which is a requirement of the ‘Human Ethical Committee’ at Victoria University of Wellington, and a structured questionnaire with closed-format questions to fill out (see Appendix 4.4, p.227). The questionnaire was designed to reveal socio-economic and demographic information about the community.

The second phase comprised the participatory in-depth interview itself. I provided the interviewee with an aerial photograph of Marahau in an A1 size format (see Figure 4.1, p.61). A plastic cover was attached to the aerial photograph to enable the participants to identify areas of importance, areas of concerns or problems and areas of future relevance by drawing them onto the map. This process was accompanied by ‘interviewing the map’ to prompt for more information and explanation of the issues indicated in the specific location (Chambers, 1997a). At the last stage, I asked the respondents to write on three separate colour coded stickers, three things they liked, three things they disliked about Marahau or the Park and three things they hoped for and three things they feared for the future of the place and locate them onto the map. An example of the mapping exercise is presented in Figure 4.3, p.65.

The interview explored how the respondents described Marahau, their motivation for living there, when they moved there, how they have perceived the changes in recent years and the contemporary issues they are grappling with. It also investigated how respondents view the future development of Marahau. In addition, I explored what the term ‘community’ means and how Marahau is perceived as a community.

Figure 4.3: Example of a Participatory Mapping Exercise

If the respondent was also operating a tourism business in Marahau another set of questions was included. These surveyed the background of the company, their marketing characteristics, their cooperation and communication with other stakeholders, plus details on the demand and supply side, the issues their business is facing and how they perceive the future of tourism for Marahau and the Park. The *tourism business survey* was also conducted with businesses based outside Marahau and explored the same questions.

A total of 96 residents or ratepayers in Marahau were interviewed. This included nine tourism businesses that are based in Marahau. An additional eight interviews were conducted with tourism businesses based outside of Marahau. The draft interview guide was pre-tested, and after being reviewed, applied to the total sample. The main aims of the interview were to involve a wide cross section of local residents and tourism businesses and to keep the process as visual and enjoyable as possible for everyone. I remained as neutral as possible and tried not to raise any expectations or provide leading questions during the interview. The aim was also to ensure that the outcomes of the process are documented in the words and pictures of the respondents. At the end of each interview I asked the respondents to evaluate the process.

The interviews were usually conducted in the houses of the respondents, mainly in the evenings due to their working schedules. The interviews were kept ‘informal’ and varied from situation to situation. The average interview took approximately two hours, but could stretch to three or four hours. All the interviews were tape-recorded and shortly after transcribed. In addition, notes were taken right after the interview on the process of the interview to capture any important observation made.

4.4.2 STAGE 2 - VISITOR SURVEY AND OTHER STAKEHOLDERS

In the second stage of the research, I again took up residence in Marahau for two months during the tourist peak season from November 1999 to January 2000. I conducted the visitor surveys and undertook interviews with representatives of the local government and other stakeholders. These were from the Tasman District Council (TDC), the Nelson City Council (NCC), the Department of Conservation (DoC) in Nelson and Motueka, the Regional Tourism Organisation (Latitude Nelson) and the Outdoor Recreation Centre. In addition, I had one meeting on the 13th of January 2000 with iwi in Motueka represented by Ngati Rarua, Te Atiawa and Nagti Tama. For the visitor survey, I had support from a geography student from Germany. To ensure consistency during the interview process I explained and showed him how to facilitate the interviews and observed his performance until it was of a consistent standard.

This *visitor survey* was administered through two approaches: The first one was a semi-structured questionnaire separated into two parts, utilising a combination of open-ended and closed-format questions (see Appendix 4.5, p.228). The first section of the questionnaire was designed to provide information on the socio-economic and demographic characteristics of visitors to Marahau and the Park. It also explored their purpose of visit, length of stay, with whom they are travelling, their mode of travel, the type and name of accommodation they stayed in, the places they visited and their expenditure in Marahau. The second section of the questionnaire was designed to identify visitors’ perceptions of Marahau and the Park by exploring their likes, dislikes and what sort of improvements they would suggest for the future.

The second approach was an in-depth interview combined with a mapping exercise and a short questionnaire with closed-format questions (see Appendix 4.6, p.229). It was designed to gain an in more depth understanding visitors’ perceptions about Marahau

and the Park. In the first phase of the interview the visitor was handed the standardised questionnaire to fill in the closed-format questions, which provided the information on the socio-economic and demographic background of the visitors. The second phase was the interview that explored the visitors' general perceptions about Marahau and the Park, their motivations for visiting Marahau and their overall experiences during their stay.

A total of 378 interviews were conducted during the two months. Of this total sample 121 interviews were undertaken with domestic and 257 with international visitors. This includes 60 in-depth interviews with 19 domestic and 41 international visitors. A draft questionnaire and the in-depth interview questions were pre-tested and after being reviewed applied to the total sample. Since the closed-format questions were identical to the ones in the semi-structured interview, the results are included in the quantitative analysis drawn from the sample.

The sample was selected randomly on a 'next to pass' basis. The survey was conducted in the community of Marahau, with the majority of the sample collected at the DoC Visitor Information Center (see Figure 4.4, p.68). It is the focal point of tourism in Marahau, where visitors are resting and stopping, because it is the entrance to the Park, there is a bus stop and also a Café. The interviews were also conducted at tourism businesses in Marahau to gain a wider range of different visitors in the sample. The average interview schedule was 10-15 minutes for the semi-structured interview and 30-45 minutes for the in-depth interview. It was crucial that visitors had enough time and willingness to participate. Visitation to Marahau was also not consistent throughout the day. There was an early morning rush and a late-afternoon rush reflecting the high number of day visitors to the Park. Therefore, most of the interviews were conducted in the afternoon hours mainly between 5:00pm and 8:00pm to ensure that visitors had been to the Park or had spent some time around Marahau to answer the questions accordingly.

There are, of course, limitations to the survey. There are a higher number of international visitors presented in the sample before Christmas. This changed after Christmas due to the fact that more domestic visitors arrived in Marahau. The influx of domestic visitors continues until the end of the school holidays in the middle of January.

Then the number of international visitors increases again. In some cases of interviewing certain nationalities, we encountered language difficulties and couldn't proceed with in-depth interviews. That may bias the sample towards more independent, English and German-speaking visitors. Also, the independent traveller -not packaged visitor- had more time and willingness to engage in an interview. Although we observed a high number of package tourists during the period of the survey, they might be under-represented in the results. Although we consciously sought to achieve both representations and diversity in age, gender, social status, place of origin and style of travel, places visited, activities consumed, further bias was inevitable.

Figure 4.4: Location of Interview with Visitors to Marahau

4.4.3 STAGE 3 - PRESENTING THE RESULTS

One of the features of participatory approaches is to share and discuss the results with the participants (Cornway and McCracken, 1990). In the last stage of the research, I presented the information from the community and visitor survey back to the community and other stakeholders. Five days were chosen, including a weekend from the 21st until 26th of November 2000. The exhibition was open between 10:00am to 2:00pm and between 5:00pm to 9:00pm. The fire station, located along the main road was used to display the results (see Figure 4.5, p.69). The participants of the research were informed through a letter I had posted one month prior to my returnvisit (see Appendix 4.7, p.231). A notice was placed in the local store at the Marahau Beach Camp, which is a focal point for community residents and visitors. Further news of my visit was also published in newsletter of the Marahau and Sandy Bay Residents' and Ratepayers' Association. My objectives were to inform and share the results with the

community and other stakeholders, to receive feedback on the analysis and interpretation and to reflect on the design of PAGIS. A total of 32 individuals visited the exhibition. The feedback on the results confirmed that the information represents the overall perception of the community.

Figure 4.5: The Presentation of Results in Marahau

The evaluation of PAGIS was carried out by presenting the tool to groups of individuals who expressed an interest in exploring the information provided in PAGIS. It was facilitated by myself and showed how to start up the program and to select the layers of ‘expert’ and ‘local’ knowledge in PAGIS. I then invited the group to choose one common issue in the community, for example: the boat ramp. The information on the boat ramp appeared in visualised form on the PC screen. This initiated already discussion within the group about the ramp, for example: why specific boundaries were chosen. In addition I showed them the comments of community members about the boat ramp and again this initiated a lively discussion about those comments. In summary, PAGIS was perceived as an interesting and innovative tool. It was highlighted that the tools’ potential is to represent opinions of individuals in the community in a more objective manner than in regular meeting situation, where usually only a few dominant voices would be heard. The discussions of issues through querying

information on the PAGIS platform revealed that displaying the information to a group of people initiated discussions and facilitated interaction.

A CD-ROM was designed for the purpose of ‘handing over’ the spatial data stored in PAGIS (see Appendix 4.9, p.280). It contains the program ArcExplorer 2.0™. ArcExplorer™ is the Window’s version of ESRI’s GIS data viewer. This program can facilitate the process displaying and querying locally stored GIS data (Environmental Systems Research Institute, 2001). It is freely available and offers an easy way to perform basic GIS functions. ArcExplorer™ is used for a variety of display, query, and data retrieval applications and supports a wide variety of standard data sources. It can be used on its own with local data sets or as a client to Internet data and map servers. The CD can enable people by installing ArcExplorer™ on their PC to view the data easily and effectively (Environmental Research Institute, 2001).

To assist the handling of PAGIS, I included a digital manual on installing the program ArcExplorer™ and accessing the PAGIS data (see Appendix 4.9, p.280). The manual supports first steps in getting started in using the project named Marahau_PAGIS (AEP) file format. PAGIS can be integrated into any existing GIS. For example the TDC could integrate it into existing GIS applications and use it making better-informed decisions or to facilitate stakeholder interaction and communication. For now it can provide planners with insights to the issues the community is facing and the perceptions they have on various planning aspects that concern future developments in Marahau. This tool still needs testing and further development.

4.5 ANALYSIS OF DATA

The process of data analysis was not a separate stage of this research. It was rather a reflexive activity that informed the data collection and the writing process (Coffey and Atkinson, 1996). The analysis of different data sets took place in three parts. The first part analysed the qualitative responses of the community and visitor survey by drawing on the systematic analysis technique of ‘grounded theory’. To aid the process of data analysis the qualitative analysis computer software package NVivo™ was utilised. The second part compromised the analysis of the quantitative data responses from the standardised questionnaires of the community and visitor survey. These were analysed with the software program Excel™. The third part of the analysis was the design of

PAGIS to represent the spatial data collected during the mapping exercise that included the narratives of the respondents.

4.5.1 QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS

There is an emerging trend in applying grounded theory to tourism studies (Hardy and Beeton, 1999). In general, grounded theory is a theoretical framework in which theory “is one that is inductively derived from the study of the phenomenon it represents. That is, it is discovered, developed, and provisionally verified through systematic data collection and analysis of data pertaining to that phenomenon” (Strauss and Corbin, 1990, 23). Glaser (1992) points out that this approach is particularly relevant to study multi stakeholder perspectives, because it can capture the various viewpoints and does not rely on reductionism of data. Therefore, I applied grounded theory techniques for the analysis of the data. In particular, it allowed themes and categories to emerge from the data, which are relevant to the case study site Marahau and the Park.

Pandit (1996) identifies five analytical phases of grounded theory building: research design, data collection, data ordering, data analysis and literature comparison. For the purpose of this research, I only drew upon the data analysis phase. In grounded theory data analysis generates concepts through the process of coding. There are three types: open coding, axial coding and selective coding. Open coding refers to that part that deals with labelling and categorising phenomena as indicated in the data. Data are broken down by asking questions such as what, where, how, when or how much. Through this process comparisons are grouped together and given the same conceptual label. Through grouping concepts in a more abstract way categories emerge. Axial coding puts data back together in new ways by making connections between a category and its subcategories. This supports the development of main categories and their subcategories. The selective coding involves the integration of the categories that have been developed to form the initial theoretical framework (Pandit, 1996). The process of coding to conceptualise data is not viewed simply in reducing data, rather it can be used to expand, “going beyond the data, thinking creatively with the data, asking the data questions and generating theories and frameworks” (Coffey and Atkinson, 1996, 30).

NVivo™ supports the qualitative data analysis. This software package is designed to support a range of techniques for the analysis of unstructured data. The name stands for

Non-Numerical Unstructured Data: Indexing, Searching and Theorizing Vivo™. NVivo™ provides the researcher with a “set of tools to handle rich data records and information, to browsing and enriching them, coding them visually or at categories, annotating and gaining accessing data records accurately and swiftly” (Richards, 1999, 4).

A variety of procedures were performed to analyse the community and visitor data. All transcripts were integrated as documents from a word processing format into NVivo™. NVivo™ is capable of storing attributes assigned to each document that reflects one interview with multiple participants having different values. For the community surveys the attribute ‘stakeholder’ and the values ‘landowner’, ‘bach-owner’ and ‘resident’ were assigned to the document. NVivo™ supported the process of coding, linking and managing the documents and nodes in sets. The documents are organised in sets, with each set reflecting one stakeholder group. For example one set contains all the documents of the community survey. The nodes contain and represent the categories, which emerged throughout the coding process. In the last stage of the analysis the software supported the process of data retrieval through searching the different nodes by the values of the document. For example, I searched for the node ‘community’ and attribute ‘landowner’ and received all the data coded as the node ‘community’ in a text document. The use of software packages supports the data analysis, but can’t do the analysis itself (see also Richards, 1999).

The results of the data analysis are presented in the words of the respondents, their language, semantic and expressions that describe more theoretical concepts. The use of direct quotes from the research help to reproduce the complexity of multi-vocal responses. This should help the reader to engage with the data that embodies the voices of the community and other participants in this research. It also helps to reduce the interpretive action of the researcher. The results of the interviews with tourism businesses, visitors and community members are therefore presented through the narratives of the respondents.

4.5.2 DESIGNING PAGIS

The design of a PAGIS needs to embrace alternative forms of GIS production, application and address the issue of access and representation. These are aspects raised

in debates of the ‘GIS and Society’ literature (see Weiner and Harris, 1999, 4). PAGIS was designed to provide a tool that meets the needs of the local community and integrates ‘expert’ and ‘local’ knowledge. The database of PAGIS contains the rich local knowledge base that provides valuable information that can facilitate more effective planning. Wiener and Harris (1999, 5) point out that “the most crucial elements of PPGIS are the actual nature of the public participation process itself”. This created a major challenge for designing PAGIS.

The spatial data from the mapping exercises were integrated into the software package ArcView™ GIS 3.2 for desktop GIS and mapping. The challenge in designing PAGIS is to integrate more complex forms of qualitative knowledge, such as values, emotions and perceptions into a GIS. Local knowledge is often aspatial, qualitative and fuzzy and doesn’t conform to spatial paradigms of point, line and polygon. The base map of PAGIS is an aerial photograph of Marahau at a scale of 1:5000 (see Figure 4.1, p.61). This aerial photograph was also used for the participatory mapping exercises during the interviews. PAGIS is made up of various layers, called themes (see Figure 4.6). The ‘expert’ knowledge is presented in themes about the natural and social features of the Marahau area. The government is represented with separate layers that reflect, for example, the information of their current zoning policy for the area of Marahau. Another theme shows the spatial distribution of the tourism businesses in Marahau and reflects their products and services.

Figure 4.6: The Layer System of PAGIS

The individual map created during the mapping exercise in the community survey is represented in PAGIS as one separate layer that contains the cartographic information and associated database containing the attributes for the polygons. This ‘local’ knowledge is represented as one theme containing the community data and the responses of participants that designated areas of importance, concerns and future development aspects of Marahau. Each designated area is represented in the GIS as a polygon with certain attributes assigned to it. These attributes can be queried to retrieve specific information from the community database. Therefore, the information can be analysed in the PAGIS through multiple approaches to queries. This can then reveal the multiple sets of different views on common resources, or identify similar or opposing views. It also stores the narratives about a particular issue or/and a particular location. The attributes are divided into ‘context’, ‘location’ and ‘issue’ (see Figure 4.7).

Figure 4.7: Attributes and the Comments in the Database

Context	Intv id	Location	Issue	Comments
FUTURE	30	WAKATU PROPERTY	DEVELOPMENT	all development should conform aesthetically to kind of strict regulation, housing
FUTURE	62	WAKATU PROPERTY	DEVELOPMENT	this could be a real enhancement to the place; I would not like to see a great
FUTURE			P	playground
CONCERN			D	another 18
CONCERN	56	WAKATU PROPERTY	DEVELOPMENT	it ruins it for us; in mid summer it is a
CONCERN	46	WAKATU PROPERTY	DEVELOPMENT	this development is too big, they have to do something about sewage and wat
IMPORTANT	57	WAKATU PROPERTY	BIRDS	birds nesting; people walk around and disturb them and treble all over them
CONCERN	43	WAKATU PROPERTY	DEVELOPMENT	it concerns me how Wakatu will develop their land
FUTURE	61	WAKATU PROPERTY	DEVELOPMENT	
FUTURE	40	WAKATU PROPERTY	DEVELOPMENT	
FUTURE	61	WAKATU PROPERTY	PUBLIC SPACE	there needs to be community space in Marahau
FUTURE	16	WAKATU PROPERTY	WATER SUPPLY/SEWAGE	will have lots of waste water and sewage and that will all go into the estuary
CONCERN	9	WAKATU PROPERTY	DEVELOPMENT	it is important what will happen there, any changes will have an impact on us,
FUTURE	37	WAKATU PROPERTY	DEVELOPMENT	
FUTURE	50	WAKATU PROPERTY	DEVELOPMENT	I do not know what it is going to be like
CONCERN	11	WAKATU PROPERTY	DEVELOPMENT	uncertain about development, no hotel and no pubs
CONCERN	96	WAKATU PROPERTY	DEVELOPMENT	I am concerned with this Maori development
FUTURE	40	WAKATU PROPERTY	BOAT RAMP	this could be a good place for a new boat ramp
CONCERN	40	TOWNSHIP	WATER SUPPLY/SEWAGE	some have legal water right and other do not have that and we need a sewage
FUTURE	38	TOWNSHIP	DEVELOPMENT	that is were they could have the township type piece, because the people will
CONCERN	63	TOWNSHIP	SEWAGE	What is an adequate sewage system?
CONCERN	68	TOWNSHIP	SEWAGE	septic tanks
CONCERN	13	TOWNSHIP	WATER SUPPLY/SEWAGE	I feel that something is not done for the township about the sewage and water
CONCERN	28	TOWNSHIP	WATER SUPPLY/SEWAGE	water is a problem, there are three groups: those have legal water right and oth
CONCERN	31	TOWNSHIP	WATER SUPPLY/SEWAGE	we have trouble with water
CONCERN	24	TOWNSHIP	DEVELOPMENT	there are too many subdivisions here, numbers water supply

Figure 4.8, p.75 shows a visual representation of the querying result responses and the comment made about a location by one respondent. It also includes another option GIS offers that is to integrate ‘hotlinks’, which provide the opportunity to show a picture of the location and other information the respondent has mentioned. Each polygon is linked with attribute data of each respondent, e.g. stakeholder subgroup, place of residence, and other socio-economic information. Due to confidentiality all these attributes are not accessible on the CD-ROM. The CD-ROM is the medium to ‘hand-over’ the information to interested individuals or groups.

Figure 4.8: Visual Display of the Information and Comments

The major constraint using the CD-ROM is that users need to have access to a PC and advanced computer skills. That might create problems such as who has access to the information resulting in social or economic disadvantages and problems in the context of power relationships. PAGIS needs monitoring and evaluation over a longer period of time. For this research it was only aimed at designing PAGIS and represented it back to the stakeholders involved in the community of Marahau. Although it might give individuals or groups a greater stake in the process of planning that determines their future and influences development directives.

CHAPTER V: LOCAL GOVERNMENT

5.1 INTRODUCTION

The role of government changed through state led economic restructuring in the 1980s. This radical reorientation of New Zealand's socio-economic and political system is known as the 'New Zealand Experiment' (Kelsey, 1993, 1997). Thereby, moving from social democratic consensus to a deregulated capitalist polity dominated by a neo-classical economic doctrine (Gleeson, 1995; Grundy and Gleeson, 1996; Memon and Gleeson, 1995). This has had major implications for tourism planning and development in local communities throughout New Zealand.

This chapter provides a brief insight into the political dimension of destination marketing by the national tourism authority, Tourism New Zealand (TNZ). The discussion continues with the role of local government in tourism and presents the various policy documents and legislations that are directly applicable to tourism development issues in Marahau. The responsibility of local government to undertake public consultation under its guiding legislations is highlighted.

The presentation of 'expert' knowledge from the local government in PAGIS is described. The chapter concludes with a reflection on the critical issues surrounding the political debate over the foreshore management in the Park.

In the context of this research there are three main local government stakeholders that have a direct influence on development issues in Marahau and the Abel Tasman National Park. These are:

1. Local council - Tasman District Council (TDC) - responsible for the public estate in Marahau and control the foreshore of the Abel Tasman National Park up to the high water mark;
2. Department of Conservation (DoC) - responsible for the conservation estate and visitor management in the Park from the mean high water mark;
3. Regional Tourism Organisation (RTO) - Latitude Nelson - responsible for promoting and marketing of the region.

5.2 THE ROLE OF 'TOURISM NEW ZEALAND'

Tourism planning and development in New Zealand was initially heavily government directed up until the 1980s. The restructuring of the New Zealand economy was the key factor that changed the role of central government in tourism planning and management. The Tourism Department was restructured and replaced in 1991 with the New Zealand Tourism Board (NZTB) (now known as TNZ) (Kearsley, 1997; Pearce, 1993). TNZ is the national government body that is responsible for marketing and promoting New Zealand overseas. A board of private sector members that are appointed by the Minister of Tourism supervises it. The recent growth in tourism has been largely market-driven, reflecting the international marketing focus of TNZ. In 1993 the Ministry of Tourism stated three main goals in the context of the sustainable management of tourism. These are:

- To balance our needs with those of the environment by ensuring that the use of resources does not endanger or irreparably damage any ecological system, including our own;
- To ensure that acceptable high standards of environmental quality are maintained;
- To ensure that the environment and its resources are used in such a way as to protect the ability of future generations to meet their needs (Page and Thorn, 1997, 65).

The reality of tourism management and planning in New Zealand is still very different. As Pearce and Simmons (1997, 217) note:

“The time is now overdue for this demand-led approach to be complemented by more emphasis on issues of development and impact, of matching demand and supply more carefully and to formulating and articulating in a more reasoned and informed manner the development goals for tourism”.

There was no overall strategy or policy for tourism management in New Zealand (Ryan and Simmons, 1999). In 2001 the New Zealand Tourism Strategy (NZTS) was introduced. The Tourism Strategy Group (2001, 1) proposes that the NZTS “provides a framework for decision-making that will allow the tourism industry in partnership with government to face the future with confidence and build capabilities for sustainable growth”. However, the government policies favour a free market approach that advocates market-led solutions to social issues rather than public sector intervention (Pearce and Simmons, 1997; Ryan and Simmons, 1999). The dilemma is that the national government in New Zealand encourages the growth of visitor numbers, while

neglecting the sustainable management of tourist destinations. Perkins *et al.* (1993, 187) states “there is little point in marketing New Zealand overseas if local communities are unable or unwilling to host tourists in large numbers”.

It is important in this context to also look at the role TNZ plays in international destination marketing through their ‘100% Pure New Zealand’ campaign especially featuring the Abel Tasman National Park as a ‘must do’ experience for visitors (see Figure 5.1). This initiative is presumed to have a profound effect on visitor numbers and these are felt mostly on the local level in such places like Marahau. TNZ can, therefore, influence development processes on the regional and local level in New Zealand.

Figure 5.1: Promotion Picture of the Abel Tasman National Park

(Source: Tourism New Zealand, 2001, 19)

5.3 TOURISM AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT

The restructuring of New Zealand’s economy involved local government reform and was concerned with a new understanding of local authorities (see Bush, 1995). The focus of local politics is on “the efficiency and effectiveness of the delivery of a variety of individual services, rather than on their collective impact on the well-being of

communities” (Hucker, 1997, 55). The problem is that classical liberalism advocates that “individuals should pursue their own interests for all they are worth and the results will be harmonised for the common good” (Hucker, 1997, 58). The socio-political implications for planning are that:

“Most of the responsibility for identifying issues, developing policy responses, and implementing and monitoring these responses has been delegated to local authorities. National policy statements and standards are expected to guide regional and district councils, and disputes are settled by the Planning Tribunals” (Memon and Gleeson, 1995, 117-118).

The key piece of legislation in New Zealand relating to development and planning is the Resource Management Act (RMA) 1991. As a consequence of the restructuring process, the primary responsibility for environmental management was handed to local authorities. The responsibility for environmental decision-making under the RMA is, therefore, allocated to the community closely affected by that resource and delegated to regional and district authorities. The district or city councils have to develop district and regional plans for a ten-year period (Ministry for the Environment, 2000; Taylor and Smith, 1997). The Minister for the Environment controls developments on the national level. This includes identifying environmental issues relating to land use for each district and setting down any restrictions on land use and subdivision, while taking into account the issues identified in the regional and national policy statements and environmental standards. These policies and standards are binding on all regional and district levels (Milne, 1993; Taylor and Smith, 1997) (see Figure 5.2, p.80 and Figure 5.3, p.85).

Although explicit tourism policies in New Zealand are relatively rare, governments at all levels are directly or indirectly involved in facilitating, promoting tourism or controlling its effects (Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment, 1997)¹⁴. Outside the conservation estate, territorial and regional authorities have the primary role in managing the effects associated with tourism. The local government jurisdiction is laid out in the Local Government Act 1974, which was amended in 1989 to include a statement on the purpose of local government. The statement recognises the existence of different communities in New Zealand and holds their separate identities and values as central elements to be included in the effective participation of individuals in local

¹⁴ A document prepared by the Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment (1997, 30-32) provides an overview over the entire central and local government-related agencies associated with tourism.

government (Bush, 1995). Local government also has regulatory responsibilities under a raft of other legislations (Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment, 1997).

Figure 5.2 Areas of Management Responsibility of National, Regional and District Government

(Source: New Zealand Tourism Board *et al.*, 1996, 4)

There are four key areas where local government plays a role in tourism: Enabling or *promoting role* (includes public relations, support for tourism marketing organisations, funding community organisations and trusts, promotional and informational activities, etc.); *regulating* (regulatory measures include the implementation of important pieces of legislation, such as the RMA, Local Government Act, Building Act); *providing for public utilities* (includes water reticulation, storm water, sewerage, rubbish collection and disposal, etc.) and, *providing for amenities* (includes parks, reserves, amenity areas, sport complexes, car parks, parking, information facilities etc.) (Ministry of Tourism, 1993; Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment, 1997) (see Figure 5.3, p.85).

There is a requirement of local government to combine tourism promotion and management with economic development. At one level the local authority should commit resources to tourism development, because “tourism needs to be nurtured,

channelled and controlled if it is to benefit the community on a sustainable basis” (Ernst and Young, 1995, 2,3). The image of the region is of particular importance in the success of tourism development. High priority should be given to residents’ input, because the community is seen as the resource at the centre of the tourism product. The tourism sector in any area will only be as good as the quality of the tourism product. Therefore, destination marketing that has sufficient and secure funds should undertake effective marketing and planning at the local and regional level to create a strong and positive image of the region (Ernst and Young, 1995). The key challenge in tourism development for local government is:

“To gain the maximum benefit for their communities, while minimising any potential negative impacts associated with tourism growth. Tourism is only sustainable when it meets visitor needs, the communities aspirations and protects and enhances the environment” (Ernst and Young, 1995, 9).

Table 5.1: Local Government Agencies with Tourism-Related Responsibilities

AGENCY	ROLE	FUNCTIONS	PRIMARY ACTS
Territorial local authorities (e.g. TDC)	Operational (direct and/asset management and/or service provision); Policy and Sector Development; Regulatory (managing compliance with legislation); Infrastructure Provision; Information and Research.	Integrated management of the effects of the use, development and protection of land and associated natural and physical resources of the district; both a policy and regulatory role and a service provision and operational role.	Local Government Act 1974; Resource Management Act 1991
Regional Councils	Policy and Sector Development; Operational (direct and/asset management and/or service provision); Regulatory (managing compliance with legislation); Infrastructure Provision; Information and Research.	Integrated management of the natural and physical resources of the district: both a policy and regulatory role and a service provision and operational role.	Local Government Act 1974; Resource Management Act 1991
Regional Tourism Organisation (e.g. Latitude Nelson)	Marketing	Usually include marketing of particular areas within New Zealand, providing information to operators and to visitors, and overseas marketing with the NZTB.	N/a

(Source: Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment, 1997, 33)

5.3.1 THE RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ACT

The development and planning decisions made in Marahau depend on the RMA. The RMA replaced the Town and Country Planning Act 1977 and some 59 individual statutes and various regulations and orders (Gleeson, 1995). The movement was from a

town and country mode, which was embedded in the wider political economy of the welfare state, to a new biophysical and technocentric-planning paradigm (Memon and Gleeson, 1995, 109). It was not only:

“A rationalisation of existing, admittedly often overlapping and contradictory resource legislation, but also a deliberate move to limit the role of statutory planning in resource allocation decisions [...] The focus of the new legislation was to be controlling externalities arising from economic activities rather than regulation of activities themselves” (Grundy and Gleeson, 1996, 199).

The RMA has the single overriding purpose of sustainable management. Sustainable management refers to “managing the use, development, and protection of natural and physical resources in a way, or at a rate, which enables people and communities to provide for their social, economic, and cultural well-being and for their health and safety while:

- (a) Sustaining the potential of natural and physical resources (excluding minerals) to meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; and
- (b) Safeguarding the life-supporting capacity of air, water, soil, and ecosystems; and
- (c) Avoiding, remedying, or mitigating any adverse effects of activities on the environment” (Ministry for the Environment, 2000).

In New Zealand environmental resources form the basis for most tourist activities. It is critical to maintain these resources for the long-term viability of the New Zealand tourism industry and its economy. The sustainable use of resources and the management of the effects of activities are required by the RMA. Sustainable management is achieved through an effects-based approach to managing resources, which focuses “on assessing and controlling the effects of activities rather than controlling the activities themselves” (New Zealand Tourism Board *et al.*, 1996,3).

The RMA states that all persons exercising functions and powers in relation to managing the use, development, and protection of natural and physical resources, shall recognise and provide for the following matters of national importance:

- (a) The preservation of the natural character of the coastal environment (including the coastal marine area), wetlands, and lakes and rivers and their margins, and the protection of them from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development;

- (b) The protection of outstanding natural features and landscapes from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development;
- (c) The protection of areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna;
- (d) The maintenance and enhancement of public access to and along the coastal marine area, lakes, and rivers;
- (e) The relationship of Maori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, *waahi tapu* (sacred area or site), and other *taonga* (highly prized possession or treasure) (Ministry for the Environment, 2000).

Further, the RMA requires the recognition and provision by the government for the traditional relationships of Maori with their ancestral lands, water, special places and other *toanga* taking into account the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi. The RMA expects to have particular regard to:

- (a) *Kaitiakitanga* (meaning the exercise of guardianship; and, in relation to a resource, includes the ethic of stewardship based on the nature of the resource itself)
- (b) The efficient use and development of natural and physical resources;
- (c) The maintenance and enhancement of amenity values;
- (d) Intrinsic values of ecosystems;
- (e) Recognition and protection of the heritage values of sites, buildings, places, or areas;
- (f) Maintenance and enhancement of the quality of the environment;
- (g) Any finite characteristics of natural and physical resources;
- (h) The protection of the habitat of trout and salmon (Ministry for the Environment, 2000).

The RMA is intended to be a ‘progressive’ reconciliation of market liberalism and the principle of sustainable development, but it is criticised as “an unstable hybrid of the contradictory agendas of neo-liberalism and environmentalism” (Grundy and Gleeson, 1996, 211). Sustainability is clearly a contested notion in New Zealand as it is elsewhere. Therefore, sustainable development has been reinterpreted in planning as sustainable management, “a principle which may well resolve the seeming contradiction between development and environment by ignoring the social effects of resource allocation” (Memon and Gleeson, 1995, 123).

Specifying sustainability as the guiding statutory purpose for resource management has created the need for increased intervention and more comprehensive planning. That includes intergenerational equity, maintenance of genetic diversity, and the intrinsic values of ecosystems. Even the sustainable utilisation of resources is not ensured by market processes alone, the social and environmental needs, in fact, often conflict with market mechanism (Grundy and Gleeson, 1996; Memon and Gleeson, 1995). Also, Grundy and Gleeson (1996, 197-198) believe that sustainable development “will more likely be achieved by regulation than market processes”. The social considerations, such as social equity in planning and resource use are reduced in the existing legislation and more attention is given to biophysical sustainability and economic efficiency. Hence, the “neo-liberal underpinnings seriously threaten to dilute, or even distort, the very meaning of sustainability and render it ineffective as a planning objective” (Grundy and Gleeson, 1996, 198; see also Memon and Gleeson, 1995, 109). The current political changes in New Zealand might challenge the existing planning and management structures.

Under the RMA the local council is also responsible for providing resources for subdivision of land, and for activities on land as necessary in the resource management plan (see Table 5.1, p.81 and Figure 5.3, p.85). The RMA requires the local authority to monitor “the state of the environment in their jurisdiction or area; whether their policy statements or plans are working as intended; whether resources consents and their related conditions are being properly carried out” (Taylor and Smith, 1997, 4-14).

Tourism is treated as another economic sector, such as forestry, agriculture, or residential development, by the RMA. There are no specific staff allocated to deal with issues regarding tourism and there is little understanding of integrating tourism into resource management plans (Page and Thorn, 1997; Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment, 1997). However, the RMA has important implications for tourism planning, because it facilitates planning procedures for the establishment of protective regimes for natural and physical environmental resources that are used for recreation and tourism (Perkins *et al.*, 1993). It also “is one of the main statutes governing the management of the environment, including aspects which are of interest to, and used by, the tourism sector; and activities such as building hotels and lodges, jet boat operations, upgrading tracks, etc.” (Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment, 1997, 35).

Figure 5.3: Responsibilities of Different Authorities under the RMA/Type of Consents Required

(Source: New Zealand Tourism Board *et al.*, 1996, 5)

Page and Thorn (1997, 64-65) suggest “the RMA should encourage public sector planners to adopt a more holistic view of development and the way in which tourism affects the environment and population within a sustainable framework”. In their experience planning policies have been put in place without considering the issue in detail beforehand, which makes planning ad hoc or reactive rather than proactive, particular when policy documents are prepared for a five-year to ten-year period (Page and Thorn, 1997). That means that the information in the plan is dated by the time it takes effect and new issues may have arisen in the interim (Mason and Leberman, 1999).

At the local level, planning for recreation and tourism is not necessarily a straightforward process. A number of pressures, not the least being time, mean local policy makers may be unable to reflect upon the complexity of the planning process,

particularly when they need to consider a variety of views representing different stakeholders (Mason and Leberman, 1999). The RMA is basically a framework for sustainable development of natural and physical resources and it has ‘failed’ as a planning tool for tourism by actually establishing guidelines to expand, constrain or deter tourism in specific areas. The problem is also that local and regional governments have to prioritise funds to address tourism issues. Thus, tourism planning remains a reactive response to problems and pressures generated by tourism in New Zealand, leaving the localities to find their own solutions to tourism’s effects (Page and Thorn, 1997).

Mason and Leberman (1999, 221) state “that the reality may not always match with the theory” in tourism planning. Page and Thorn (1997, 75) argue, “that the principles of sustainability embodied in the RMA and their relationship to tourism will remain rhetoric rather than reality [and that the] image of a clean, green and unspoiled tourist destination is likely to be eroded in this century” in New Zealand’s regions and local areas without some investment in the future sustainability of tourism.

5.3.2 PARTICIPATION IN LOCAL TOURISM DEVELOPMENT

The challenge of participation is treated seriously and is endorsed in the RMA and the New Zealand Tourism Strategy (NZTS). The RMA includes the involvement of public through consultation and the extensive exploration of issues with the attempt to involve stakeholders in the formulation of legislation. Therefore, it grants liberal provision for public participation (Memon and Gleeson, 1995). Although public consultation is a requirement under the RMA, there is “little participation of the tourism industry” (Page and Thorn, 1997, 72). However, councils have public meetings, key group consultations and submission processes, but due to the philosophy of no-state intervention many “councils are powerless to regulate the market beyond those principles outlined in their local plans” (Page and Thorn, 1997, 72).

In theory, public consultation is part of the statutory process. In practice, however, much participation has frustrated both planners and the public. The nature of many meetings is intimidating for local people and has resulted in a situation where only a few take part, because they are often viewed as objectors rather than as participants within the planning process (Anderson *et al.*, 1994). Harris (1995) argues that the

consultation process in New Zealand has been compromised by paternalism/materialism because of the protectionist business and government environment. Recent attempts in politically contentious areas have sometimes resembled a ‘public relation strategy’ rather than effective two-way communicating. In consequence, many New Zealanders are wary about negotiating and are uncertain about the results. This distrust makes people reluctant to communicate (Harris, 1995). More people are becoming aware of issues affecting their quality of life and want to become involved at local level decision-making (Anderson *et al.*, 1994). Certainly the general public:

“Has knowledge and beliefs and ideas, but may find expressing them difficult or believe that there is ‘no point’, as consultation is not seen to have positive results. Many people may therefore seem to be apathetic and in the end only community members of elite groups or the very confident may participate in consultations” (Anderson *et al.*, 1994, 43).

The process of public participation is crucial in the formulation of district, annual and strategic plans for local government (Hucker, 1997, 60). The public has the opportunity to be involved in environmental management issues, and has a legal right to convey their views to council and to be heard. They can also contest the decision of the council, or other statutory bodies (Tasman District Council, 1996). The local council is obligated to consult ‘widely and adequately’ in resource management plan and annual plan preparations with the community, but there are no existing guidelines of what that incorporates. A particular role for involvement of Maori exists and the council has to consult with the iwi in its resource management planning activities. The public involvement concerning the environment and its management includes:

- (a) Public consultation over resource management plans or strategies during their preparation;
- (b) Continuing public participation in developing resource management plans through public submissions, hearings and appeals;
- (c) Public involvement in resource development proposals through consultation before resource consent applications are lodged, and through public submissions, hearings and appeals after applications are notified;
- (d) Submissions on proposals for other resource management activities, such as environmental monitoring programs, and the development of codes of good practice or bylaws;

- (e) Contributions to environmental management by interested public attendance at meetings, provision of advice and information, and self-management initiatives, including codes of practice and corporate environmental management systems;
- (f) Public complaints or advice to council of environmental problems or concerns in relation to properties, locations, resources or environmental management processes (Tasman District Council, 1996).

The dilemma is that there are many factors that prevent people from participating in environmental decision-making under the RMA. This includes the lack of public awareness of the RMA and a failure to recognise the importance of becoming involved as early as possible in the planning process. There is inappropriate council management of decision-making processes (including pre-hearing meetings and hearings which are user friendly) and a lack of resources (people, skills, funding) for the public to participate. Also, the statutory procedures (including time availability and the adversarial nature of hearings) are barriers to public participation (Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment, 1996, 1).

5.4 'EXPERT' KNOWLEDGE IN PAGIS

The presentations of 'expert' knowledge in the PAGIS are the data layers of the local government agencies, TDC and DoC. The example in Figure 5.4, p.89 presents the current land zoning for Marahau, it shows the current land cover, the location of heritage trees, roads, rivers, lakes and other relevant planning information for Marahau from TDC. The other example in Figure 5.5, p.89 reflects the current boundaries of the conservation estate that is managed by DoC (see also CD-ROM).

The 'expert' knowledge in PAGIS provides the ability to communicate information to various stakeholders and to facilitate discussions on planning issues. The information can be accessed as digital maps or attribute records in a database file that is available on the CD-ROM. The integration of 'hotlinks' supports a common understanding of places and helps to visualise the location or area under investigation, especially for stakeholders outside the community (see Figure 5.5, p.89). The 'expert' knowledge can be overlaid with the 'local' knowledge that represents the community perceptions on issues in specific location in Marahau. The visual aspect is significant as it can enhance the process and make it more engaging for a diverse range of people. Therefore, PAGIS

can provide an opportunity to share and communicate information between individuals and groups.

Figure 5.4: Visual Representation of ‘Expert’ Knowledge – TDC in PAGIS

Figure 5.5: Visual Representation of ‘Expert’ Knowledge – DoC in PAGIS

5.5 THE TASMAN DISTRICT COUNCIL

The TDC is the council responsible for development issues in the community of Marahau and manages the foreshore of the Park. The area under its jurisdiction is located in the top northwest corner of the South Island of New Zealand (see Figure 5.6, p.91). The TDC is a unitary government, meaning it embodies both regional and territorial functions under the RMA (Taylor and Smith, 1997).

Every territorial authority has the following functions relating to the RMA and its implementation at the district level:

- (a) “The establishment, implementation, and review of objectives, policies, and methods to achieve integrated management of the effects of the use, development, or protection of land and associated natural and physical resources of the district:
- (b) The control of any actual or potential effects of the use, development, or protection of land, including the implementation of rules for the avoidance or mitigation of natural hazards and the prevention and mitigation of any adverse effects of the storage, use, disposal, or transportation of hazardous substances:
- (c) The control of subdivision of land:
- (d) The control of the emission of noise and the mitigation of the effects of noise:
- (e) The control of any actual or potential effects of activities in relation to the surface of water in rivers and lakes:
- (f) Any other functions specified in [the] RMA” (Ministry for the Environment, 2000).

There are a number of ways that TDC can influence the development and management in the public estate and all coastal and water-based activities in the District (Department of Conservation, 1996c). A number of acts, e.g. the RMA 1991, the Harbour’s Act and the TDC Harbour Bylaw 1994 control these activities. Council bylaws under the Acts regulate human activities that do not generate environmental effects, such as navigation safety of boats under the Harbour Bylaw (Tasman District Council, 1998a). The Harbour Bylaw applies within the limits of the harbours of Tasman Bay, Golden Bay and Whanganui Inlet. That area encloses three nautical miles (one nautical mile is equal to 1.853 km) from the coast and manages recreational boating activities important for tourism in the Park. No person, without having first obtained permission in writing from council, shall “operate any commercial activity or service on, across or from any beach

or foreshore” (Tasman District Council, 1994, 10). However, there are no restrictions on the number of kayaks or water taxis that can operate in the Park (Manning, 1999).

Figure 5.6: Map of the Tasman District

(Source: Tasman District Council, 1998a, 1/5)

TDC has three ways to control development issues relating to tourism. There is the regional policy statement and the Tasman District Resource Management Plan (TRMP). The TRMP includes the regional coastal plan. The council is also required to prepare an annual report. Public participation is part of the formation of the plan and takes place in the form of submissions that must be considered by the council. This is a political process and the results can have an impact on the plan (Milne, 1993).

5.5.1 TASMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN

The Tasman Resource Management Plan (TRMP) prepared under the mandatory requirements of the RMA with the purpose in assisting the council in carrying out its functions in order to promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources. In the case of the TDC being a unitary authority the plan combines the district and regional plan including both functions. Its main functions as a regional council (Section 30 of the RMA) are:

- (a) “Control of land use in regard to soil conservation, water quantity and quality, natural hazards and hazardous substances;
- (b) Control of activities (except) fishing in coastal marine area;
- (c) Control of taking, using, damming and diversion of water;
- (d) Control of discharge of contaminants” (Tasman District Council, 1998a, 1/2).

As a district council (Section 31 of the RMA) its main functions are:

- (a) “Control of effects of land use, development and protection, including natural hazards and hazardous substances;
- (b) Control of land subdivision;
- (c) Control of noise emission;
- (d) Control of effects of activities on surface of lakes and rivers” (Tasman District Council, 1998a, 1/2).

The TRMP also incorporates the Regional Coastal Plan (as Part 3 of the TRMP). The preparation of the regional coastal plan is mandatory and involves both central and local government. This regional plan must not be inconsistent with New Zealand’s coastal policy statement, which is to state policies in order to achieve the purpose of the RMA in relation to the coastal environment of New Zealand (Milne, 1993). New Zealand’s coastal policy statement may include one or more of the following matters:

- (a) “National priorities for the preservation of the natural character of the coastal environment of New Zealand, including protection from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development:
- (b) The protection of the characteristics of the coastal environment of special value to the *tangata whenua* including *waahi tapu*, *tauranga waka* (canoe landing sites), *mahinga maataitai* (areas from which food resources are gathered), and *taonga raranga*:
- (c) Activities involving the subdivision, use, or development of areas of the coastal environment:
- (d) The Crown’s interests in land of the Crown in the coastal marine area:
- (e) The matters to be included in any or all regional coastal plans in regard to the preservation of the natural character of the coastal environment, including the specific circumstances in which the Minister of Conservation will decide resource consent applications relating to
 - i) Types of activities which have or are likely to have a significant or irreversible adverse effect on the coastal marine area; or
 - ii) Areas in the coastal marine area that have significant conservation value:
- (f) The implementation of New Zealand’s international obligations affecting the coastal environment:
- (g) The procedures and methods to be used to review the policies and to monitor their effectiveness:
- (h) Any other matter relating to the purpose of a New Zealand coastal policy statement” (Ministry for the Environment, 2000).

The plan applies to the Tasman District, including the area of sea within the territorial limits, twelve nautical miles off the coast. It affects the use of resources in particular zones, areas and sites, which are defined by rules, within the District (Tasman District Council, 1998a). The resources dealt with within the plan are land, coastal marine areas, rivers and lakes, wetlands, water (taking, using, damming or diverting), and discharge of water or contaminants to water, air and land. The promotion of sustainable management includes the requirement to avoid, remedy, or mitigate the adverse effects of activities on the environment before resources may be used by people and communities to provide for their well-being, health or safety (Tasman District Council, 1998a).

The meaning of ‘effect’ in the RMA in relation to the use, development, or protection of natural and physical resources, or in relation to the environment, includes:

- (a) Any positive or adverse effect; and
- (b) Any temporary or permanent effect; and
- (c) Any past, present, or future effect; and
- (d) Any cumulative effect which arises over time or in combination with other effects regardless of the scale, intensity, duration, or frequency of the effect, and also includes
- (e) Any potential effect of high probability; and
- (f) Any potential effect of low probability, which has a high potential impact (Ministry for the Environment, 2000).

The meaning of ‘environment’ includes:

- (a) Ecosystems and their constituent parts, including people and communities; and
- (b) All natural and physical resources; and
- (c) Amenity values; and
- (d) The social, economic, aesthetic, and cultural conditions which affect the matters stated in paragraphs (a) to (c) of this definition or which are affected by those matters: for example foreshore “means any land covered and uncovered by the flow and ebb of the tide at mean spring tides and, in relation to any such land that forms part of the bed of a river, does not include any area that is not part of the coastal marine area” (Ministry for the Environment, 2000).

The rules established are based on the management of adverse environmental effects, rather than upon the activities themselves (Milne, 1993). The general rules for the use of zones and areas apply in conjunction with rules to manage adverse environmental effects of resource use activities. The zones or areas:

“Regulate or control certain effects or activities that might occur in a particular way in that zone or area [and/or] to protect resources, including resource values, from certain adverse effects of activities that might occur in a particular way in that zone or area” (Tasman District Council, 1998a, 1/8).

A zone or an area is described in the plan as being any mapped part of the District in which a common resource for a zone or a further specific resource for an area may be adversely affected in certain ways by certain activities. These are also where common restrictions on activities and effects are specified by rules for zones, or apply in addition to zone rules for areas. The areas may overlay zones and other areas, and may be

regarded as layers of regulation in any part of the District (Tasman District Council, 1998a). The relevant zoning information for the community of Marahau is represented in PAGIS as ‘expert’ knowledge. It also contains the other GIS information available from the council, such as the location of lakes and rivers, the coastline and current land cover (see Figure 5.4, p.89).

The TRMP also sets out rules that prohibit, regulate or allow activities. These rules, therefore, determine whether resource consent needs to be obtained from the council before an activity is carried out and the standards and terms that must be satisfied before resource consent is granted (Tasman District Council, 1998a). Resource consent is a permission to use or develop a natural and physical resource and/or carry out an activity that affects the environment for a specified time. The regional and district plans identify standards and rules against which proposed activities need to be assessed in terms of their actual or potential effects. Where an activity does not comply with a standard in the plan, resource consent is required to ensure the effects are avoided, remedied or mitigated (New Zealand Tourism Board *et al.*, 1996).

Consents are divided into six classes that reflect the actual or potential effect on the environment of the activity. These are:

- *Permitted activity* is allowed without resources consent if it complies with conditions stated in the TRMP.
- *Controlled activity* is allowed only if resource consent has been obtained. The activity has to comply with standards and terms specific to the TRMP.
- *Discretionary activity* is allowed only if resource consent has been obtained. Although the council retains discretion about whether or not it will grant resource consent.
- *Non-complying activity* is allowed only if resource consent has been obtained. Non-complying activities are those that contravene a rule but are not prohibited. Many of those activities are not subject of specific rules but arise automatically when the standards and terms stated in a rule are not complied with. Conditions may be imposed if consent is granted.
- *Restricted coastal activity* is allowed only if resource consent has been obtained. The resource consent application is made to TDC, but the Minister of Conservation decides whether or not to grant consent. That is after receiving a recommendation

from a hearings committee from the council. Conditions may be imposed if consent is granted (Tasman District Council, 1998a).

The consultation process is a key part of a resource consent application. It is the process of communication with the neighbouring community and other interested persons to gain their support. If a proposed activity is on the conservation estate managed by DoC other consents might be needed. There are different responsibilities outlined in Figure 5.2, p.80 and Figure 5.3, p.85) (New Zealand Tourism Board *et al.*, 1996). The council also has to regard the Conservation Management Strategy (CMS) for Nelson-Marlborough Conservancy prepared by DoC.

The TRMP also stresses that the Tasman District's land resource is largely rural, with the rural character, amenity value, and the productive use of rural land underpinning the social, economic and cultural well-being of the people. Amenity values mean those natural or physical qualities that characterise an area that contribute to people's appreciation of its pleasantness, aesthetic coherence, and cultural and recreational attributes (Ministry for the Environment, 2000). The presence of commercial activities in rural areas can affect rural character and amenity values. Commercial and residential activities inevitably involve buildings and services development. This development can detract from the environmental quality and rural character and rural character. The cumulative effects of such development can lead to the 'urbanisation' of rural areas (Tasman District Council, 1998a, 7/1).

The plan recognises that landscapes are a "valuable economic asset. They provide a major attraction for the District's growing tourist industry" (Tasman District Council, 1998a, 9/3). Potential landscape conflicts include the urbanisation of rural landscape or the effects of subdivision and development, especially urban, in the rural and coastal landscape. As a monitoring indicator the TRMP relies of community perception studies on quality of visual change in rural areas (Tasman District Council, 1998a). The plan points out that:

"Structures, especially in the coastal and adjoining national parks, have the potential to impact adversely on landscape character through inappropriate location, size and colour. Many of these effects can be mitigated through careful design and use of colour" (Tasman District Council, 1998a, 9/3).

The Park is described as an outstanding landscape in the District. Marahau is increasingly facing the issue of urbanisation and commercialisation of its landscape through development.

Further, the plan states in regards to the effects of crafts using the surface of coastal waters that:

“People being delivered to the Park by craft, particularly from commercial craft, contribute to congestion at Park campsites, but so do campers arriving by other means. Control of numbers arriving by craft is not considered justifiable in isolation from controls on numbers arriving by other means” (Tasman District Council, 1998a, 20/1).

5.5.2 REGIONAL POLICY STATEMENT AND ANNUAL REPORT

The Regional Policy Statement (RPS) is another of the control mechanisms provided for under the RMA. RPS preparation is mandatory and must not be inconsistent with any national policy statement or water conservation order (Milne, 1993). It is intended:

“To achieve the purpose of the RMA by providing an overview of the resource management issues of the region and policies and methods to achieve integrated management of the natural and physical resources of the whole region” (Ministry for the Environment, 2000).

The TDC has prepared a ‘Proposed Regional Policy Statement’ (PRPS) that serves as the strategic plan to promote sustainable resource management of natural and physical resources in the Tasman District (Tasman District Council, 1998b).

The PRPS and the TRMP mention the importance of centuries of Maori settlement. There are six iwi with ancestral occupation rights, or rights by conquest, over areas. These iwi are: Ngati Rarua, Ngati Tama and Te Atiawa in Golden and Tasman Bay, Ngati Koata and Ngati Apa in eastern Tasman Bay and Poutini Kai Tahu in the south of the District (Tasman District Council, 1998b). Maori hold strong cultural and spiritual beliefs over the use and management of natural resources and hold scattered areas of ancestral land, although most land has passed into Crown or Pakeha ownership. The philosophy and principles of Maori in the management of resources are closely aligned with the concept of sustainable management, although these perspectives also have a spiritual dimension for Maori (Tasman District Council, 1998b). The *mauri*, or essential life force, and *wairua*, or spiritual essence, of natural and physical resources, whether living or inanimate; the oneness of the natural and physical environment with the spiritual beings, Rangi and Papa and their *uri*, and with *tupuna* or ancestors, and

through all and respected in pursuing sustainable management” (Tasman District Council, 1998b, 21). The council has a number of responsibilities and obligations towards Maori under the RMA. These are:

- (a) “To recognise and provide for traditional Maori interest in their ancestral lands, water *wahi tapu* and other *taonga*;
- (b) To take into account the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi; to have particular regard to the concept of *kaitiakitanga*;
- (c) To consult with the *tangata whenua* of the District in the preparation of all resource management plans;
- (d) To have regard to any relevant planning document recognised by iwi authority affected by any resource management plan” (Tasman District Council, 1998b, 20).

The public and iwi also have input into council’s policy formulation and decisions through participation in the preparation of the annual report, also called annual plan. The council has to prepare an annual report under the Local Government Act 1974. It outlines particular terms for the financial year in which the report is adopted, and in general terms for each of the following two financial years:

- (a) Significant policies and objectives of the local authority, trading enterprise, etc.;
- (b) The nature and scope of the significant activities to be undertaken;
- (c) The performance may be judged in relation to its objectives; and the cost of implementing the objectives of the plan (Milne, 1993, 52).

These annual reports are put together through a process of public submission and hearings that gives opportunity for everyone to have a say on how they would like the council to spend their money. The importance is that the annual report is all about priorities and activities (Milne, 1993).

The TRMP, PRS and the annual report outline the influence that TDC can or can’t impose on the development of tourism in Marahau or on the activities on the foreshore of the Park. The analysis of those documents also highlights that the control and management of tourism itself seems to be a political dilemma.

5.5.3 MARAHAU STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT REVIEW

TDC has identified, in consultation with the local residents in Marahau, issues of concern in regards to the pressures of development. These are outlined in the 'Marahau Strategic Development Review' (MSDR) (Boffa Miskell Ltd., 1998). The overall purpose of the review was to formulate recommendations for the future development of Marahau in consultation with key stakeholders, landowners, iwi and other relevant organisations. The review acknowledged aspects of coastal erosion, tourism, recreational use and resident growth, service infrastructure and community facilities, natural character and significance of the landscape in Marahau. The growth pressures identified as significant issues in the review include:

“Beach erosion and coastal processes; adverse impacts of tourist activities on beach and foreshore access; traffic congestion along the beachfront road (limited to peak tourist season); impact on ecological values; landscape protection; visual impact of development; location and nature of growth; focus on ‘low impact’ tourism; servicing constraints” (Boffa Miskell Ltd., 1998, 4).

Marahau is facing major resource management issues in the future. These are closely related to the increasing pressures from growth in visitor numbers and their activities, which are principally associated with the Park. Parallel to the increase of visitor numbers Marahau has experienced a growth in permanent population. This is due to its location relative to the Park and the closeness to Nelson and Motueka and the intrinsic natural and recreational qualities. The increasing development pressures generated largely by the tourism activity are resulting in conflicts between stakeholders. The review was formulated in order to provide an appropriate and sustainable long-term growth strategy (Boffa Miskell Ltd., 1998). The recommendations for the future development of Marahau are in accordance to the aspects of coastal erosion issues, tourism, recreational use and residents growth, service infrastructure and community facility needs as well as natural character and significance landscape (Boffa Miskell Ltd., 1998, 1). The over-riding issue was that the visitor numbers are growing, the available land is shrinking, and all the activities are concentrated on the foreshore. The outcomes are summarised in Figure 5.7, p.100 and 5.8, p.100.

Figure 5.7: Workshop Outcomes and Possible Solutions for Marahau

<p>WORKSHOP OUTCOMES:</p> <p>The main planning/resource management issues that were identified at the workshop were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Beach erosion and coastal processes; ▪ Adverse impact of tourist activities on beach and foreshore access; ▪ Traffic congestion along the beachfront road (limited to peak tourist season); ▪ Impact on ecological values; ▪ Landscape protection; ▪ Visual impact of development; ▪ Location and nature of growth; ▪ Focus on 'low impact' tourism; ▪ Servicing constraints. <p>STRATEGIC ISSUES IDENTIFIED:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Tourism growth (20 years out); ▪ Partnership between stakeholders; ▪ Concept of a 'village centre'; ▪ Provision of central 'green' open/public space. <p>POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Extending the depth of the foreshore area by pushing out the rock revetment; ▪ Banning tourist operator vehicles from parking along the foreshore area; ▪ Providing a parking area back from the foreshore area; ▪ Relocation of the boat launching ramp; ▪ Construction of a new road behind the existing beach settlement, enable one-way thereby increasing the available land on the foreshore for public use; ▪ Creating a focal point for Marahau possibly in the vicinity of the Outdoor Education Centre. It was agreed that the existing DoC visitor centre would continue to be the main drop-off point for visitors to Abet Tasman National Park. This raised the issue of there being two "activity" nodes and what, if any, were the implications of this; ▪ Landscape design controls to contain and structure development.

(Source: Boffa Miskell Ltd., 1998)

Figure 5.8: The Key 'Structural' Issues for Marahau

<p>SUMMARY OF KEY 'STRUCTURAL' ISSUES IDENTIFIED AT THE WORKSHOP:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) The need for a sound 'framework' to accommodate future growth; b) The location of the new road connection; c) The separation (in terms of access and parking) of park visitors, day visitors and residents; d) The location of a central open space area and/or a 'village centre'; e) The location of back up parking facilities for day visitors and tourist operators who do not have a permanent base at Marahau.

(Source: Boffa Miskell Ltd., 1998)

Conceptually a development option that found favour was based on an approach, which would identify Marahau as a 'Special Area' with particular environmental and development controls.

There are five or six identifiable sub areas:

- The existing coastal settlement area including the adjacent foreshore. The main issues to be addressed would be the mitigation of the adverse effects of beach erosion, over-spill parking and the provision of an enhanced public amenity;
- The DoC visitor centre and adjoining estuary and wetland areas. Access, parking and generally how to accommodate and mitigate the effects of increased visitor numbers would be the main issue;
- The area immediately behind the existing settlement offers opportunities to accommodate increased growth in terms of accommodation and tourist activity areas. The nature and scale of this growth would be the major issue;
- The Marahau Valley and what provision should be made for more intensive subdivision/rural lifestyle blocks and/or commercial tourist facilities, Accommodating increased growth while maintaining the natural character and qualities of the valley would be the main issue.

Overall the report provides an overview of the significant aspects to be considered in the context of future tourism development. It represents an investigation into future growth opportunities while setting out some standards and recommendations(Boffa Miskell Ltd., 1998). These should be taken into account for any future tourism developments in Marahau.

5.6 THE REGIONAL TOURISM ORGANISATION

The Regional Tourism Organisation (RTO) is the primary marketing and development agency inside New Zealand and yet there is no statutory basis for it. The functions of the 24 RTOs in New Zealand vary widely (Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment, 1997). Due to the restructuring process in the 1990s planning and management for tourism was deregulated to the regional and local planning bodies without any clear national plan to manage the growth in visitor numbers (Page and Thorn, 1997).

Local authorities provide major funding contributions for RTO's. An assessment of visitor growth in the 1990s showed that visitor numbers were growing in the Nelson region and the two councils Nelson City Council (NCC) and TDC decided in 1994 to establish the regional tourism organization, 'Tourism Nelson', as a Local Authority

Trading Enterprise. It was later renamed to 'Latitude Nelson'. Latitude Nelson is primarily a marketing and promotion organisation, funded equally by the two local councils at NZ\$167,500 (1999/20000) and the contribution of the Nelson Regional Airport Authority and Port Nelson Ltd (Latitude Nelson, 2000). The rest of the funding comes from private investments from the tourism sector. The private sector investment in the company's programme continues to rise totalling an estimated NZ\$494,000 for the year 1999 (Frater *et al.*, 1998; Neal, 1999). This means that 35% of the funding comes from the public and 65% from the private sector (Davis, 2000).

The Board of Directors, appointed by NCC and TDC, directs strategy and policy, and manages the shareholders' investment. The directors are selected from Nelson's wider business community and bring to the organisation skills such as international marketing, company management, public relations and mainstream tourism knowledge. The Board employs a Chief Executive to operate Latitude Nelson. The Chief Executive and staff develop an annual tactical plan outlining the public relations, marketing and promotion projects, human resource management, financial management and visitor information services (Latitude Nelson, 2000).

Figure 5.9: The Regional Positioning of Nelson

<p>THE REGIONAL POSITIONING OF NELSON:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Natural attractions – There are three main National Parks, which all offer different experiences to the visitor. The Abel Tasman National Park, Nelson Lakes National Park and the newest and second largest National Park is Kahurangi National Park. ▪ Arts and Crafts – Over 300 full-time artists work in many different mediums. ▪ Lifestyle – 'Kiwis who enjoy the good life have been coming here on holiday for years' ▪ Adventure – The region offers a wide range of adventure experience from the softest to the hardest based upon the natural environment.
--

(Source: Aitken-Turner *et al.*, 1996; Latitude Nelson, 2000)

Latitude Nelson is a leading regional tourism organisation (Latitude Nelson, 2000). It addresses the complex, dynamic and changing nature of the local industry "to keep pace with this rapidly changing market" (Tourism Nelson, 1995, 1). The main regional positioning of Nelson is identified via four main themes (see Figure 5.9). Latitude Nelson's stated mission is:

"To market and develop the Nelson/Tasman region as a visitor destination, providing a quality experience to visitors, achieving economic and social

benefits for suppliers, business and the community, an ensuring the integrity of the region's environment is maintained" (Tourism Nelson, 1995, 4; 1999).

The organisation coordinates the marketing and development of Nelson region as a visitor destination, and the visitor information within the region. Latitude Nelson owns and operates the Nelson Visitor Information Centre as a separate business unit. It also operates the Golden Bay Visitor Information Centre in a joint venture with the local promotional group and provides base funding for other visitor information centres within the region (Davis, 2000; Latitude Nelson, 2000).

There are two main types of projects to co-operatively market and promote the Nelson region as a visitor destination: pre-planned marketing projects and ad-hoc or new marketing projects (Tourism Nelson, 1999). The strategic directions relating to tourism in the Nelson region are outlined in the 'Strategic Direction and Issues Report 1995-2000' (see Figure 5.10, p.104). Marketing projects are developed each year through a tactical planning process, with shareholders and industry input. Strategic directions are designed to signal how the region will develop as a visitor destination, and therefore guide tourism businesses and potential visitors (Tourism Nelson, 1995, 1999).

An aspect in tourism is the linkage between iwi and the other stakeholders. Latitude Nelson is in contact with iwi on a 'when issue comes up basis'. Paul Davis points out:

"We understand that they have aspirations relating to employment and management of the Park. I think, that an additional offer of a Maori layer to the Park, which is missing at the moment, would be a very positive thing to happen. Iwi will be involved in a big way through the Wakatu development in Marahau. If you have eighty rooms here then Golden Bay starts to get far greater benefits as well. You've got a staging place in the middle of the region, so that development will change forever the nature of the tourism industry we have here, if it is the right type of development" (Davis, 2000).

Latitude Nelson reports that the peak flow of visitors in Marahau needs to be managed very carefully in the future as it is already putting considerable strain on the local infrastructure. Marahau is in a critical stage of development, due to the rapid growth of tourism and shortage of land, but still in a position to evolve a long-term sustainable tourism industry (Davis, 2000). Further key issues relating to the Park are closely linked to the seasonality of the product. The Park is "full to bursting for three weeks of the year, and is also very busy for a further three months of the year, for eight months

visitor usage is very low” (Davis, 2000). Paul Davis argues that one solution for the future is through more effective management of visitors to the Park, rather than discouraging visitors from coming.

Figure 5.10: Strategic Objectives for the Tourism Industry identified by Latitude Nelson

<p>THE STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES ARE TO:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Position the region as a quality boutique destination under a strong brand, which clearly differentiates the region from competitors; ▪ Coordinate the marketing and promotion activities of Nelson and Tasman region; ▪ Raise awareness and foster support amongst the local community of the importance of tourism to the region, and promote opportunities for entrepreneurial activity, investment and social enrichment; ▪ Make better use of the Nelson region’s existing physical, infrastructure and human resources by increasing visitor expenditure and increasing employment, productivity, entrepreneurial opportunities and profits and attract additional investment; ▪ Take account of the wishes of the <i>tangata whenua</i> in tourism issues and to encourage their involvement in the industry at whatever level they feel appropriate; ▪ Add value to existing and potential tourism products and services, increasing visitor spending; ▪ Encourage the expansion and diversification of the range of tourism products and services available matching regional strengths with visitor needs; ▪ Ensure quality service delivery in all aspects of the Nelson region’s products and services: accommodation, food and beverage outlets, activities, entertainment, events and shopping experiences; ▪ Ensure the tourism industry values the natural environment as a resource needing careful management and protection, and promote appropriate development which is undertaken sensitively, so sustainable tourism activity is achieved, which protects the base environmental resource; ▪ Ensure that sensitive tourism growth is given direction through planning channels.
--

(Source: Tourism Nelson, 1995, 1999)

To date issues in tourism were discussed on an ‘as needed basis’ with stakeholders and there was little coordination between destination marketing and the visitor management of the Park (Davis, 2000). More collaboration between Latitude Nelson, DoC, TDC and NCC is attained through the establishment of the ‘Nelson Tasman Regional Visitor Strategy Forum’. The purpose of the forum is to coordinate actions and share information between key managers in the tourism sector and in resource management in the Nelson Tasman region. The aim is to achieve sustainable tourism in the future by recognising the region’s special qualities. Regular meetings are suggested to “appreciate each other’s management policies, to identify inconsistencies and ensure these are

addressed wherever possible and to promote best practice regional tourism policy” (Latitude Nelson *et al.*, 2000; Neal, 2000).

5.7 THE DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION

Environmental responsibilities within New Zealand are consolidated into three new agencies: Ministry of the Environment (MfE) and the Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment (PCE) and DoC. MfE’s role is to give policy advice to the government on sustainable management. They coordinate development of environmental standards and guidelines to help local authorities and resource users implement their responsibilities under the RMA. Guidelines contain recommendations for attainment of certain aspects of environmental quality. Standards differ in being legally enforceable, apply nation-wide and are national standards to be enacted in the form of regulations. The ‘Environment 2010 Strategy’ is the first comprehensive statement for environmental priorities and strategies. The PCE’s role is to provide independent assessment of central and local government environmental agencies and their activities (Taylor and Smith, 1997).

DoC is a significant stakeholder in the tourism sector as it manages 30% of New Zealand’s land area, including most of the significant natural settings and attractions that underpin the ‘product’ provided for international and domestic visitors by the New Zealand tourism industry (Cessford and Dingwall, 1998; Taylor and Smith, 1997). The Department was established under the Conservation Act 1987 and the principle statutes under which it manages tourism-related activities are the Conservation Act 1987, the National Parks Act 1980, the Marine Reserves Act 1971, the Reserves Act 1977 and the Wildlife Act 1953 (all as amended 1996) (Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment, 1997). DoC has responsibility for giving advice on conservation matters to the government and managing all protected Crown land. This includes policy and operational responsibilities as well as a significant role in managing the effects of tourism in the conservation estate. The conservation estate itself “is a critical asset in the attraction of domestic and international visitors to the region” (Frater *et al.*, 1998, 83).

DoC’s stated mission is “to conserve the natural and historic heritage of New Zealand for the benefits of present and future New Zealander” (Parliamentary Commissioner for

the Environment, 1997, A22). The specific aims that are reflected in its statutory functions and are:

“The conservation of New Zealand’s natural and historic resources; sensible and sustainable use of these resources by the public; public awareness of, support for and enhancement of a conservation ethics, both within New Zealand and internationally” (Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment, 1997, A23).

Therefore, the principle areas of work that support these aims are:

“The provision of visitor services and visitor centres; general facilities maintenance; management of historic resources on conservation land; administration of concessions on conservation lands; conservation advocacy; policy advice to the Minister of Conservation; provision of information; and liaison with governmental and non-governmental agencies” (Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment, 1997, A23).

The Conservation Act requires DoC to prepare management plans for all the land under its jurisdiction. The Department also has to prepare a visitor strategy to examine the management of visitors on conservation land. This is important, because a significant amount of outdoor recreation and tourism takes place on the conservation estate (Page and Thorn, 1997). The ‘Visitor Services Strategy’, aims to: “protect the intrinsic natural and historic values; foster public visits through recreational opportunities; manage tourism concessions, inform and educate visitors; and ensure visitor safety” (Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment, 1997, 29). DoC manages the recreational and tourist use of natural and historic resources within the conservation estate, and provides other visitor facilities and services (Cessford and Dingwall, 1998; Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment, 1997; Taylor and Smith, 1997).

A new structure of DoC came into effect from May 1997 and distributes the responsibilities on a range of visitor related issues. DoC is spread out through different divisions at head office and the regional offices where technical service managers and their staff work with tourism and other recreational issues for the conservancies (Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment, 1997). The departmental and board responsibilities are embedded in its functions set out in the Conservation Act 1987. These are:

- (a) “To manage for conservation purposes, all land and all other natural and historic resources, for the time being held under it, and all other land and natural and historic resources whose owner agrees with the Minister that they should be managed by the Department;

- (i) To preserve as far as is practicable all native freshwater fisheries and
- (ii) To protect recreational freshwater fish habitats;
- (b) To advocate conservation of natural and historic resources generally;
- (c) (in part) To promote the benefits to present and future generations of conservation of natural and historic resources;
- (d) To prepare, provide, disseminate, promote and publicise educational and promotional material relating to conservation;
- (e) To the extent that the use of any natural or historic resource for recreation or tourism is not inconsistent with conservation, to foster the use of natural and historic resources for recreation and allow their use for tourism;
- (f) To advise the Minister on matters relating to any of those functions or conservation generally;
- (g) Every other function conferred on it by any other enactment” (Department of Conservation, 1996a, 19).

The Nelson/Marlborough Conservancy of DoC contains extremely important areas of New Zealand’s conservation heritage. DoC has jurisdiction over the Abel Tasman National Park, which excludes the foreshore (see Figure 5.11, p.108). The boundaries of the Park are represented in PAGIS in the ‘expert’ knowledge portfolio (see Figure 5.5, p.89). DoC is required under the National Parks Act 1980 to develop management plans for the Park. The Nelson/Marlborough Conservation Board recommends strategies outlined in the ‘Conservation Management Strategy’ (CMS) for approval by the New Zealand Conservation Authority. The role of the New Zealand Conservation Authority is also to approve conservation management plans and advice on their implementation as well as give advise on any change of classification of any area of national and international importance (Department of Conservation, 1996a, 20). The management plan for the Park sets out the objectives and policies that will govern the management of the area.

The Park has been managed by a succession of authorities focusing on preservation and enhancement of its natural and cultural heritage. Since April 1987 the DoC administrates the Park. Staff from Takaka administrates the northern and staff from Motueka the southern part of the Park (see Figure 5.11, p.108) (Dennis, 1990; Smith,

1997). The majority of activities and pressure of visitor numbers are located in the southern part of the Park.

Figure 5.11: Nelson/Marlborough Conservancy and Management Unit of DoC in Motueka

(Source: Department of Conservation, 1996a, 18, 382)

This Abel Tasman coastline “is one of many sites under pressure from people, a pressure guaranteed to increase [...]. How that pressure is managed is of crucial importance to the future of the natural, historic and recreational values within those areas” (Department of Conservation, 1996a, 22). One of the main issues for the Motueka Area Office is the growth in visitor numbers in the Park and as the Area Manager comments “it occupies quite a lot of our time down there, just dealing with the management system, just managing visitors really” (Wishart, 1999).

5.7.1 CONSERVATION MANAGEMENT STRATEGY

The Conservation Management Strategy (CMS) for the Nelson/Marlborough Conservancy is a statutory document, which establishes general policies and establishes objectives for the integrated management of natural and historic resources and must be regarded by the TDC. It deals with management of areas in its care and its responsibilities for the next decade for the regional specific provisions. The CMS must “implement general policies and establish objectives for the integrated management of natural and historic resources and for recreation, tourism and other conservation purposes” (Department of Conservation, 1996a, 19). It is also required to give effect to the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi. Therefore, both government and iwi are obliged to accord each other reasonable co-operation and consultation on issues of common concern (Department of Conservation, 1996a). It serves three main functions:

- (a) “To provide clear directions for the conservancy’s activities over the next decade and beyond;
- (b) To bring together various aspects of management and resolves some of the conflicts through providing clear guidelines for day to day management; and
- (c) To present an opportunity for the public and interest groups to contribute to management of areas administered by the department and the department’s advocacy role elsewhere” (Department of Conservation, 1996a, 17).

The CMS seeks to resolve increasing pressures on the natural, historic and recreational values resulting from the rise in visitor numbers and their increasing demands for recreational facilities and associated commercial developments. It is crucial how that pressure is managed in the future. The department must plan for change, not only taking into account the physical impacts of increased pressures on places, but also the social impacts on individuals and communities (Department of Conservation, 1996a, 29). The

greatest threat to the conservation estate “is sometimes the crowds and inadvertent actions of the very people who come to enjoy [National Parks]” (Department of Conservation, 1996a, 29). In protecting and conserving natural and cultural heritage most areas must remain a place of solitude where nature is met largely on its own terms, through maintaining a quality visitor experience (Department of Conservation, 1996b). One of the long-term goals is to “develop and co-ordinate recreational opportunities that preserves or enhances the current range of visitor experiences and reserves natural, historic and recreational values” (Department of Conservation, 1996a, 31).

One of the CMS directives addresses the significance of managing visitor impacts on the Abel Tasman coastline more closely (Department of Conservation, 1996a, 35). There has been a range of studies undertaken relating to the social effects of visitors to the Park. A survey in 1990 showed that 40% of walkers on the coastal track perceived that some part of their trip was overcrowded, and that this diminished their overall experience. This emphasised the need to encourage more off-season usage and redirect visitors to other parks, such as Nelson Lakes (Hill, 1993).

The ‘Great Walks Study’ in 1994 revealed that the perception of seeing too many others during the day was highest on the Abel Tasman track with 73% of respondents (Cessford, 1994). Another report in 1994 examined expectations and attitudes of walkers and sea-kayakers towards management options on the coastal track. The perception of crowding appeared to be highest among walkers, because of seeing too many others on the track, seeing too many big groups or the disturbance by motorboats (Department of Conservation, 1995a). The perceptions of crowding appeared high to sea-kayakers and the assessment of social and physical impacts highlighted issues of campsite congestion, conflict with motorboats, littering and uncertain water hygiene. The assessment of social impacts indicated that problems with the experience of visitors would emerge with any future increase in use-levels (Department of Conservation, 1995b). Both reports point out that the visitors’ evaluation of their trip was highly positive, suggesting little dissatisfaction or need for urgent management action. Addressing the management options both visitor types indicated that they preferred information-based management rather than more regulatory controls, although many sea-kayakers favoured tighter regulations on motorboat access (Department of Conservation, 1995a, 1995b).

The visitor numbers continue to increase and are, therefore, becoming a major management issue for the coastal track. The DoC (1996c, 270), stated that the “Abel Tasman National Park could reach saturation in the next decade”. The CMS suggests that some regulation of numbers could be necessary and promotion of use away from peak season and adjustment of charges may alleviate pressures, for example by offering off-season rates. Also, data are required to monitor recreational use and the effectiveness of planning programmes (Department of Conservation, 1996c).

The Community Relations Officer of DoC in Nelson, Alan White, points out that ‘high visitation’ in the Park might be perceived differently for visitors from different countries. For example, a visitor from Tokyo might think it is lonely and isolated, because he is only seeing perhaps 300-400 people on the track, while a visitor from Auckland is used to backcountry isolation and wilderness experience might be disappointed. Therefore, some New Zealanders will say visitation it is too high and that there are large problems (White, 1999). The problem is that the planning and management issues are mostly only ‘reacted upon’ as noted by the Motueka Area Manager of DoC, Colin Wishart. He mentions: “we like to think that we are able to do some strategic planning ahead and we are always talking about planning and keeping ahead, but most of the time we are just reacting to problems” (Wishart, 1999).

There are two approaches adopted by DoC to manage visitors: one is working closely with Latitude Nelson to divert visitor flows to other areas, and the other is to look after the facilities in the Park, for example that no extra extensions of huts are being carried out (White, 1999). One of the regulatory methods to enhance management is the introduction of the hut booking system for the Abel Tasman Coast Track in the summer of 1999/2000. It applies to overnight hut users only and not to campers or day-trippers. The system has been implemented to reduce the risk of overcrowding and for better utilisation of the hut space (Department of Conservation, 2000).

Conservation managers and tourism interests in New Zealand receive little practical guidance from researchers about the environmental impacts of visitors on protected natural areas. The state-of-knowledge is fragmented and non-specific, therefore, the provision of information needs to be improved, including the collection and integration of data (Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment, 1996; Taylor and Warren,

1998; Taylor and Smith, 1997). Cessford and Dingwall (1998) suggest the usage of GIS for better development for databases and management of environmental impacts. There is a lack of provision for regulatory management of visitors to the conservation estate. Agencies are currently unable to adopt holistic approaches to tourism planning due in part to an absence of strategic links in the institutional arrangements for tourism (Hellström, 1999).

5.8 THE CONTESTED FORESHORE

The Park's seaward boundary is the mean high water mark and accordingly all intertidal areas of the rocky shore; beaches and beds of estuaries are outside the present National Park under the jurisdiction of TDC. The outcomes of the management dispute over the foreshore will have a direct impact on development aspects in Marahau. Mention the "Abel Tasman National Park, and most people would think of golden sand beaches and tidal estuaries to explore. It is a 'Mecca' not just for New Zealanders, but also for tourists from throughout the world" (Clark, 1998). In 1997, the Minister of Conservation initiated an investigation into the appropriateness of including the foreshore in the Park. This represents 1000 ha of intertidal land, stretching 91 km from Wainui Bay in the north to Marahau in the south. The idea of adding the foreshore to the National Park has been around for about 16 years and has been part of the Park's last two management plans (Clark, 1998; Department of Conservation, 1998). This request is based on the "recognition of the foreshore's important natural values and a need for it to be managed in a way that is consistent with the management of the adjacent national park" (Department of Conservation, 1998, 7). The Park boundary and foreshore administration is currently under review, whereby DoC wants to include the area into the Park, although TDC wishes to maintain their control over the intertidal foreshore.

Sea kayaking has become increasingly popular in recent years. It provides an ideal medium to explore the coastline of the Park and has relatively low-impacts on the environment. The water taxi activity along the coastline has dramatically increased over the past few years. Commercial water transportation has grown from two ferries and seven (14+seats) water taxis to eleven (18+seats) water taxis and the frequency of these services has also increased. In addition, private boats launched at Kaiteriteri have

increased to 100-150 a day during the peak season, for example on Boxing Day 2000 500 boats were launched.

Over the last five years, the number of kayakers have doubled, there are approximately 300-400 kayak seats in use each day during the peak summer season, 90% of which are provided by commercial companies. These increasing numbers have created conflicts using the coastal environment over a much greater time of the year than was formerly the case (Department of Conservation, 1998). Also, commercial sea kayaking has grown from five groups of eight clients to 14 groups of eight clients on day trips in the Astrolabe Roadstead. There is also a notable increase in kayak rentals in that area. The Astrolabe Roadstead is, therefore, the most heavily utilised foreshore area in the Park by public and commercial activities (Clough, 2000; Davis, 2000; Hawke, 2000).

The increasing number of day-visitors to the Park is causing additional management problems. There are increasing conflicts between various user groups, such as kayakers, powerboats and water skiers, there is a particular concern regarding safety issues on the water (Hawke, 2000). The increasing numbers of all user groups have created a variety of impacts on the social and natural environment in both locations, the Park as well as in Marahau itself. Some of the issues are well-known, as this Marahau tourism operator said about the toilet issue in the Park “when the existing toilet facilities become too crowded, too objectionable, or both, the public takes to ‘the scrub’ and on the islands they take to ‘the scrub’ anyway”.

The inclusion of the foreshore would give DoC control over commercial operations in the Park because “over 90% of the visitors to the Park use the coastal environment and over 50% access the Park through the foreshore while the great majority of the rest make extensive use of the foreshore area” (Department of Conservation, 1998, 27). This would enable DoC to manage boating activities using the foreshore, commercial operators, dogs and other animals, littering, guiding and filming, fires, and the movement access of visitors within and through the foreshore. At present there are no controls over the number of clients that commercial operators bring into the Park or drop off on the foreshore. Under DoC management the commercial operators would need concessions (Clark, 1998). A limit on numbers of concessions using the foreshore

would need monitoring and is also subject to the Commerce Act 1986, meaning to that DoC can't abuse their monopoly powers to grant concessions (Stephens, 2001).

The areas administered by DoC are managed on behalf of the public, therefore, the public or a corporate entity can apply for a specific authorization for the use of this land. The right to grant an authorisation is bound by statutory requirements, general policies of the CMS and relevant management plans. The Conservation Act sets out the details for the requirements for granting a concession for areas DoC administers (Department of Conservation, 1996b). The objective is "to allow the use of resources and areas administered by the department, only to the extent that it is not inconsistent with the status of an area, and protection of values for which it is held" (Department of Conservation, 1996b, 232). The recreation concession is "to allow commercial visitor services and facilities that increase the wider enjoyment of areas administered by the department provided that they are not inconsistent with the purpose for which the land is held" (Department of Conservation, 1996b, 249). Alan White points out that:

"The benefit of co-operation with the commercial operators that have a concession with us to provide us with an opportunity to work with them and set conditions to minimise impacts. The only kayak companies who need concessions are actually the ones who go out with guided parties in the Park. The activity of freedom kayaking and the water taxi operation is outside of the Department's control. The commercial operators are saying there are all these people coming and we want some rules to prevent this increase" (White, 1999).

There are 12 tourism businesses that have a concession¹⁵ to operate in the Park. The dilemma is "you can't simply turn applications down on the basis that there are already a dozen out there and we do not need anymore. We need data to prove adverse effects or overcrowding then we have a reason to decline concessions" (Wishart, 1999).

The concession regime of DoC provides a framework for controlling the activities of commercial operators on the conservation estate (Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment, 1997). Many commercial operators are "apprehensive about a government department taking charge of the foreshore, as that would give power to collect revenue" (see Clark, 1998). Through the inclusion of the foreshore into the Park,

¹⁵ The fees can be per client per day, but more often they are a percentage of their turn over and multiplied by taking into account the time they are not on DoC land. If they are kayaking on the water for 50% of the time and the other 50% of the time they are on the campground then we multiply 7,5% of the turn over as a starting point and multiply that by 50%, because that is the only time they are on DoC land. It might end up that we are taking 3-3,5% of their turnover (Wishart, 1999).

tourism operator's worry that DoC can increase concession fees but not improve social impacts, so it will simply be a revenue collecting exercise (Murdoch, 1998). There are no controls placed upon current concessionaires regarding the number of craft or people they are allowed to transport onto the foreshore and into the Park (Department of Conservation, 1998). TDC, however, control the foreshore under the TRMP and are able to control the numbers of crafts and people entering the foreshore, but does not consider those controls justifiable in isolation from other visitor controls (Tasman District Council, 1998a).

Alan White suggests that it is collective problem and not only DoC's. Everyone affecting the management of the Park responsibility for and has to work towards common ideals and common purposes, to ensure the future of the Park is sustainable, regardless of the foreshore debate. This means that TDC, Latitude Nelson, the tourism industry and the people in communities have to work together. All have to feel part of the decisions being made for the Park, thus there need to be more 'consultative type forums' and not the government making decisions alone. Moreover, "I do not see the Abel Tasman as a sort of place where there is a TDC boundary, a DoC boundary or there is a private land boundary. If there is a problem the way it is dealt with, the way in which it is resolved needs to be a collective one" (White, 1999).

The mayor of Nelson City Council (NCC), Paul Matheson, was appointed by DoC as an independent facilitator to carry out the investigation on the issue of the foreshore. His role as a facilitator is:

"To convene an advisory forum comprising representatives of conservation, recreation, iwi, tourism, community, local and central government, and the boating interests to seek the views of and gain further information on the values, issues and management opportunities related to the future management of the foreshore adjacent to the Park".

By using the material gathered from the forum members the facilitator shall provide a report to the Conservator of DoC, the Nelson/Marlborough Conservancy and the TDC, on the future management option for the foreshore (Matheson, 2000). His suggestion was to create an independent advisory committee (The Nelson Mail, 2000). Matheson (1999) further suggests:

"It gets to the point that if you do not have some guidelines you will destroy the experience, it is as simple as that, and it is a very vulnerable Park. If you do not keep it where it is now, keep the experience as it is, tourism will drop

off, people will say do not go there it is too crowded, it is out of control, filthy falling apart and all the rest of it”.

This management dispute will have an impact on the entire tourism industry. There is a lack of data on visitor numbers and their social impacts and perceptions (Clark, 1998). This issue is ongoing and its outcome will have a major effect on the future of Marahau and the Park.

CHAPTER VI: TOURISM INDUSTRY AND VISITORS

6.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter discusses the role of tourism in the current and future development of Marahau and the Abel Tasman National Park. The first part explores the tourism industry and its products and services. It discusses the issues the tourism industry is facing and its attitudes towards future directives for the Park and Marahau. The second part investigates the perceptions that visitors hold about Marahau and the Park. This reflects the importance of understanding the views of consumers in identifying future development objectives.

The tourism industry can work effectively with the Resource Management Act (RMA) to achieve sustainable management of resources on which it depends. The industry can also get involved in preparation of plans and policies to ensure its needs are met with planners and politicians. The tourism businesses also have to take responsibility for their activities. Therefore, the New Zealand Tourism Board (1996) suggests that sustainable management for the tourism industry requires the operators to understand the needs of local communities and to enable communities to participate in tourism developments to meet their needs and improve strategies to reduce impediments to growth. This is to be achieved by effective consultation with the community, through “a proactive approach to consultation, where early consultation with communities of interest is undertaken and their needs and concerns are taken into account in development proposals” (New Zealand Tourism Board *et al.*, 1996, 3). An important aspect in sustainable tourism development identified by the ‘New Zealand Tourism Strategy 2010’ is to integrate the private sector perspectives into the planning process (Tourism Strategy Group, 2001).

The visitors to Marahau and the Park are not direct stakeholders in the sense of participating in the process of decision-making of development, but their temporary perception of place is vital. This is because perceptions of overcrowding might lead to adverse reactions towards the future development of tourism (Hall *et al.*, 1997b). The decline in the quality of the visitor experience through negative social impacts, such as overcrowding, could possibly lead to a negative image of the Park. As a result, a decline

in visitor numbers would impact upon the tourism industry. Therefore, it is important not to neglect the narratives of visitors' perceptions and miss a major component of the holistic picture. Visitors are seen as consumers who "collect, read, negotiate and communicate symbolic meaning and representations created and offered for their consumption" (Ateljevic, 1998, 9). Thus, their perception of the place they visit becomes an important component of the decisions made for the future development of Marahau and the Park.

To date, there are no concrete plans to manage the growing number of visitors and tourism businesses with consequences for Marahau and its future development. For example, there are concerns regarding two proposed activities. The first of these is, two floating, fully self-contained sixteen to eighteen bed backpacker facilities including a café, off the Park's coastline and the second is an operation running two 80-seated ferries out of Nelson twice a day. There is also a proposed development that aims to build a beach resort with 160 units for 320 beds in Marahau with a twelve-year timeframe for completion. The existing activities are already contributing to the perception of overcrowding and the loss of the 'paradise' image.

6.2 THE COMPOSITION OF THE TOURISM INDUSTRY

The tourism industry is an important contributor to the regional economy and is heavily dependent upon the conservation estate of the region. Private sector involvement in tourism is in form of commercial enterprises with the aim to make a profit (Collier, 1997). There are a large number of small businesses and a very few medium to large operators across New Zealand (Clope and Perkins, 1998). My interviews with 17 tourism businesses identified two main subgroups based on different perspectives on development issues in Marahau. There are Marahau-based companies and companies based in Motueka, Kaiteriteri and Nelson, which operate out of Marahau. The latter were often described, in the interviews with the respondents in Marahau, as being the 'outsiders'. Conflict and disputes surround issues such as 'outside' companies 'occupying public land free of charge', 'preventing the public from accessing what little public parking and easy beach access is available', 'generating rubbish and potential health hazards', 'not complying with safety' and 'contributing to the increasing of number of visitors to the Park'.

Figure 6.1: Overview Map of Tourism Businesses and the 'Proposed Local Development' in Marahau

ABEL TASMAN NATIONAL PARK	
TOURISM BUSINESSES	
	"ABEL TASMAN KAYAKS"
	"ABEL TASMAN MARAHAU LODGE"
	"ARTS UNIQUE"
	"BUENA VISTA HOLIDAY HOMES"
	"MARAHAU BEACH CAMP"
	"OCEAN RIVER ADVENTURE COMPANY"
	"OCEAN VIEW CHALETs"
	"OLD MACDONALDS FARM"
	"SEAFARIS AQUA TAXI"
	"SOUTHERN EXPOSURE"
	"THE BARN BACKPACKERS"
	"THE PARK CAFE"
PROPOSED LOCAL DEVELOPMENT

There are a total of 17 family-run and/or owner-operated tourism businesses based in Marahau providing accommodation, transportation and activities as well as food and beverage facilities for visitors (see Figure 6.3, p.121). Their spatial distribution and more detailed information are presented in PAGIS as the 'tourism business' layer (see Figure 6.1, p.119 and Figure 6.2). In my community sample 28% of the respondents in Marahau are involved in tourism as owners or operators of businesses or as their employees (see Table 6.1). The tourism businesses in Marahau provided up to 91 seasonal jobs in 1999/2000 within the community. A further eight businesses based outside of Marahau offered kayaking and water taxi facilities to visitors. These businesses added an estimated 62 seasonal jobs to the region in 1999/2000.

Table 6.1: Number of Respondents Involvement in Tourism in Marahau

INVOLVEMENT IN TOURISM	TOTAL
Owner or operator of business	21
Employed in Tourism	6
Not employed in Tourism	69
SAMPLE TOTAL	96

Figure 6.2: Visual Display of Tourism Business Layer in PAGIS

Accommodation in Marahau ranges from budget to four-star services that cater for the Free Independent Traveller's (FIT). The 'Abel Tasman Marahau Lodge' and 'Ocean

View Chalets' offer self-contained and studio units. The Ocean View Chalets cater for the "nature and quietness seeking visitor" promising a "carefree holiday" where the visitor is able to "escape stress and recharge batteries" (Ocean View Chalets, 1999/2000). The Abel Tasman Marahau Lodge attracts business people offering a fully equipped conference room. Their promotion material emphasises the "proximity to diverse nature adventures" (Abel Tasman Marahau Lodge, 1999/2000).

Figure 6.3: Tourism Businesses and Products in Marahau

There are several budget-accommodation providers. ‘The Barn Backpackers and Campground’ is designed for backpackers and offers a wide range of accommodation from a beautifully crafted house-truck, a hammock or an Indian tent to a conventional campground or a dormitory in the house. The visitors they attract are “people who appreciate the specialness” (The Barn, 1999/2000). ‘Old MacDonalds Farm’ offers campground facilities, backpacker accommodation, cabins and homestay facilities for visitors as a place to “enjoy the peaceful, clean environment in a delightful setting” (Old MacDonalds Farm, 1999/2000). Farm animals and a swimming hole make it an attractive place for families and long-term campers. Both cater for the budget market and operate a small store on the side with daily supplies. One of the first campgrounds in Marahau, established in the mid-1960s, is the ‘Abel Tasman Marahau Beach Camp’ “just steps away from the beach” (Abel Tasman Marahau Beach Camp, 1999/2000). This operation also offers kayaking tours and water taxi rides into the Park.

The ‘Abel Tasman Homestay and Stables’ has self-contained units and a Bread and Breakfast. They promise “friendly New Zealand hospitality” to visitors (Abel Tasman Homestay and Stables, 1999/2000). A couple of privately run accommodation-providers service the increase in demand for accommodation by visitors, particularly during the peak season, for example ‘Buena Vista Holiday Homes’. The future of accommodation providers might change, because of the proposed beach resort in Marahau.

There is a range of recreational activities to experience in the Park. This includes walking, kayaking or taking a water taxi, or a combination of these, to visit the Park. There are currently thirteen companies offering sea kayaking, swimming with seals and ‘wind riders’. Three Marahau-based companies primarily offer sea kayaking. They are ‘Abel Tasman Kayaks’, ‘Ocean River Adventure Company’ and, since 1999/2000, ‘Southern Exposure’. The Marahau Association of Tourism Operators (MATO) promotes the Abel Tasman coastline as being “New Zealand’s leading sea kayaking destination. A sleek stable and silent kayak allows you intimate interaction with the environment [...] ensuring you a first class adventure” (Marahau Association of Tourism Operators, 1999/2000). In addition, the ‘Abel Tasman Marahau Beach Camp’ offers kayaking tours, ‘Natural Energy Adventures’, a one-man business offers trips in a traditional outrigger canoe, and ‘Abel Tasman Seal Swim’ offers swimming with the seals “to have a true wild animal adventure” (Seal Swim and Water Taxi, 1999/2000).

There are two Motueka-based companies, 'Abel Tasman National Park Enterprises' and the 'Sea Kayak Company'. The sea kayaking company operating from Kaiteriteri is 'Kaiteriteri Kayaks'. The other companies operate from Nelson, such as 'Kiwi Kayaks' and 'Natural High'.

There are five operators offering water taxi rides to the Park. This service is offered by 'Abel Tasman Aqua Taxi' in Marahau, which operates with six boats up to four times a day during the summer season, and promote itself as "fast, efficient and friendly" (Abel Tasman Aqua Taxis, 1999/2000). Two others, operating with one boat each, are the 'Abel Tasman Marahau Beach Camp' and the 'Abel Tasman Seal Swim and Water Taxi'. The 'Abel Tasman National Park Enterprises' operate two launches from Kaiteriteri, and the 'Abel Tasman Water Taxis' operate with two boats and run seven to eight times a day in the peak season. An estimate is that there are around 684 seats provided by water taxis operating approximately four times a day into the Park, transporting an estimate of 2750 people a day. This estimate excludes the launches and the numbers are only so high during the peak season. Also, the boat spaces are not necessarily always all occupied. However, numbers can only be estimated, because of commercial sensitivity and lack of data.

'The Park Café' is a licensed restaurant located at the entrance to the Park and the bus stop. It started in 1985 as a little wagon and mainly served domestic customers for two months a year. They now offer evening entertainment, like concerts or artist presentations in the peak season. There is an art and craft shop, 'Arts Unique', selling pottery, stone- and woodcarving made by local artists, and offering other services, such as massages provided by local residents. The 'Abel Tasman Marahau Beach Camp' operates a 'dairy' store, and at 'Old MacDonalds Farm' there is the 'Gum Drop', a locally-operated fish and chips shop.

Most of the local tourism businesses in Marahau are organised in MATO, a non-government organisation that was established in 1992/1993. The members must be Marahau-based with a "clean, green and environmentally orientated" business interest (Marahau Association of Tourism Operators, 2000). The association is active in addressing various issues relating to tourism in Marahau. They aim for no more major

tourism developments “that are likely to spoil the charm, character, peace and beauty of Marahau” (Marahau Association of Tourism Operators, 2000).

MATO produces a generic brochure, that includes the tourism businesses in Marahau, to position itself with a specific branding for Marahau (Marahau Association of Tourism Operators, 2000). They promote Marahau as the ‘Abel Tasman Village’ with the message to visitors: “if you are looking for 100% pure New Zealand, this is it” (Marahau Association of Tourism Operators, 1999/2000). To ‘make Marahau nicer’ some members initiated a couple of other projects within the community in collaboration with the Marahau and Sandy Bay Ratepayers’ and Residents’ Association (MSBRRA). These projects include the ‘Enhancement Project’ to restore a wetland, a signage programme, and garbage pick-up each week (Marahau Association of Tourism Operators, 2000). MATO can provide the means of participating in decision-making and negotiate resolution regarding the future development of Marahau by local government. They can also co-ordinate small initiatives and projects with Latitude Nelson and the local government, Tasman District Council (TDC) and Department of Conservation (DoC).

6.2.1 PROPOSED LOCAL TOURISM DEVELOPMENT

In 1990 the lease for the land of Wakatu Incorporation in Marahau expired and the incorporation investigated the development of tourism-related activities (The Nelson Mail, 1998b). This company was established in 1977 by over 2000 Maori landowners (over 3000 today) in Nelson and Motueka, pooling their land in return for incorporation shares (The Nelson Mail, 1998a). It is considered as a ‘Maori success story’ due to their asset growth from NZ\$14 million in 1977 to approximately NZ\$85 million today (Palmer, 1999).

The Chief Executive of Wakatu Incorporation, Keith Palmer, points out that most of the land assets were non-yielding lands, e.g. not giving money back. They want to provide returning assets to reward existing generations, but not at the expense of the next generation. Their philosophy now is commercial and not social, cultural or educational, although recognising Maori *tikanga* or courtesy and customs. He explains:

“Our philosophy clearly says we are to operate for profit and to provide the resources for *whenua* to carry out their social and cultural needs, not for

Wakatu. Wakatu's job is really to maximise the wealth and make money, give it to *whenua* and they will carry out their goals" (Palmer, 1999).

The development site is a triangular block of fourteen hectares on an eighteen hectares title, approximately four hectares have been lost to coastal erosion (see Figure 6.4 and Figure 6.2, p.120). It consists of about 800 metres water frontage. The greatest challenge is to generate business during the four-month off-season (Pusinelli, 1999). There is a need for Marahau itself to function as:

"An integrated destination, with sound environmental policies and practices adopted by the community as a whole. This would require a high degree of co-operation between the hotel developers, the local residents, business community and iwi, the council and the Department of Conservation" (Pusinelli, 1999, 28).

Figure 6.4: Proposed Site for Resort Development

To Maori the Marahau site is basically a resource that either has to be used or nurtured depending upon circumstances. It must be built on, making it an asset not only for Maori owners, but also for the community at large (Palmer, 1999). Keith Palmer emphasised that "Maori say we do not own the land, the land owns us, so in that sense we will use the land wisely and protect it and it would never be sold out of Wakatu. It also has a high spiritual recognition" (Palmer, 1999).

The resort will comprise 160 units, that is 320 beds and four staff houses with a main complex building. The development requires twelve years to completion (see also Marahau and Sandy Bay Ratepayers' and Residents' Association, 2001). All units will be built single story and with environmentally friendly materials like natural wood. In addition, landscaping will be a major part of the project. They plan to create an open public space and a picnic area at the southern end and allow access to the beach.

Sewage will be pumped outside and put in a compact self-contained plant and the water coming out of that can be used to wash cars and for irrigating the site. The Incorporation intends to spend 15% of the total budget for the development on planting the site (Palmer, 1999). Also, with regards to current problems with beach erosion they are working with the local council on a beach replenishment project (see also Truebridge Callender Beach Ltd., 2000).

The development proposes to draw on the client base already visiting the Park (Marahau and Sandy Bay Residents' and Ratepayers' Association, 2001). The tourism operators in Marahau argued that “either the prospective guests are coming here anyway and are already using the private tourism companies or there will be a major increase in visitor numbers accessing the Park from Marahau” (Marahau and Sandy Bay Residents' and Ratepayers' Association, 2001, 3). Several concerns of local residents emerged during the interviews about this development. The anti sentiments were expressed as ‘they will bring a different sort of tourist here, I do not like it’, ‘this will change the whole dynamic of the community’, ‘the development changes the flavour of the area’, ‘it is a huge concern, Wakatu does what they want to do’ or ‘I do not trust Wakatu and their plans’. The pro sentiments included: ‘I believe it will be lovely’, ‘I can see it could work well’, ‘Wakatu does not worry me’ or ‘it is their land and whatever they want to do - good on them. It is not my right to tell them what to do’.

The main issue was the lack of information that existed at the time of interviews about the development itself. Therefore, these statements are reflecting the uncertainty that respondents have about this development objective. Consequently, one respondent said ‘I have no objection to the development proposed as long as it is a low profile and keeping with the Marahau sort of way doing things’. Many others were concerned about the size, e.g. ‘that is too big’, ‘they have massive ideas’, and ‘it will have a huge impact on everything’. This development is currently in the process of lodging their resource consent application with TDC under the RMA. There have been 118 submissions, with 117 opposing the development and one in favour of it. The MSBRRA is concerned about the sustainability of Marahau and its environment, because of the extent of the project and the issue of compounding problems of overcrowding in the Park (Smith and Newman, 2001). The outcome of this process will determine the future of Marahau and the Park as a tourism destination.

6.2.2 'GREAT SERVICE' AND 'WELL ORGANISED'

This section reveals the statements of visitors on the tourism product and services that are offered by tourism businesses in Marahau. The general view was that 'all the services are great, you have got a café, something to eat, cheap and expensive accommodation, you have got everything you need'. Other comments included: 'good management', 'tour operators seem well organised', 'good organised activities', 'good service' and 'quick and flexible to the desired routes' (see Table 6.2, p.142).

Visitors chose activities and accommodation from the various brochures available at the Visitor Information Services in Nelson, Motueka or Golden Bay. In the case of choosing a kayaking company visitors stated that both companies, Abel Tasman Kayaks and Ocean River Adventure Company, seemed to be good and different people recommended one or the other:

'The reason is that we picked up a couple of brochures and there was hardly anything to choose between them really. We chose Ocean River Adventure Company, because our backpacker in Nelson recommended it'.

The professional appearance and location of the companies was a decisive factor for many visitors. This international visitor mentioned that 'how it is situated and all the stuff in there looks really professional, so that is a good thing'. Visitors described the service positively: 'the guide was good, introduced us to the history of the Park and the nature and the animals', 'it was nice to see somebody from New Zealand who talks about his own country' and 'very nice people, very helpful, we enjoyed ourselves'.

The observations made by visitors on the services offered by the water taxis and ferry operators were positive, as this international visitor said: 'it was a great service; it was a really good ferry ride. They give you a little commentary and if they see some seals they would stop so you can look at the seals. I thought that was a really nice trip actually'. Similarly, another international visitor said that:

'The guy who drove our taxi took us down to split rock, stopped and gave us a little historical stuff on the way. He did not just drive through to Anchorage and dropped us off. He did stop several times and talked, which I did not expect at all, and that was nice'.

However, a small number of visitors had negative experiences: 'I went to jump on a water taxi when it pulled up, and the guy in the boat asked me for my ticket, and said no, you have to go on the slow boat'. Others commented on the tractor ride and the

prices of the service: ‘silly tractor ride’, ‘having to be on a boat on the road like you are too stupid to walk’ and ‘prices are quite high for water taxi’ (see Table 6.3, p.153).

Overall, visitors are very positive about the accommodation in Marahau. More specifically international visitors’ view on the backpacker hostels included that ‘it is great, that little house over there with the showers’ or ‘it is nice that there is no television, it is really relaxed, I can read my books’. A few international visitors prefer the Bed and Breakfast, because ‘you can speak with people who are living there about their lives’. The perception of international visitors about the Lodge or Motel indicates a high standard of service: ‘we are staying at the Ocean View Chalets, and it is excellent there and they are so helpful sorting out our trip today’. Especially during the peak season and during the shoulder season these types of accommodation are fully booked and some Marahau residents are catering for that overflow, as one international visitor explains ‘they recommended a place that somebody has on top of their garage, and so we’re staying there, it is called Buena Vista’.

Many international visitors travel in a campervan and make use of the facilities on the campgrounds (see also Figure 6.15, p.140). They stated ‘that the campgrounds here are all so well equipped that you could do with a car and a tent’ or ‘that the campsite is very nice’. Domestic visitors also support these views. One long-term visitor pointed out that the Abel Tasman Marahau Beach Camp ‘has improved a thousand times over the last years, everything is tidy and the toilets are clean. It is a good camp and we are really lucky to have it’. Other descriptions included: ‘well maintained camping facilities’, ‘excellent camping facilities’, ‘beautiful sites’, ‘decent campsite’, ‘well equipped site’, ‘large campsites’, ‘lots of big and small campsites’ or ‘nice shady campsite’. In comparison, some of the negative comments related to the lack accommodation, comfort and prize: ‘too many campgrounds’, ‘not much middle range accommodation (e.g. tourist flats)’, ‘need more choice of accommodation’, ‘the facilities at the campground (Old Macdonald’s Farm)’, ‘beds very uncomfortable’, ‘did not like Marahau Beach Camp’, ‘the campground is moderate’ and ‘no free camping’ (see Table 6.2, p.142 and Table 6.3, p.153).

International visitors also brought up the Park Café with the remarks like that ‘the prices are high at the Café’ or ‘we read in the Lonely Planet about the blueberry muffins, but I thought it is very expensive here’. Domestic visitors said for example that:

‘The Park Café is expensive, they are relying on one-off’s, people that are going through the Abel Tasman and coming back and would just go in there once. If they had reasonable prices, people who are using the campsites would go and have a meal there and take the kids’.

Other responses included: ‘not enough restaurants’, ‘no pub’, ‘no supermarket’, ‘no bottle store’, ‘shops for provisions or extended stay’ and ‘a lack of shops’ (see Table 6.3, p.153).

6.2.3 ‘QUALITY EXPERIENCE’ INSTEAD OF ‘VOLUME TOURISM’

The major problems for the tourism industry are increasing competition, the changing visitor preference and behaviour, the management dispute over the foreshore and the growing need to control visitor numbers. The major issue is the idea of controlling visitor numbers to the Park in the peak season to ensure a quality product and experience. The tourism businesses also feel that the future of Marahau and the Park needs to be based on ‘low-impact’ tourism. Many fear the loss of the quality experience due to signs of overcrowding during the peak season along the Astrolabe Roadstead, which is at the southern end of the Park (see also Figure 6.19, p.149).

The number of businesses offering kayaking tours and water transportation is increasing and a Marahau-based business manager pointed out ‘there is one person after the other, the numbers of operators are increasing and the quality is decreasing. Kayaking companies are running five or six trips out, there is a social kind of limit there’. For another Marahau-based operator:

‘It is the most common thing that people mention the crowds. Five years ago it was more a wilderness trip than nowadays. They pretty much enjoy the trip, but it is pretty busy. Still, people come out with a positive feel about it’.

An outside business mentioned that ‘increasingly comments are coming back from the second generation family members that it is not the same as it was’. Businesses fear that ‘wrong or no planning will increase the congestion problem coming up on the tracks and the beaches’. That will have a direct effect on the ‘quality experience’ and they blame the government agencies for it, saying ‘they can’t think outside the square and

couldn't be bothered'. Some feel powerless and said 'we are just a little fish in the big sea and they do not give a toss'.

Having a marine reserve along the Abel Tasman coastline was suggested. This might encourage ecotourism. For the future, one outside business pointed out:

'The challenge with the Abel Tasman and Marahau is generally to get diversification of the product, and not have everyone looking everyone over the shoulder and replicating what they are doing. That is where Marahau's future lies. There are the four-wheel motorbikes which started here and it is different and complements, you need the complementary type of activities around Marahau for balance'.

An outside company emphasised that 'we need to find different products so that we do not step on each other's toes'.

Most tourism businesses think that there is a need to offer more quality experience and step aside from high volume tourism. One outside operator suggests that 'it will be an environmental-tourism product. The tourists look for sun, sea, romance and sand. It twists slightly, but that is the perception of a South Island paradise'. And further, 'people come here for remoteness and solitude and you do not get that over summer there at all, realistically something has to happen'. The issue another outside operator mentioned is 'there are lots more people with less time. Before people had a week or ten days, now we get people they have three hours or just tomorrow'. Therefore, a business in Marahau predicted 'I think that the day trips will increase, the trend is to more and more shorter trips and less people doing long trip'. Another business in Marahau agrees that 'people just do not allow enough time. They are all on such a tight schedule, everyone goes rush, rush, rush'.

The competition for time of many visitors is increasingly becoming an influencing factor to consider, as one outside company remarked:

'We are learning the expectations of the market, that if you are for example an American you have two weeks' holiday and it takes two days to get here and two days to get home, so you have ten days in New Zealand. If you do three days kayaking it is 30% of their whole annual holiday and so you are competing for their time, not money. The cost of your trip is the least of their consideration'.

Also, 'people are more interested in having a good time, than they are interested in history' another business operator in Marahau points out.

The lack of communication and cooperation between Marahau-based companies is another important issue for outside tourism businesses. One business reports that ‘we have major communication problems with the operators in Marahau’. For another operator, ‘Marahau is a bit focused on their patch and it is not sustainable to be so focused on MATO. It would be better to communicate and work together’. The relationship has just recently changed as:

‘It used to be that everyone gets on very well, but since two years everyone just does their own thing, we still get on, but the way it is going, it is basically we are competing for a lot more business’.

The majority of outside tourism businesses also chose to work for lifestyle reasons. However, they face a dilemma, because they sometimes have to choose between the lifestyle and growing the business. An outside operator stressed that ‘in reality we work for lifestyle, but we do not have a life here. We do not finish until 11.00 pm, but we want to have a lifestyle and an income basically and not grow too much’. Therefore, ‘we do not really want to get big like all the other companies and say we are not growing, but adding a few more boats on each year. I would rather do cottage (boutique) kayaking and have a really good product, not trying to push more people all the time’. In contrast, another outside business stated their dilemma as ‘we need to extend the business, we turn so many down, and they sit on the beach’. One outside operator remarked further: ‘we are becoming too big and it becomes like a supermarket, you send people in the front and out of the back’.

Similarly, for Marahau-based businesses a common reason to have started to operate a business was for lifestyle reasons. One operator explained that he wants to live in Marahau and needed something that he could make a living from, without commuting to Nelson every day. Another operator agreed: ‘we found out Marahau has a high quality of life, good potential for business, so we focused our interest here’. This operator further remarked that ‘I will keep this business, not expand, I am here for the lifestyle not for the profit. I have to have a vibrant business to keep up the lifestyle’. Some of the businesses in Marahau close down during the winter season. However, the outside counterparts face the same dilemma, as this operator mentioned: ‘basically we want to just live here quietly but the cost is that I pretty much work constantly, ultimately I would not like to be in tourism. It is a very competitive business’. One business in Marahau warns: ‘people would say they want to keep the status quo, but in a

competitive environment you can't stay there and you got philosophical reasons and the market will tell you otherwise. If an opportunity comes up, do you grab it or let it go? If you do not grab it, someone else might. I think that most of my fellow operators will say, we are happy where we are now and want to sustain our quality of lifestyle and not flog Abel Tasman Park to death and want to be reasonable and responsible operators, but the market demands are often contrary to that lip service' (see also Ateljevic *et al.*, 1999).

The management dispute over the foreshore was another theme that was addressed during the interviews. Some suggestions were: 'DoC shouldn't control the foreshore. If DoC takes a percentage out of us, and they say it is overcrowded in their opinion so that it does not get overcrowded they would raise the percentage'. Some tourism businesses do not trust the government, as this outside operator puts it: 'they can just do whatever they want. Once they get control they will start charging and they can do everything, I just do not trust them'. Access to the Park seems to be another major concern. One outside operator pointed out:

'The average New Zealander has to pay more and will not be able to use the Abel Tasman, because it is getting too expensive. The Park gets less accessible to the average New Zealander. I used to say the Abel Tasman is owned by the people of New Zealand, now I say it is owned by the people of the world, because the international tourist uses it more than the average Kiwi'.

Another outside operator pointed out:

'Initially I was for limited numbers, but it becomes a bit of a circus. The business has to expand, because everyone is doing that. It is becoming like a race and if you do not do it business wise, that would be it. It would be far better to have a system, where there are so many kayaks and it stops people coming in. It keeps the goose, which lays the golden egg'.

This outside operator shared this view: 'we are into keeping the environment as nice as we can, keep limits on the business that is fine. It keeps it strong as long as it does not go into government pockets'. One reaction to restrictions was 'we just go with what the market dictates, obviously if legislation comes through and numbers get limited, sweet as, but until that happens we will just grow'.

The intensive competitive environment explains the sensitivity to data collection, monitoring and evaluation regimes by tourism businesses. The concern is that competitors might have access to the data and this could result in an advantage for

them. However, as this Marahau tourism business remarked that ‘the first step to good management is good information’. Although every agency and some tourism businesses gather data, but there is little collective data-sharing. Tourism businesses in Marahau were reluctant to divulge information on the scale of their operations due to commercial sensitivity (Pusinelli, 1999). This high commercial sensitivity towards data collection and sharing is a fundamental problem to the management of tourism-related issues and implementing common standards (Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment, 1997).

6.3 VISITORS’ CHARACTERISTICS

The visitor data are distinguished between *international*¹⁶ and *domestic*¹⁷ visitors. The major visitor characteristics are summarised in the accompanying tables by distinguishing between the two groups. Before investigating the visitors’ perceptions it is essential to have information on their characteristics. A total of 378 interviews were conducted, of which 32% were domestic and 68% international visitors to Marahau and the Park (see Figure 6.5). The visitor results showed a higher number of international visitors before Christmas. This changes with the beginning of the annual summer school holidays in New Zealand with a higher number of domestic visitors until the end of January. Then the international visitors increase again. As indicated by tourism operators, the average distribution of domestic and international visitors is about equal.

Figure 6.5: Distribution by Nature of Experience of Visitors

¹⁶ The *international visitor* is characterised as being from other countries than New Zealand and not permanently living anywhere in New Zealand.

¹⁷ The *domestic visitor* is characterised as living in New Zealand and being away from their usual place of residence for a short period of time.

Place of residence in the sample of domestic visitors is presented in Figure 6.6 and shows that the dominant traditional market (see Latitude Nelson, 2000) was Christchurch, followed by Nelson with emerging markets like Wellington and Auckland.

Figure 6.6: Place of Origin - Domestic Visitors

Internationally, the European markets of Germany, England, Holland and Switzerland accounted for the greatest number of visitors, followed by Australia, United States and Japan (see Figure 6.7, p.135). This pattern of visitation is different from the overall visitation to New Zealand.

Figure 6.7: Place of Origin - International Visitors

The age distribution in Figure 6.8, p.136 indicates that 72% of the international and domestic visitors were between 20-24, 25-34 or 35-44 of age. About fifty percent of international visitors were between 25-34. The age distribution is more equally across the 20-24, 25-34 and 35-44. The gender distribution in the sample is presented in Appendix 6.1, p.239 and shows that only 4% more females were interviewed.

Figure 6.8: Age Profile of Domestic vs. International Visitors

Thirty eight percent of all visitors were professional, technical or related workers, 21% were students or retired and 17% were sales and service workers (see Figure 6.9).

Figure 6.9: Occupation Profile of Domestic vs. International Visitors

The international visitors had a higher average income than the domestic visitor (see Figure 6.10, p.137).

Figure 6.10: Income Profile of Domestic vs. International Visitors

About fifty percent of all visitors surveyed stayed one to three nights in Marahau. The domestic visitor stayed up to 14 nights, while the international visitor stayed up to five nights only in Marahau (see Figure 6.11).

Figure 6.11: Number of Nights of Domestic vs. International Visitors

The average length of stay was 2.22 nights by international and 4.36 nights by domestic visitors. As one domestic visitor commented 'we have one holiday a year with at least two or three weeks, probably throughout the year another three weekends away of two

or three days'. For the majority of international visitors, the Park is only one of many destinations on their visit to New Zealand. As this comment about their overall travel in New Zealand suggested 'we arrived in Auckland and we have been in New Zealand for about eight weeks. We spent about seven weeks on the North Island and have been on the South Island for about two weeks so far. We are here for three and a half months and we fly out of Christchurch'. The majority of comments suggested that international visitors do not spend a long time in one destination, because they have short holidays and intend to visit as many places as possible.

The main reason that visitors come to Marahau and the Abel Tasman National Park is for a holiday (86%). Domestic visitors are more likely to visit friends and relatives, to come for sports or activity or for a short break than international visitors (see Figure 6.12).

Figure 6.12: Purpose of Visit Profile of Domestic vs. International Visitors

Overall, 80% travelled as a couple or with family and friends, 13% travelled alone and 7% were part of a tour group. Significantly more domestic visitors were travelling with family and friends (47%) and only 8% were travelling alone (see Figure 6.13, p.139). This may reflect the sampling during school holidays, when entire families spent their holiday together at one of the campgrounds. Thirty two percent of international visitors were travelling with family and friends and 16% were travelling alone (see Figure 6.13, p.139).

Figure 6.13: Group Makeup Profile of Domestic vs. International Visitors

Eighty percent of domestic visitors travelled by private car. On the other hand, the international visitors choice was more evenly distributed in the sample with 27% using a rental car, 21% renting a campervan, 20% using public or shuttle buses, 14% on a tour bus and 13% travelling in a private car (see Figure 6.14).

Figure 6.14: Mode of Travel Profile of Domestic vs. International Visitors

The most common type of accommodation chosen by visitors was the campervan or tent site on camping grounds (41%), followed by backpackers (7%) and motels/chalets (5%). The type of accommodation utilised was almost equally distributed throughout the domestic and international visitor market. The only exception was that 22% of

international visitors stayed in campervans in comparison to only 3% of domestic visitors (see Figure 6.15).

Figure 6.15: Type of Accommodation Profile used by Domestic vs. International Visitors

The domestic visitors' sources of information were mainly friends or relatives, local travel guides and magazines. The responses included comments such as 'I heard it from people that have been here before' or 'it was in the Automobile Association Accommodation Guide'. The suggestion of friends and relatives play a major role in the decision-making process, as this comment of a domestic visitor reflected: 'my friend told me that was the best thing to do here, the kayaking around here'. For many domestic visitors the Park is a well-known destination:

'It is been well-known, I have lived in New Zealand for my whole life and I know all about the walks around New Zealand, so I think it has been fairly well publicised. I have quite a few friends who have done it over the years'.

Similarly another visitor reported 'we knew about it, because I was born and brought up in Motueka and I have been to Kaiteriteri when I was younger'.

Many international visitors mention the travel guides and the recommendation by friends and relatives, as a source of information. These included remarks such as 'I have a girlfriend in Germany and she was here and she said the Abel Tasman National Park is beautiful, very beautiful, one of the nicest area in New Zealand', 'we heard about the Park from friends and it is also in a lot of brochures and in the Lonely Planet guide' or

‘in our travel guide there are some pictures of the Park and so we decided to see it live’. The Internet was another source of information mentioned by a few of international visitors.

6.4 MARAHAU ‘STEPPING IN AND OUT’

The statements of visitors reflect that the Park is the key motivating factor to come to Marahau. It was problematic to only investigate the perception of visitors about Marahau, because as one international visitor mentioned ‘you’re just stepping in and out of this place’. She explained further: ‘we did not look at it closely, we just passed by looking for a campground and did not really look at Marahau’. Another international visitor emphasised that many visitors just pass through Marahau. He said ‘what we have done is travel in a car along this main road and then along the coast a bit when we were looking for accommodation and there is not that much to see around here’. International visitors also indicated that they do not know much about Marahau or simply have never heard of Marahau before. This shows that visitors come to Marahau to explore the Park and Marahau is the closest they could get to its entrance (see Figure 6.16).

Figure 6.16: The Sandy Bay Road in Marahau – Main Road

Table 6.2: 'Likes' about Marahau and the Abel Tasman National Park

Categories	Examples of 'Likes' about Marahau and the Abel Tasman National Park identified by Visitors (N=378) ¹⁸	Total ¹⁹
Abel Tasman National Park (ATNP)	ATNP is beautiful, like a dream, place on haven, not having dogs in the ATNP, toilets along the way, DoC facilities taken care of, interesting historical facts, no rubbish, great walking, walking for all age groups, good directions when walking, fantastic place for walks, well maintained track, tell my friends to go	150
Beaches/ Coastline	Beautiful beaches, stunning nice bays, small bays, sandy golden beaches, stunning coastline, coastal scenery, big tide difference, beach at low tide, nice lagoons/ estuary	103
Landscape/ Scenery	Great scenery, spectacular scenery, magnificent views, views on beaches, landscape, it's very beautiful, green environment, mountain, mixture between water and forest scenery, surroundings	101
Marahau	It's lovely, good place to chill out and relax, nice and quiet, a great place, the nicest place we've stayed so far, very beautiful and a good place to stay, better than Kaiteriteri, good casual feeling, good to have in short time, family orientation, wish we had longer	60
Flora	Pure nature, wonderful nature, diverse nature, plants, flora, vegetation, native bush, big ferns, places with the ferns, native tree species,	55
Not Crowded	Not (too) crowded, not overcrowded, no mass tourism, quieter than Kaiteriteri, seems to be soft tourism, does not matter to meet 5 or 20 people, sparsely populated, wide open space of the beach, freedom	41
Social Interaction	Helpfulness of people, really friendly people, relaxed and friendly people, nice and kind people, friendly staff, meeting people from all over the world, community spirit, friendly atmosphere, DoC employees	33
Location/ Access	Gateway to the ATNP, close to good beaches, access to activities, close to Nelson, close to Wellington, nearest to Motueka, good transport system	31
Fauna	Birds, wildlife, fauna, animals, touching seals, seals, shells, shells nice memory and souvenir	31
Sea/Water	Ocean is very beautiful, blue water, colour of the sea, clear water, sheltered sea	31
Weather/ Atmosphere	Great weather, climate, warm, sunny, sunshine, clouds, fresh air, clean air	29
Recreational Activities	Kayaking, kayak through the waves, good kayak guide, nice meal, plenty of outdoor activities, a little bit of everything, tramping, swimming, sunbathing, collecting cockles, fishing, water taxi	28
Accommodation	Good campground facilities, beautiful sites, large campsites, nice shady campsite, accommodation	24
Information Services	Tour operators seem well organise, good service, good Park information, the very nice stuff in the Info Centre, no entrance fee	21
Café/ Art and Craft	Café, banana thick shake in the café, café was nice, Art shop, awesome craft shop, carvings	17
Development	Not over commercialised, undeveloped, country unspoiled, almost untouched, balance between well-built and left-alone,	15
Infrastructure /Facilities	Road access, shortage of roads, great flat roads for bikers, facilities, top conditions, good infrastructure/ everything well maintained, computer facilities	13
Tranquility/ Remoteness	Peaceful, quietness, tranquility, away from civilisation, privacy	12
No'Likes'	Have not seen Marahau	4

¹⁸ For more detailed results see Appendix 6.2, p.239.

¹⁹ This total reflects the number of 'likes' mentioned for each category by visitors.

Visitors have a variety of images about Marahau and its people. It is envisaged as a traditional farming community where people are retired or involved in tourism. This domestic visitor thought ‘people here are very environmentally conscious. It is a very tidy community with not too much exploitation’. One international visitor viewed Marahau as a ‘hippie place’ and said that it is a relaxed place to go for a holiday. Marahau seemed to be perceived as absolutely wonderful. It has a community spirit that visitors consider doesn’t exist anywhere else. As this international visitors commented: ‘in a place where commercial forces are obviously in action you usually find they are stepping over each other and hurt each other as badly as they can, but they don’t here’. Generally the visitors perceived that there are a lot of people living in Marahau and it is only the launching point for the track. In particular some of the European visitors emphasised the size of the community: ‘it doesn’t seem like a community or a little town, it just seems like a gathering of some houses’ and ‘it is quite small, just 10 or 15 buildings’. These responses represent the images visitors have about Marahau when they visit it for the first time (see also Table 6.2, p.142).

6.4.1 ‘GATEWAY’ TO THE ABEL TASMAN NATIONAL PARK

Marahau is the ‘gateway’ to the Park particularly for international visitors, as one explained ‘it is the main gate to the Park and it is a good point to go, it is near to the entrance and it is a lovely spot’. The visitors have read about the Park in their travel guides and reported ‘it is all in the Lonely Planet, and we decided to go to the nearest town, and that is Marahau’. Another visitor said ‘we tried to come as close to the Park as possible, and we had a look at the accommodation guide then on the map and came here’. Other visitors came to Marahau, because they did not want to stay in Nelson or Motueka and searched for something more remote.

The return visit is important for the tourism industry in the region (see Milne, 2000). There are different motivational factors, for some domestic visitors it is the outdoor life: ‘we do a lot of sport, kayaking, I run and cycle and we like to camp and the camp here is lovely, they have a lot of space for us and the kids. We have been here three years in a row’ and ‘my motivation is just exercise really, scenery, sunshine, it is a very easy accessible trail and the chance you get for swimming so close by, also the views are nice’. Others preferred Marahau ‘because it looks nice, it is close, not too far to go to

town, quiet, we just love the natural surroundings, the bush, the birds' or simply 'we like it here, it is peaceful'.

Marahau is relatively close to Nelson city (one hour by car) and Motueka (twenty minutes by car) and therefore, is very popular for visitors from those places. Marahau attracts the long-term visitor, because of its 'spaciousness', 'lack of commercialism' and 'good facilities'. One visitor commented:

'It is the space and we love the great outdoors and we have room to put our gear and we can spread out and have a camping holiday, that is what we like, good facilities. Right to our doorstep we have everything we need. It is close to everything, like Motueka or Nelson and for the fact that it is isolated, so natural and beautiful and that it is not commercialised in any way, that is what we come here for'.

The shopping and facilities nearby are also important. A visitor commented 'I like to have the convenience of shops and that is not that far to go either, if we want anything we go into town. So, we are close to the real world in our two-week holiday'. Therefore, the isolation and remoteness that presents peace and rurality is more attractive when close to city-life and conveniences. The following comment summarises this:

'What I like about it here is that you have got an environment like this, but twenty minutes down the road you can have the other side of life if you want it in Motueka. Lovely surroundings, the options are good, you can go kayaking, walking, boating and there are lots of options in reach'.

Kayaking is one of the main activities visitors come for. The great condition along the Abel Tasman coastline for sea kayaking and its international reputation draws in the majority of visitors. A domestic visitor stated:

'Well, I think what makes this place so appealing is that there is kayaking available. Having done a lot of walking in other parts of the South Island, I would come back here and send a lot of people up here, because being able to be on the water has a different appeal'.

Another reason for choosing to visit the Park is because of its accessibility for all age groups and especially for children. One international visitor pointed out: 'we have a baby and a three-year-old and the Park seemed like a place we could come to meet everybody's needs'. This was also true for a domestic visitor: 'it has a lot of things going on for kids. What makes the place so appealing is that you can take a water taxi up and back and that caters for each age group'.

The statements show that international visitors are in the region for the first time and find that Marahau surpasses their expectations. One international visitor commented:

‘the inlet with the golden sands and the bush was what I expected, but the sheer beauty of it, of this lookout and the beaches, it is so peaceful’. For international visitors remoteness and rurality is important in their choice of destinations. In this respect Marahau is how the visitors imagined New Zealand to be, ‘the rural stuff, just a really nice spot to chill for a while’. An American visitor explained:

‘Honestly, I thought it might be a little larger because it is close to a National Park and in the United States the towns immediately outside a National Park are larger. I did pass through Motueka and that looked more like the type of town you expect to be outside a National Park, but it is still quite a distance from Marahau to Motueka. I expected Marahau to be larger, perhaps to have a gas station, a bar, a hotel, and all the things I expected in the extremities of a National Park in the United States’.

A domestic visitor on his first visit was also surprised:

‘I think it is smaller than I expected it to be. I thought the art shop up here was just amazing. I think I expected the entrance to the Abel Tasman walk to be a little bit more dramatic, like a big sign start here. But it is a really lovely place with all the opportunities and different things to do. The people are amazingly friendly, for me that is a real plus’.

6.4.2 ‘QUIET’ AND ‘NON-COMMERCEALISED’

Common descriptions from visitors about Marahau include adjectives such as beautiful, small, quiet and relaxing, which reflect the key motivations to stay in Marahau (see Table 6.2, p.142). This comment exemplifies the general feeling: ‘we have just come across this beautiful little place. It is idyllic, it is absolutely beautiful, and we are so happy to be in this spot today. It is better than I thought it would be’. One international visitor said, ‘it seems like a small, sleepy place, I don’t know if it is true, but that’s the impression I got, which is quite nice after the big cities, the smaller places seem to be the more pleasant ones’. Another visitor reported that ‘Marahau seems very sparsely populated, but again this is what we wanted to see, and as soon as we walked in here we felt welcome immediately and we are just staying here’.

The important characteristics of Marahau for visitors are shown in remarks like no crowds, non-touristy and not commercialised. The majority of international visitors commented that ‘Marahau is beautiful, absolutely beautiful, we wanted something, which is less touristy, something more relaxed, not crowds of people’. International visitors have often travelled around New Zealand or worldwide and so compare Marahau to other places.

Comments like the following reflect their positive view of Marahau:

‘Compared to other places I’ve been, it doesn’t seem very touristy, because it is not lined with shops. I guess, it is touristy from the perspective that there are a lot of people and signs offering tours, but it doesn’t seem like there are tons of people here’.

The comments indicate that Marahau is perceived as beautiful and relaxing, because it is non-touristy and non-crowded, e.g. ‘it is an ideal place to come if you want to get away from a lot of people, but not too far away from everything’, ‘I like Marahau it is quiet and simple and not too touristy’ or ‘I think it is just the beauty of it, it is not crowded, not many people, it is so unspoiled’.

The domestic visitors generally described Marahau as beautiful and quiet and also commented on the bush and bird life. One domestic visitor said, ‘I love this place. It is so beautiful. I will surely come back’. Marahau is close to other centres and it easy to get to, which is an important factor for domestic visitors. A Nelson resident explained:

‘We find it really relaxing and it is only an hour away, so you work to half past four and then come over here, it is so relaxing and there is always something going on. I have come here for 25 years’.

Similarly, one visitor emphasised that ‘this place is ideal for anyone from Christchurch and Dunedin, so a lot of people come here year after year, because it is lovely and it is not a crowded campground’. Another domestic visitor said ‘it is nice, it has retained the kiwi flavour, sort of very relaxed and laid-back, not particularly organised, very nice, stress-free, probably being near the ocean helps too’ (see also Table 6.2, p.142).

Domestic visitors made similar comments to the international visitors, such as ‘this is what we came for. This place, there are no other people around you, really quiet, we don’t like camping where you can hear people snoring next to your tent’. Many comments focused on the campgrounds, one visitor pointed out ‘I think people enjoy the peace and quietness around here, it is a good campground and facilities are good’. It is an ‘escape’ for visitors from the usual environment in getting away from the rush in the cities. They are mainly people interested going for walks and enjoying the Park and its beaches.

Kaiteriteri is mentioned as an example of a developed area that people want to avoid during their holidays. Domestic visitors remarked: ‘we knew we did not want to come to Kaiteriteri, because we knew it would be very crowded’ and ‘I would never ever go

to Kaiteriteri for a holiday, just for a day, because it is too crowded’. International visitors, who experienced Kaiteriteri for the first time, reported that they were pleased to be in Marahau: ‘I am glad to move on and not stay in Kaiteriteri’ and ‘we stayed a day in Kaiteriteri and that’s nice, but as soon as we came to Marahau we thought this was lovely. It is quieter, less commercialised, we love it, it is great’.

This difference, in the stage of development and commercialism, between Kaiteriteri and Marahau makes the latter more attractive for some visitors. The reasons are, as an international visitor stated: ‘Marahau is nice. It is small and has not so many tourists. When we came here we travelled to Kaiteriteri and there is a big campground for 450 people and we moved on to this place. I think it is better, it is quieter’. These comments show that the visitors coming to Marahau are attracted because it is different from Kaiteriteri in relation to social impacts, such as crowding and commercialism. In contrast only a couple of visitors commented that Marahau is ‘a really busy place’. These few negative comments about Marahau related to increasing commercialism, such as ‘too small for all the people to come’, ‘too much noise’ and ‘noise of tractors’ (see Table 6.3, p.153).

The qualities of Marahau, especially its non-touristy, non-commercialised and uncrowded aspects, indicate that there is a need to sustain these qualities, because they are vital to visitors. The perceived social effects of tourism, such as crowding or commercialisation, are already reflected in the statements of visitors.

6.5 THE ‘TASMAN DANCE’

There is a link between the perceptions of visitors to the Park and the future development of Marahau. In regards to tourism development the experience of visitors and its meaning plays a major role. The social and environmental impacts that result from tourism-related activities influence the image of the Park and thus, determine the future of Marahau. The Nelson region and Marahau depend economically on a positive image of the Park for the long-term sustainability of the tourism industry and for the communities tourism takes place in. The statements of visitors show that there is a change of perceived social impacts in the Park becoming evident. The domestic visitors talk about the ‘Tasman Dance’, implying that there are more encounters with visitors in the Park than there used to be 20 years ago. There is a difference in perception by

domestic and international visitors about the Park. They also engage in different forms of activities and visit different places (see Figure 6.17 and 6.18).

Figure 6.17: Places Visited by Domestic vs. International Visitors

Figure 6.18: Activities Profile of Domestic vs. International Visitors

Around 85% of international visitors sampled took day-trips into the Park, while 15% walked the entire coastal track and none walked the inland track. The international visitor visit would include taking a water taxi into or out of the Park and walking parts of the coastal track. As these visitors' statements reflect: 'we have been on a six hour walk in the National Park and just went up to Anchorage by boat and then walked out' or 'we just wanted to go walking in the Park and then take a boat back'. However, only a few visitors do longer trips and walk the coastal track from Marahau to Torrent Bay. This international visitor stated 'we did a two-day walk in the Park, we went out with the water taxi and walked back the whole day'. Another international visitor mentioned:

'We went to Akerston Bay with a kayak trip for one day and it was very nice because we did not have to paddle back because sailed back, it was very comfortable'.

Others stay a few days in Marahau and undertake day-trips, as one visitors' comment shows: 'the first day we went to Torrent Bay and walked back to Marahau, and the second day we went to Bark Bay and went back to Marahau'. The busiest section of the Park is the Astrolabe Roadstead that these statements reflect upon, and this is located at the southern end of the Park (see Figure 6.19).

Figure 6.19: Abel Tasman National Park looking south towards Marahau

(Source: Morath, 1999)

Thirty-one percent of international visitors sampled took a water taxi trip to Anchorage or Bark Bay and walked back to Marahau (see Figure 6.18, p.148). They seemed to enjoy the convenience of a water taxi or ferry ride to experience the coastline. One international visitor commented on the service ‘I like the fact that you can catch a water taxi or ferry back, that’s a really nice thing to come back on a little boat and see the coastline that you haven’t seen on the walk’. A water taxi operator, however, points out that most of his trips go to Awaroa and the majority of clients walk from Tonga to Torrent Bay²⁰.

In comparison, only 6% of the domestic visitors took a water taxi into the Park and went walking (see Figure 6.18, p.148). Therefore, domestic visitors are more likely to spend more time in the first section of the Park, usually up to Coquille Bay/Appletree Bay and in Marahau. One domestic visitor said: ‘I just walked to Tinline Bay, pretty easy walk’. Although domestic visitors also undertake the same activities as international visitors, as this comment reflects ‘we went three days kayaking and today just gone up the Park for a picnic into the Park up to Apple Tree Bay’. Another domestic visitor described their activities as ‘day one we walked to Appletree Bay and back, day two we kayaked to Appletree Bay and back, and day three which is today we went to Split Apple Rock beach’. Domestic visitors usually also engage in other activities such as fishing and biking: ‘I just want something good to fish’ and ‘we went biking, towards Kaiteiteri, lots of things to do here’.

6.5.1 ‘STUNNING BEACHES’ AND ‘LOVELY COASTLINE’

Visitors describe the key attributes of the Park as stunning beaches, lovely coastline and wonderful scenery (see Table 6.2, p.142). Other statements refer to the combination of ‘bush and beaches’ as a difference to other places in New Zealand. As these international visitors described it: ‘it is nice, a bit different things, like nice beaches and quite nice forest’ or ‘it is a mixture between rainforest and sandy beaches, the whole nature is beautiful’. Another visitor stated ‘I really liked it, the clear water, the places are really amazing’. One visitor commented on the presentation of the Park in brochures and how he experienced it in reality.

²⁰ My sample does not include many visitors who have taken a water taxi into the Park and out again, because I interviewed at the DoC Visitor Information Centre, which is located at the exit/entrance of the Park, not at the Water Taxi base.

He said:

‘It was beautiful, quite similar to the brochures. I remember remarking how lovely the beaches and the coastline looked and wondered if it would be that nice in reality, and it was and especially on a day with this good weather as we had. It is stunning, lovelier bays than I imagined and the track was not as busy as I thought’.

Other remarks of international visitors included: ‘it was great and spectacular. The beaches are probably the highlight of the Park’ and ‘it is a very nice place to be’ (see Figure 6.20).

Figure 6.20: Coquille Beach in the Abel Tasman National Park close to Marahau

International visitors also made comparisons with their countries of origin or their last visits. One remark was: ‘the beaches are white like snow, the blue water, nobody there, like in paradise, you can’t compare it to Germany’. Another experience was:

‘I find the coastline stunning. It is the most attractive part really, the beaches, the sea, and all the physical things. It is the backdrop, when you are kayaking the backdrop is just stunning. We have got National Parks in Britain, but it is quite different to what you get here in New Zealand. National Parks here have got real wilderness which doesn’t exist in the United Kingdom, I guess it is because we have a lot more people’.

Domestic visitors commented on the Park in a similar way as their international counterparts. Statements included: ‘I love it, it is better the deeper you go, it is beautiful, very untouched’ and ‘some of the beaches are absolutely beautiful’. They also commented on the presentation of photographs they have seen and compared these with their perceived reality. A visitor remarked: ‘I have seen photographs of the Park and I was wondering if the beach actually really look as golden and the sea looks as blue-green, and I was amazed when we went on the walk that they really do look like those photos’. Visitors’ statements emphasise the beaches as a point of difference to other places in New Zealand. This comment illustrates this: ‘I think with the golden beaches, it is different to the other hiking in New Zealand. I think it is really beautiful and the good thing about it is that anyone could really do it’. This latter aspect is that the track is considered easy in comparison to other tramping areas in the country, as this visitor explained: ‘it is pretty nice if people want a first experience of tramping, because it is easy and everything is very organised’.

Many domestic visitors perceive the Park as ‘an extension of home’ or as their ‘backyard’. It is one of the places they take their own visitors, because it is close and very accessible. Some domestic visitors stated that meeting international visitors on the track added to their overall experience. As this comment reflected:

‘I think that is interesting, saying hello to the people as you are going by, as you pass them and you have got the stream of people coming past you as they are going the other way on the track. It is interesting to hear all the nationalities’.

Another remark was ‘that was quite neat, wherever we go people say hi always with a different accent. Who needs to go overseas when everybody comes here, it is amazing, a lot of nationalities here. We really enjoy meeting people from overseas’.

6.5.2 ‘GETTING MORE CROWDED’

Visitors mentioned the issue of crowding in the Park, with comments such as ‘it is getting more crowded over the years’, ‘it is busier this year than last year’, ‘lots of people here’, ‘too many kayakers’ and ‘too many water taxis’ (see Table 6.3, p.153). Some visitors stated: ‘I try to avoid the crowds, so I’ll move on’. The perceptions of crowding are high in the Park, and an assessment of social impacts indicated that there could be problems with the visitor experience in the future with an increase in user-

levels, especially through social congestion and disturbance by motorboats (see also Department of Conservation, 1995a, 5).

Table 6.3: 'Dislikes' about Marahau and the Abel Tasman National Park

Categories	Examples of 'Dislikes' about Marahau and the Abel Tasman National Park identified by Visitors Comments (N=378) ²¹	Total ²²
No 'Dislikes'	Nothing/ Have not seen Marahau	56
Crowding	Got more crowded over the years, ATNP is much busier than it was, lots of people here, crowded beaches, too busy in the main season, lots of people at southern end of the Park, so many tourists from overseas, I tend to avoid the crowds and so I'll be moving on, too many kayakers, Too many water taxis/ smell from the boats was annoying	49
Flora	Bush not as nice as expected, too much gorse, not enough native bush, lack of trees on the foreshore, looks like the North Island, sandflies	36
Weather	Cold wind, strong wind, weather is changeable, lack of sunshine, cloudy mornings, too cold, rainy	34
Recreational Experience/ Activities	Getting in and out of the kayaks takes too much time, no short term kayaks, kayak tour quite expensive, silly tractor ride, tractor boat ride for aqua taxi, limited offer at Christmas, prices are quite high for water taxi, jet skis, too much preplanning like booking, naked people, no bikes	27
Marahau	Noise of tractors, would not be a great area to stay, do not like it at all, too small for all the people to come, lack of a decent swimming beach, lack of transport, tides go out too far, fishing the bay out	23
Shops and Restaurants	Price of beer, expensive shop, expensive café, expensive to buy, not enough restaurants, no pub, no supermarket, no bottle store, shops close early	21
Abel Tasman National Park (ATNP)	Septic toilets, stinky smelly toilets, not enough toilets, lack of rubbish removal facilities, more rest areas on the track, Giardia, drinking water should be here at info centre, water not so clean as it used to be, private land that does not belong to the ATNP there were the nice places	17
Infrastructure Parking	Dust roads, windy roads, not enough parking, rubbish being thrown away, no jetty for getting out of the boat, no mobile phone access, no petrol station	17
Location/ No Facilities	Nothing to do, far from town, in the evening there is nothing to do, a long way to essential services e.g. bank, post office, too far from good shop supplies	12
Accommodation	Too many campgrounds, more choice of accommodation, the campground is moderate, camper vans can camp where ever they want/ no free camping	12
Tourist Information Services	Departure point of boats should be better sign posted, signs should have distances, park info centre, no telephone at info centre	6
Commercialism	Too commercial/ very commercialised/ its getting too commercialised	4

The statements of several international visitors reflected that the track is perceived as crowded at certain times of the year. For example they said: 'it is a very busy track to walk. If you compare it with the Queen Charlotte Walk there are not as many people, but it is more beautiful out here' or 'I saw too many people'.

²¹ For more detailed results see Appendix 6.3, p.242.

²² This total reflects the number of 'dislikes' mentioned for each category by visitors.

Some international visitors described their experience as:

‘There were quite a few people, we were surprised, because when we first got in our boat there were eight people, and four of us got dropped off, and we started walking and then a whole busload of thirty people came by’.

A similar story was: ‘on the first beach where we had morning tea there were a lot of people. We were the second people when we got there and about ten minutes later the beach was full’. Other comments supported this story, such as ‘there were so many other people that it was annoying’ or ‘there were many people and they were mainly in groups’ (see Figure 6.21). Other statements suggest that the encounter with other people has reached its limits. ‘Too many people’ for international visitors referred to a range of 50-100 or 120-130 people they encountered during their whole visit in the Park.

Figure 6.21: Kayakers on Akerston Beach in the Abel Tasman National Park

For domestic visitors tolerance was lower in regards to the number of encounters on the track. ‘Too many people’ refereed to an encounter of 30-50 people during their visit. They commented: ‘I don’t want it to get much busier’. The social carrying capacity is exceeded for domestic visitors by a lower number of encounters. These comments of domestic visitors confirmed this: ‘there are a lot of people in there, you pass people constantly’, ‘I would not want to get it much busier’ or ‘it spoils it a bit, the ideal is that nobody is there’. Some try to avoid the crowds, saying ‘I don’t think I would like it in a

few weeks, it is too busy, that's why we have come now'. On the other hand one domestic visitor argued that 'while there are sometimes too many people on the track, they are all very friendly and hey let's not be selfish'.

Some of the domestic visitors suggested limits on visitor numbers. One respondent said:

'Maybe some day there will be a restriction on people coming into the Park. I think it has an effect on the Park to be absolutely crammed full of people. I think it would be nice if you knew that there are certain times to come when it is not so busy, it is really important to us to avoid the crowds'.

Another domestic visitor points out:

'I think in total was quite ok, but not more people, kayaks and water taxis. At one beach we stopped for the lunch we saw a lot of people and it was too much. I think they shouldn't bring many more people in otherwise it is going to be too much. I think it is enough now'.

In conclusion the comments all lead to the overall perception that 'if there are more tourists or too many people they are going to destroy it'.

Some of the domestic visitors noticed a change from earlier visits, one stating 'I would say the biggest change is it is a lot busier, at least double as many people, and I was here at a busy time in 1993'. People expect to find the same level of crowdedness on their second trip that they did on the first. The crowded threshold is established by the first experience of, or exposure to, a given area. That means that each new generation of visitors might show a higher tolerance for crowding. The old generation will have varying crowding thresholds, depending on their first visited experience (Nielsen *et al.*, 1977).

The growing concern of domestic visitors was the increase in water taxis or motorboats and especially jet skis. This person noted:

'What I do not like are jet skis, they spoil it, the noise and they are dangerous and they detract from the natural attractions of this area. I can understand that they come in to do skiing on wonderful beaches and do that sort of thing, but they are mindless'.

Another comment emphasised that as well: 'I mean it takes away from the experience if you hear a boat going by, if they go backwards and forwards all the time'. It depends, however, on the person and the purpose of visit, as this comment shows:

'If you come in on a kayak and it is just full of people and there is a lot of noise and they are taking off on water skis on the beach. It is not the peaceful environment you expected to see and some people just look at it

differently. We were joking about it in the kayaks, ‘damn powerboat’, but we could easily come back in a powerboat and go ‘damn kayakers’.

However, for some international visitors the factor of crowding was not relevant to their overall experience. They feel, for example, that ‘there are a lot of people walking, but it does not feel crowded’ or ‘we were walking and met a few people, you don’t feel alone but there are not too many people, that is just a good mixture’. International visitors expected the Park to be busier and were prepared for experiencing more people than they did. As this remark reflects ‘we expected more people along the beaches and the walks and it did not seem to be that bad’. Another visitor stated:

‘I can only be complimentary about it. It is clearly a track that is heavily used. It is extremely well-managed, there are obviously a lot of people there today but you don’t get the feeling that you are crowded in and even with the kayaking yesterday, it was clearly very busy, there are dozens and dozens of kayaks out there’.

What constitutes crowding or solitude for a particular individual depends on crowding norms, which are influenced by the characteristics of the individual, of the people they encounter, and of the situation or location in which encounters occur (Shelby and Heberlein, 1986; Hendee *et al.*, 1990). The following comment confirms the different expectations and shows the subjective nature of the social carrying capacity:

‘I think it is very subjective. When I walk tracks in England there are people every five minutes, but if you walk tracks in other parts of the world you may not see people for a whole day. I did not find it too busy, I did not pass so many people; the huts and campsites weren’t so crowded. I come from a country which is pretty much the same landmass as New Zealand but whose population is about fifteen times that of New Zealand’.

A similar perspective was ‘we are used to more crowds, no it is not crowded at all, we saw a dozen, maybe half a dozen people the whole day’. Further comments of international visitors support these views:

‘I don’t think the place is too crowded, the only comparison we’ve got are beaches back home and it is virtually empty here compared to what we thought it would be like. We had the impression this place, especially the National Park area would be a lot busier than it was, but it was fairly empty’, ‘it is just nice because it is not too commercialised. There are not many people, not much chaos, whereas if you go to a place in Europe it is different’ and ‘if you would go anywhere in Europe where you’d have a place like this you’d have a huge campsite’.

6.6 'KEEP IT AS IT IS'

The visitors' statements show that Marahau and the Park should 'stay as it is' or 'be kept as it as it is'. The comments on improvement for the future were: 'keep commercialism to a minimum' and 'not too many tourists', while some others warned of the 'danger of tourism' (see Table 6.4).

Table 6.4: 'Improvements' for Marahau and the Abel Tasman National Park

Category	Examples of 'Improvements' for Marahau and the Abel Tasman National Park' identified by Visitors Comments (N=378) ²³	Total ²⁴
Nothing	Leave it as it is, should be kept like this, it's all right how it is, perfect place, it can't be improved, stay as beautiful and unspoiled, keep it quiet and natural, nothing	64
Shops and Restaurants Prices	(More) local shops, pub, bistro, cafés, restaurants, souvenirs, cheaper café, cheaper shop, for camping not so expensive	39
Development	Not to become more commercialised, keep small and not commercial, keep development to a minimum not to spoil the area, don't want a Kaiteriteri situation, don't spoil it like Rotorua or Taupo, not too many motel, less taxi services, no five star hotel, try not to ruin it	36
Facilities/Parking Roads	Steps down to the beach, jetty suitable for water taxi in rough weather, more toilets, playground, more facilities, better infrastructure, garbage cans, telescope for bird watching, secure car park, public transportation, in seasonal times more buses to Nelson, air taxi, improve Awaroa airstrip, email facilities, road signs to slow down, petrol station	28
Flora	Shrub cutting along roadside, gorse clearing, replanting, regenerating native bush, plant native trees on streets, more flowers	16
Recreational Experience/ Activities	Speed up starting and stopping the kayak tour, slightly more development in kayaking, slightly cheaper kayaking, windsurfing, bad weather activities, more choice in activities in the ATNP, boat charter, horse riding, golf course, more tours into ATNP to other places, how about the development of a dive spot?	15
Accommodation	More tourist flats at better prices, better motel accommodation, more upper market accommodation, free camping, bigger campgrounds	12
Tourist Information Services	Tourist info needs improvement, more detailed information, more info about fishing, DoC office, signpost on the ramp to get to the beach, guides for freedom walkers and kayakers	11
Crowding	Less tourists, not too many backpackers to make it crowded, it is just starting with boat developments, not become to overrun with us tourists, otherwise may lose it's charm, not too much population	8
Marahau	Too soon to say, not sure, would like to live here	5
Weather	Better weather, warmer climate, less rain, sunshine	5
Management/ Control	Limit the number of people on trails and kayak, control operators	4

²³ For more detailed results see Appendix 6.4, p.243.

²⁴ This total reflects the number of 'improvements' mentioned for each category by visitors.

For domestic visitors commercialism is increasing, as this comment reflects: ‘it is more commercialised now than it was. It was cheaper, more primitive and easy-going. All the services have improved and the accommodation, there is a lot more to cater for the increasing numbers’. The threshold for some visitors is different than for others. Another domestic visitor argued that ‘it is still easy-going, it is becoming commercialised and it is not too bad at the moment, but it shouldn’t grow any further’. Only a few suggested that ‘not much has changed, we noticed that they have put in new seating and it is still beautiful. We do not want too much change; we do not want it to be like Kaiteriteri’.

The overall agreement among the majority of domestic visitors was that they do not want any changes. They said that: ‘I would not like to see it changed’ or ‘I don’t want it changed. I want it the way it is. If you change it too much it is not going to be the place that we are going for’. Another visitor made a similar comment:

‘Leave this place as it is. Any improvements that you put in would spoil the charm and that would commercialise it. It is beautiful as it is, there is lots of nature around, lots of birds and green’.

Many referred to the increasing commercialism and recommend ‘keeping it as it is, do not let it get too touristy’ and ‘keep it as much the same way as possible, this is natural’.

The statements reflect what visitors fear for the future of Marahau and the Park. This comment described how one domestic visitor envisages Marahau’s future:

‘We often sit on the rocks and watch the moon come up. It is so peaceful. I really do not think they can keep it like that, because people from Nelson can drive here in one hour. All this will be subdivided and more holiday houses will be built and the Maori development will go ahead’.

The same fear is reflected in comments of other domestic visitors, such as ‘I think it is going to be really developed in a couple of years, there is a lot of land still available for subdivisions’.

The term ‘low-key tourism’ emerged in the context of future development visions. This comment from a domestic visitor reflects the perspective of many others on the future that:

‘Low-key tourism, not too many structures being build, no helicopters and that sort of stuff, tourism that works on a similar basis like ecotourism. Ecotourism is animal-friendly, dolphin-friendly, not destroying the Park, not changing features, minimum impact. Maybe Marahau could be developed a

bit more, maybe there is room for a little bit more development, but the Park shouldn't change, if that means control it by law, because you have to protect the Park primarily and make money secondarily'.

The possibility of controlling numbers was mentioned a few times as a way to manage development. These comments of other domestic visitors reflected that suggestion:

'I would like to see controlled operations on the number of people who come in here and set up. Too many people lead to overcrowding and competition ends up being messy. The operations and local services are very good here', and 'there is not enough beach space here for an unlimited number of kayaks. That would soon destroy it. Limits sometimes have to be put on, we put limits on the amount of fish we catch, maybe we can put limits on the number of people that can be in one place'.

International visitors made similar comments about the future of Marahau and the Park for example, they said: 'it should stay like it is in the future, no more tourists', 'it is important to preserve the things that make the flavour of here' and 'I think the nice thing about here is it isn't spoilt. I couldn't imagine more building and facilities'. Another argued: 'I could imagine that some people are quite keen on spoiling it, bringing in electricity and upgrading the lodges and stuff. I think for a couple of days people can easily be without electricity and comfort and they enjoy it'. One visitor likes Marahau the way it is and said 'I won't tell anybody because then there are too many people coming here, because it is not like Europe, it is not crowded'. There is an understanding that any change or development has an effect on the existing situation and eventually 'spoils' it. As this comment suggested 'to improve things you have to change them and to change them would spoil them, so I don't think there is anything I would like to be changed or improved'.

An international visitor argued that Marahau as it is now, is what visitors want to experience. He mentioned:

'There will always be a few people who say you're spoiling it by having a café, because then there will be a restaurant soon and there will be another café and so on, but that's what people want that are going to the Park, they're not explorers, not wild adventurers, you don't need mountaineer's skills to do it. So people who have done it want to sit down and have a coffee and relax. I would hate to see the whole area spoilt. It would be a pity to come back in ten years' time and find the whole land developed and they have all their summerhouses there and it would be like a gigantic summer resort, which is always possible'.

In regards to limits of encounter norms, as an approach to management, Canard (2000) provides a manageable indicator. For example, if there are 100 visitors in 25 groups, with four people per party on the track and all are going one direction. Say, five parties overtake five other parties, 20 people overtake 20 people equals 400 encounters. On a two way track with 50 people going north and 50 people going south the density is the same, so the number of encounters is 50 times 50 equals 2.500 encounters that is over six times the social interaction. By spacing the parties' launch times of the water taxis and having only a one way track, managers could theoretically reduce the encounter rate to zero, or at least to an agreed rate of social encounters (Canard, 2000).

The discussion suggests that Marahau is seen as small, beautiful, quiet and not commercialised and there are no crowds. The Park is described through its stunning beaches and lovely coastline. Although there are increasing voices that mention the crowds and the number of kayaks and water taxis they encountered during their visit that impacted on their experiences. There is a difference in the perception of social impacts especially between domestic and international visitors. The overall suggestion for the future of Marahau and the Park is the vision to 'keep it as it is'.

CHAPTER VII: THE COMMUNITY

7.1 INTRODUCTION

Tourism often takes place in or around a local community where people have to deal with the effects of development (Murphy, 1985). A significant aspect of sustainable tourism planning is to integrate the concerns of the community. Cooperation, participation and involvement of people in the planning process of tourism development need to occur if a sustainable tourism industry is to develop (Taylor, 1995).

This chapter focuses on perceptions of tourism held by the Marahau community as a significant stakeholder group. This is explored in the context of Marahau through the views of various community members. I draw upon the experiences of respondents in the past and present and explore their perspectives on the hopes and fears for the future of Marahau. The discussion includes the composition of the community and explores the meaning of the term ‘community’ for the people in Marahau.

The perspective local iwi have on future development is discussed. This chapter also presents the ‘local’ knowledge in PAGIS. I describe how the information is represented in different categories (see also CD-ROM). Although Marahau is made up by a diverse group of residents, the results show that the core aspirations and views held by various people have a common vision.

7.2 THE COMPOSITION OF THE ‘COMMUNITY’

In 1986, 81 residents lived in Marahau. This number doubled ten years later to a total of 165 people. The number of dwellings increased during this period from 45 to 69 (see Table 7.1, p.162). This reflects the increasing number of permanent and temporary residents in Marahau and is closely related to the increasing availability of subdivisions, so-called lifestyle blocks.

The community survey conducted with a total of 96 individuals interviewed identified three subgroups: landowners, bach-owners and residents (see Figure 7.1, p.162). The respondents commented on their perceived role in the community and on the different perceptions about development. The statements show that in general these subgroups

hold similar perceptions of Marahau and the Abel Tasman National Park. Moreover, the subgroups are made up of a variety of individuals with different characteristics and perceptions in particularities about Marahau.

Table 7.1: Total Population Resident in Marahau and Number of Dwellings

Year	Population Resident in Marahau ²⁵	Number of Dwellings
1986	81	45
1991	120	51
1996	165	69

(Source: Statistics New Zealand, 2000)

Landowners own or lease residential property and are permanent residents. Some own or operate tourism businesses (see Table 6.1, p.120). In only two cases did the landowners interviewed not reside in Marahau. The bach-owners own residential property and have holiday homes or 'baches'. The bach-owners are not involved in commercial tourism, but may rent out their baches to friends, relatives or others. Residents stay usually only for shorter periods and rent property. They usually work for tourism businesses in Marahau or Motueka or operate small tourism businesses.

Figure 7.1: Graph of Stakeholder Typology of Marahau Community

²⁵ The Marahau Meshblock (2366500) includes the area between Torrent Bay and Otuwhero River.

Seventy-nine percent of the sample is between 25-65 years of age and only 19% are over 65 years of age. Forty percent of the residents are between 25-34 years of age and 39% of the bach-owners are over 65 years of age, while 38% of the landowners are between 35-44 years of age (see Figure 7.2). The gender distribution shows that somewhat more males than females were interviewed (see Appendix 7.1, p.245).

Figure 7.2: Age Profile of the Marahau Community

Seventy-six percent of the respondents are New Zealand European, 19% European and only 2% are New Zealand Maori. The 19% Europeans are German, French, Dutch, British and Australians (see Figure 7.3).

Figure 7.3: Ethnicity Profile of the Marahau Community

The majority of all 57% respondents are couples with children. Whereas 81% of bach-owners and 54% of landowners are couples with children and 53% of the residents are couples with no children (see Figure 7.4).

Figure 7.4: Family Status Profile of the Marahau Community

The educational profile shows that 53% of the respondents have a high school, 21% a University degree and 21% have a tertiary diploma (see Figure 7.5).

Figure 7.5: Educational Profile of the Marahau Community

Thirty-five percent of bach-owners are retired. A significant number of respondents, namely 26%, are professional or technical workers, and 13% have legislative, administrative or managerial occupations. The significance is the low unemployment rate among the respondents, a total of 2% were unemployed residents. In the sample,

22% of the respondents are tourism operators and 8% work in tourism-related services (see Figure 7.6).

Figure 7.6: Occupation Profile of the Marahau Community

They are residents and landowners, whereas none of the bach-owners own or operate commercial tourism businesses in Marahau (see Figure 7.7).

Figure 7.7: Tourism Business Profile of the Marahau Community

The income profile reveals that 57% of respondents earn less than NZ\$30,000 a year, and 31% earn more than NZ\$30,000 a year. Twelve percent of respondents did not provide information on their income (see Figure 7.8). Figure 7.9 shows the year when respondents permanently moved to the community or bought residential property.

Figure 7.8: Income Profile of the Marahau Community

Figure 7.9: 'Incomers' to Marahau between 1935-2000

The arrival of a growing number of permanent residents over the last 65 years has changed the settlement from a homogeneous to a heterogeneous community. The major change occurred during the last fifteen to twenty years. The greatest influx of residents, landowners and bach-owners was between 1991 and 1995. This is related to the beginning of tourism in Marahau, and the increased popularity for lifestylers and holiday-home owners through newly subdivided land available in the wake of the downturn in farming. The results support the importance of the tourism sector in the economic development for Marahau and the changes it has brought with it.

7.2.1 MARAHAU AND SANDY BAY RESIDENTS' AND RATEPAYERS' ASSOCIATION

The Marahau and Sandy Bay Residents' and Ratepayers' Association (MSBRRA) was formed in 1994 as a non-government organisation to establish a platform for the community. The association includes residents and ratepayers that live in Marahau and Sandy Bay. It also includes houses on the Otuwhero Inlet and any house that looks onto Otuwhero Bay is considered to be part of Marahau (see also Figure 6.1, p.119).

The statements from the interviews show there are conflicts between the subgroups and a lack of participation in the association and projects that were initiated. The association aims to be the 'mouthpiece' of the Marahau community, but as one landowner pointed out:

'I think it is not working as well as it should be. There is apathy and the turnout at the last general meeting was quite poor for someone living in the community. If you are living in the community you should be seen and heard, you can't just sit back in your lounges'.

He further stated that 'in the past there was always a big turnout when there is something controversial, no other person is really interested if there is nothing controversial'. Bach-owners felt that the ratepayers' group in Marahau does not represent them appropriately and that commercial operators dominate the ratepayers' committee. This respondent explained:

'Many people on the committee are tourism businesses and that causes conflicts. As they are the wrong people, you need someone totally neutral that does not run a business. Every now and again we have a big meeting and we are invited and business people sit there quite prominently and they decide'.

A MSBRRA survey of 1995 recommended that Marahau should be retained as a 'quiet beach resort'. Ninety-two percent of respondents were against major future tourism

developments in Marahau. Although 40% would favour further residential development, 60% were against it. Noise and traffic resulting from tourism operations and the fear that tourism businesses might direct the future of the community were also mentioned. The community was in favour of building height restrictions (93%) and design (73%), colour (63%) and signage (68%) guidelines (Marahau and Sandy Bay Residents' and Ratepayers' Association, 1995).

7.2.2 LOCAL IWI

There are eight iwi in the Nelson region having an interest in Marahau and the Park. They are presented by two organisations: the *Wakatu Incorporation*, made up from people from Ngati Koata, Rarua, Tama, Te Atiawa; and the *Ngati Rarua Atiawa Iwi Trust*, made up from people of Rarua and Te Atiawa (Thomas, 2000). Several Waitangi Tribunal claims are forthcoming and might influence future planning decisions. The Treaty of Waitangi Act 1975 established the Waitangi Tribunal. It is a permanent commission of inquiry and consists of sixteen members appointed by the Governor-General on the recommendation of the Minister of Maori Affairs. The Tribunal's role is to make recommendations on claims brought by Maori relating to the practical application of the Treaty and to determine whether certain matters are inconsistent with the principles of the Treaty. The department for courts supports its work through the Waitangi Tribunal Business Unit, which provides administrative, research, and support services (Waitangi Tribunal, 2001).

The iwi in Motueka pointed out that the claims are an important issue:

‘Our claim for the foreshore is that we should control it. It is part of our claim to the Waitangi Tribunal to sort out who owns the foreshore and seabed. We own some of the islands, like Fisherman Island and Adele Island, and have the title to them’.

Some of the concerns that have been expressed by members of Ngati Rarua, Te Atiawa and Tama are closely related to the management aspects of the Park in relation to the growing number of visitors. One comment expressed this concern: ‘I have seen too many feet on tracks killing the bush by compacting the earth and soil, and that actually kills the trees around it’. The iwi are concerned about the management of the Park and its future.

Consultation with local iwi is a necessary part of the implementations of the Treaty of Waitangi. The iwi in Motueka feel that the process of cooperation has been unsatisfactory. They noted:

‘The unfortunate thing about our responsibilities to the environment is that there is no recognition from DoC or even TDC. It has been a really hard battle to try and progress their thinking and attitudes to turning them around for what they always have believed, in to something else, is very very difficult. That is the ongoing task for us, progressing that thinking and turning it around. Also giving them an understanding that as people belonging to that *whenua*, there is no thought of ever selling land or damaging it to the extent that it is not going to be able to nourish or feed us. That would be suicide’.

These negative experiences perceived by *tangata whenua* can harm existing relationships. Therefore, the participation processes in tourism planning and development need to be improved. The existing degree of conflict and uncertainty over issues for iwi needs to be considered in development perspectives and future planning aspect for tourism.

7.3 ‘LOCAL’ KNOWLEDGE IN PAGIS

The ‘local’ knowledge that reflects the community perspective on tourism development and other issues is integrated in the PAGIS. The information represents the spatial responses from the mapping exercises that were part of the interviews. The discussion of the community perception on tourism development in Marahau is supported by data that is available in the PAGIS (see CD-ROM).

The ‘local’ knowledge in PAGIS is classified as the *community theme* and the information in the database is divided in categories that can be queried, such as ‘*context*’, ‘*location*’ or/and ‘*issue*’. These categories are further subdivided into more detailed subcategories (see Figure 7.10, p.170). For example, the context can be a concern, and an important issue or an issue of future relevance in a specific location. The issues identified are e.g.: conflicting usage, congestion, development, kayaking and management. The locations of those issues are confined to Marahau and are, e.g.: beachfront, boat ramp, township, Wakatu property and DoC visitor centre (see Appendix 7.6, p.255 or CD-ROM, p.280).

Figure 7.10: Figures showing the Subcategories of ‘context’, ‘location’ and ‘issue’

The categories can be queried by combining the results of different subcategories. The information can be presented as digital maps or attribute tables (see Figure 7.11 and 7.12, p.171). The example in Figure 7.12 reflects the results of querying the ‘issue’: development in the ‘context’: future and visualises the ‘locations’ that were identified by community members. Thus, the visual display shows the ‘local’ knowledge about the future development aspects in Marahau. In addition, the more qualitative responses have been integrated into the database and can be presented. The ‘expert’ knowledge, as the TDC Zoning information and the DoC boundaries, are also included in PAGIS and can be added if needed. Generally, the results in the database confirm the further discussion in this chapter. The more detailed issues and the places in which they are relevant including the comments can be examined in the database on the CD-ROM or are available in the Appendix 7.6, p.255.

This is only one example of the variety of possibilities in querying different aspects in the database. It shows that PAGIS presents a unique opportunity to integrate ‘local’ knowledge and ‘expert’ knowledge. This tool has the potential to be used to facilitate stakeholder interaction and communication. Through PAGIS the individual stakeholder or the organisation has an opportunity to be better-informed, and therefore to make more sound decisions in the context of sustainable development. It might also generate more meaningful results addressing more specific problems. The database includes other resource management concerns of the community, such as forestry and fishing.

Figure 7.11: Visual Display representing 'Local' Knowledge in PAGIS

Figure 7.12: Database representing 'Local' Knowledge in PAGIS

ArcView GIS 3.2

File Edit Table Field Window Help

0 of 593 selected

Attributes of Community_data.shp

Context	Location	Issue	Comments
FUTURE	FIRE STATION	COMMUNITY	this could be a place for community happening
FUTURE	TASMAN SEA	NATURAL FEATURE	the whole area is magic, I love the ocean
FUTURE	NEW ROAD	INFRASTRUCTURE	we do not want this road
FUTURE	ENHANCEMENT PROJECT	PUBLIC SPACE	I would also like to see a soccer ground to play on, where people can kick a ball
FUTURE	OTUWHERE INLET	PROTECTION	preservation especially from commercial activity
FUTURE	WAKATU PROPERTY	DEVELOPMENT	low key development that is constructed to keep with the environment around the
FUTURE	SANDSPIT	PARKING	public area-parking, there is just one toilet and no are to just sit
FUTURE	MARAHAU BACKDROP	NATURAL FEATURE	community asset
FUTURE	ABEL TASMAN NATIONAL PARK	ROAD	no road there
FUTURE	WAKATU PROPERTY	DEVELOPMENT	I like the idea of a town center to meet
FUTURE	PRIVATE PROPERTY	TOURISM INFRASTRUCTURE	I like to have some more buildings here
FUTURE	KAYAK LAUNCH AREA	TRACTORS	tractor access on beach should be low key
FUTURE	BEACHFRONT/ROCKWALL	RECREATION	a promenade with cafes on the beachfront and a children's play area, with slides
FUTURE	FIRE STATION	RECREATION	the firestation needs more land around it, communities need a sport field; needs r
FUTURE	NEW ROAD	INFRASTRUCTURE	that would be great, the old road would be a lot slower and just one-way; you ca
FUTURE	TASMAN SEA	MANAGEMENT	the ocean holds the key for future prosperity
FUTURE	WAKATU PROPERTY	DEVELOPMENT	it will be lovely made, but a man-made thing is not going to be natural thing and t
FUTURE	NEW ROAD	INFRASTRUCTURE	the road around the houses I do not think it is any good
FUTURE	BOAT RAMP	INFRASTRUCTURE	it would be nicer to have a shop than a tractor parking place
FUTURE	MARAHAU ESTUARY	PROTECTION	
FUTURE	COASTLINE	DEVELOPMENT	underutilized beaches, when the tide is out they are good beaches to swim in an
FUTURE	MARAHAU ESTUARY	PROTECTION	estuary edges for the ecological values, during white bating full of breeding fish,
FUTURE	ROAD BEACHFRONT	EROSION	rockwall needs improvement to save the road
FUTURE	DOC CARPARK	RECREATION	picnic area
FUTURE	BEACHFRONT	ACCESS	maintain beach access
FUTURE	ROAD BEACHFRONT	DEVELOPMENT	safe walkway for pedestrians along road/road where the rocks are

7.4 COMMUNITY - 'A CONFUSING WORD'

The meaning of the term 'community' relates to the place and the people that it applies to. It provides a means of identifying a variety of processes and of creating the understanding of those in return. The characteristic features of community have changed throughout the emerging theoretical paradigms. The post-modern paradigm discusses community as a contested concept, but points out the importance of understanding it in order to engage in any issues about development. It is important to understand the meaning of community for Marahau and its influence on the future development, because it is a diverse community.

Some of those interviewed acknowledged that 'community' is a confusing word. Two main aspects were clearly agreed upon. It is a geographical area and it has social features, such as shared goals, common aspirations and cooperation and participation in the community on common issues. Landowners defined it as follows: 'community means a group of people living together in a small area' and 'a group of people who live in a limited boundary and who interact with each other'. Bach-owners explained: 'community means a group of people' and 'it is all about the type of people'. Other comments emphasised shared goals, common directions, and being involved in the community. These are reflected in statements by landowners such as, 'hopefully people working together on common goals and directions' and 'a community that is where people are involved in issues, meet day to day and talk to each other'. Another landowner said 'community means people doing things together, knowing one another', while another respondent hoped for some common ground and some sort of commonality.

Some landowners' comments extended the idea of commonality and shared goals by emphasising that this includes caring for each other and dealing with problems. One comment was 'community is to have common aspirations or common ways, values and a sense of people caring for each other'. Another definition was 'people interacting on and sharing an environment, which is of concern to everybody, and finding ways of dealing with problems on a common basis'. For another landowner 'community ideally can be an extended family, good ones and bad ones, trying to solve problems or work towards a common goal, to help each other, look after each other and support each other, and give everybody the freedom he wants or needs'. All these comments show a

variety of meanings of the term ‘community’, although they all have in common, that ‘community’ matters. They show that ‘community’ is understood either as a place or as a component of social life.

7.4.1 MARAHAU A ‘HETEROGENEOUS COMMUNITY’

The concept of community holds different meanings for different people, and the changing socio-economic, political, technological aspects in contemporary societies have an effect on local community structures. The increase in population in Marahau with people from different countries and with different backgrounds leads to a wide range of different perspectives. A common response was concerned with the social interaction in the community and behaviour towards one another (see Appendix 7.3, p.247).

The majority of statements made by long-term landowners from the tobacco era focused on community as ‘the way it used to be’. The following comment of one respondent reflects the changes that occurred over time and gives some reasoning for that:

‘There was the dance and there was a piano and we had a big keg in the corner and they always had a cockle supper, there was a marvellous community spirit at that time. They later built the hall, which is now a bach and was another good community area. We had 21st birthdays and weddings. Now I do not know a lot of the people who live here and I am not saying that is their fault, but we do not have many community things where you could get to know people like that. It might be a drawback and everyone does their own thing and everyone got cars now, you have your own home entertainment and it is not far to Motueka. The roads are upgraded, you used to go through Kaiteriteri, and now it is only twenty minutes to go to Motueka or the pub, that is another entertainment some people like. It might not be so important to have those community things here, I do not know. It has changed; it is not a community like that. We do not have the liaison like we used to have a few years ago. That is possibly part of modern living, I mean things change and do not stand still and families change’.

Some respondents reflect on the lack of history and its effect on the present community. As one resident commented: ‘history has quite a big impact on the sense of community and if there is no sense of the past than there can be no community in the present’. For this resident:

‘There is no sense of community. People do not come here for the sense of community, because community has to be dipping into the past and have an identity, where people go back and share stories, and if there are just stories about the last two years it is hard to have a sense of community’.

Also, through the increasing number of people moving into the community conflicts are emerging between various groups. One landowner reflected on these changes:

‘I do not see the degree of community spirit that was here when I grew up. In the last fifteen years we have become more and more fragmented. I know change is inevitable and it is going to happen and with the influx for new people, who come into the area with different backgrounds, expectations and perceptions, it becomes problematic. Marahau now is a much more selfish, self-centred community than it ever was’.

These comments indicate some of the perceptions of community that are currently present in Marahau.

The diversity of the community is described through these landowners’ comments as ‘a very interesting, diverse community’ and ‘a real mixture of people with different values’. This results in ‘negative feelings’ and in ‘conflicting views’ about one another. As another landowner remarked ‘there are different levels, with different people having different ideas and that makes it an extremely difficult situation’. The statements suggest that Marahau is basically individuals thrown together, who come to Marahau for whatever purpose, and as a result there are problems because this does not necessarily lead to a sense of a commonality and a clear definition of goals.

The divisions in the community are highlighted by this comment from a landowner: ‘it is quite divided as far as tourist operators and residents go, and it is not a homogeneous community’. Another resident elaborated on this: ‘one big issue in Marahau is that the community is divided between residents, who just live in the village for pleasure and enjoy life, whereas another big part of the community is interested in making a living from tourism’. There is also a perceived separation in Marahau between bach-owners and landowners. The following comment of a landowner reflects a common attitude in the community towards bach-owners: ‘Marahau is really full of people who have baches and who have a lot of say and it is not really in line with what should happen in Marahau’. The bach-owners reasoned ‘Marahau is a two-piece community. There is not a lot of mixing between the permanent residents and the bach-owners’.

However, there are bach-owners who feel part of the community and want to be involved. This is reflected in this comment by a bach-owner: ‘I know most of the locals and I am there almost every weekend, I suppose I feel part of the community. I went to some of the meetings. I feel they did not get very far and because I am just a weekender

I do not want to shout'. Another bach-owner commented 'community to me means locals. I like to think that I am part of this community. I go to the meeting of the ratepayers' association, and I believe that if you want to be part of the community you have to get involved'.

Another characteristic of Marahau is the influx of seasonal workers, the so-called transition community, who reside in Marahau during the summer season. One resident explained: 'we have large transition community that come back here every year, and the more often they do that the more often they are recognised as being part of the community'. In recent years more of these seasonal workers have taken up residence in Marahau over winter or are returning on a regular basis.

The different groups in the community blame each other for having a certain view about aspects that affect Marahau. Many respondents called others 'greedy', 'have a selfish attitude' and 'do not listen' or that there is 'insufficient social structure and community feeling' (see Appendix 7.3, p.247). Landowners mentioned that 'there is really no community spirit in Marahau. I mean, people are not able to look past their own self-interest for the overall benefit for the majority', and 'everyone is far too busy to be a community'. Other comments revealed a feeling of disappointment with the community:

'I am extremely disappointed, they want to get together and behind each other. I have been more involved and here it is probably worse than in other areas. I expect more out of the people in Marahau, because it is a special place. Everybody would say that it is a special place, so why do they not pull together and work together for improvement. Everyone is too busy, that is his or her excuse. There are some people who do something in the community and a lot of people just sit back'.

However, other landowners pointed out that there are still ways of dealing with issues. One landowner said that there are quite a few sensible people in Marahau to work with. The heterogeneous community structure and the contested views about community can provide challenges for cooperation and participate in planning process.

7.4.2 THE 'COMMUNITY FOCUS'

Marahau has no public school and the recently established fire station hall is the only existing community centre (see Figure 7.13, p.176). The Park Café is a focal point mainly for newcomers. Respondents mentioned the importance of having a 'community

focus' to support a sense of community. One resident explained that 'you can't make any community, in fact there is no ground anymore, no place to go, no community focus or place. If we do not have that, there is no sense of community'. The statements of landowners suggest that the fire station could be used as a centre point for the community, but 'it takes the will of people to do that'.

Figure 7.13: Fire Station in Marahau at Sandy Bay Road

A local school symbolises an opportunity to create a community focus in Marahau. The local school was closed down around 1975, because there were fewer than nine children. In 1998 the former school ground was turned into the Outdoor Recreation Centre and is owned by the 'Marahau Outdoor Education Centre Charitable Trust' formed by the government and involves the Ministry of Education, as well as people presenting the interests of education (Pritley, 1999). That Marahau has no school creates problems as a landowner explained:

'A school in a community is a focal point; if you have a school you are a community, if you do not have a school or shop you are not a community. Having a school would mean having the entire infrastructure, which is centered on the school, the support systems, the teachers, and the jobs. A school would make a big difference to this community, as a lot of social contacts are related to a school'.

It is clear that for a sense of community there ‘has to be somewhere for that to occur’. These statements documented how respondents see the need for a community focus as a vital element to ensure that there is a place to interact with one another, and this could then create a sense of community.

7.5 THE PAST - ‘LAID BACK, SMALL, FARMING COMMUNITY’

Development has to be studied in its particular context, because it is socially constructed in a particular culture and within a particular history (Rist, 1997; Cowen and Shenton, 1996). History has an impact on the contemporary context of development in Marahau. Therefore, how the people in Marahau describe and interpret their history and culture needs to be understood. This section investigates the past of Marahau through the knowledge held by mainly long-term landowners and bach-owners. Thus, Marahau today “is a place of a future for some and a place of past memories for others” (Bloomfield, 1999, 49). Generally, Marahau was described as a laid-back, small farming community.

In quoting the passage of a book one landowner described Marahau as perceived by the early explorer D’Urville in 1827. D’Urville recorded that Marahau was the jewel in the crown of the whole coastline, because the bush was so dense and the birds were so loud that you could hardly hear yourself speak. The other story referring to the 20th century of a landowner goes:

‘In those days there was just travel by horse and cart. Whenever we had parties everyone just got together and guys would put the net out, they’d pull up so many fish they couldn’t eat all that they would just dig them up into the garden. The tables were full of crawfish, that has all changed there is no fish out there anymore, because of commercial fishing and all the logging has definitely silted up the river and the beach. The Marahau River used to be so deep that boats used to come up it and they used to flood down the logs, when they were cutting the timber, all those hills have been milled’.

The advances made in communication technology after the Second World War, through the introduction of electricity, television and telephone, resulted in changes in the social and economic structure of local communities throughout New Zealand, including Marahau. This account described the past:

‘We have gone through the old days when technology moved on to electricity to telephone and then television (in 1965). When we had the hall that was the community centre for everybody, and when anyone got married

or for any reason at all everybody concentrated in the hall. This was in the early fifties. During wintertime, we had indoor ball and table tennis and people came from Motueka, Riwaka, and Kaiteriteri to play it, but when television came on the scene things changed and all the types of amusements we had before with it. The hall was sitting there and sometimes we couldn't even find the money to pay the rates for it, so they called big meetings what can we do with the hall and everyone said sell it we do not want it, because there was no interest. After ten years they wished we hadn't sold it, because they never had a community centre again'.

However, the most significant factor was the improvements of the road to Marahau, which some people called 'the big event'. One landowner described this event:

'The community changed with the advent of the road over the hill and television. In the 1930s Kaiteriteri got popular and the council did not want to maintain two roads, so they closed the road over the hill and just maintained the road from Kaiteriteri to here. When the forestry started planting all those pines they opened up the other side of the road in 1962 just going to the top of this hill, and we got the road over the hill from the other side'.

A resident explains further that 'the Sandy Bay hill road was opened a few years ago that made a heap of a difference for that area, it brings a lot more people in'. A bach-owner commented that 'when the road got tar-sealed that encouraged more people to come'. Similarly the observation of a bach-owner includes 'the physical access to Marahau is a significant factor in its development, because before it was shut off from the outside world'. The opening of the road to Marahau was a major contribution to socio-economic change in Marahau.

The key events that contributed to the changes, associated with the move from tobacco to tourism, are reflected in the following accounts from landowners. It was before the late 1940s that life in Marahau 'was all about growing hops and milking cows. Families started growing tobacco around 1935 and 1945, but we still had cows and sold our cream to Nelson'. Twenty years ago there was no tourism in Marahau. The major industry was tobacco growing and there was a little attempt growing kiwifruit for one or two years. The social structures in the community were based on 'the old traditional rural farmer types, which was tobacco basically with an infusion of new hippie types and another spectrum of lifestyles'. In the early 1980s 'tobacco went out, because the government did not want anymore tobacco grown in this region because of the anti-smoking campaign, and we couldn't get anymore export licenses'.

Other respondents repeated this observed that:

‘The key event that affected Marahau was tobacco finishing in 1978. It switched to nothing for a while, land was very cheap, and everyone had to leave, because you couldn’t make a living. The next biggest event was the immigration from Europe. Europeans saw possibilities of how it could go and how they could actually make money from this beautiful place that we have not seen. From this big depth things just carried on normally and went into tourism smoothly in the first couple of years, but then suddenly exploded. That was also pretty huge, because the price of the land changed as well. All of a sudden instead of buying land for how much you can make out of it, sheep, cows, tobacco, vegetables, etc., it was valued on something that no one before had actually valued the land on’.

The first tourism ventures opened and provided new jobs, and people and families came back, brought in more vitality into Marahau. These statements provide a testimony to how a farming community has undergone radical socio-economic restructuring.

7.5.1 ‘MARAHAU GRADUALLY CHANGES’

In the mid-1940s tramping started to become a popular recreational activity for many New Zealanders (McAloon, 1997). The Park was only accessible through a narrow track through gorse. A landowner stated that ‘tourism started with the bridge over the Marahau River, it improved the access to the other side. There only used to be a swing bridge across’. In later years the tracks in the Park were improved and more people used to come through Marahau to visit the Park. One landowner described the entrance of the Park as ‘there was a bit of a car park, but it only took twenty cars’. These changes were the beginning of tourism in Marahau.

Tourism started in Marahau with the establishment of the ‘Hunting Lodge’. The first Motor Camp (today Abel Tasman Marahau Beach Camp) opened in the early 1960s. Then, as one landowner explained:

‘At the end of the 1950s and in the early 1960s it started happening with tourism. John Wilson (Abel Tasman National Park Enterprises) started his boat service. He spent lots of money advertising the Park in Europe and more people came. He put on another boat and then he got a third boat, all going from Kaiteriteri’.

It was not until the 1980s that international visitors, mainly backpackers, came to Marahau to experience the Park and the first kayaking companies started. The Park Café was established in 1985 with ‘a tiny little wagon and they had a few vegetarian burgers and cakes’. The customers were Kiwis and it was a very very short season, a two months’ season at the most. The year the stock market crashed in 1987 more

international visitors started coming, with a noticeable downturn in Kiwis. The first types of international visitors were backpackers and ‘it changed gradually to more middle class and more big groups coming’. The first accommodation providers the Barn Backpackers opened.

A former hut warden recalled that many local people had underestimated and undervalued the Park as a tourism destination. He recalled:

‘When I was a hut warden in 1983 you would get a few people walking through. There were a few foreigners, but mainly locals. The foreigners used to talk about this place going wild in the next twenty years. We said, because Marahau is tidal, it will never go off’.

Likewise, this landowner commented: ‘in New Zealand we undervalue ourselves as a destination in terms of the attractiveness and relative pristine environment’. These were the first experiences with tourism in the 1980s and from then on Marahau gradually changed. These changes were not confined to Marahau and the Park, this happened throughout New Zealand, because international tourism started growing since the 1980s.

In 1984/85 the first two sea kayaking companies started in Marahau offering kayaking tours along the Abel Tasman coastline. One bach-owner remembered: ‘when we went there it was quiet and there was only Tom and Ingrid (Abel Tasman Kayaks) with three or four kayaks and a notice board with chalk on it and then it gradually changed’. A former tourism operator recalled that in those days ‘it was a bit strange starting the kayaking, because we thought there would not be enough business for two companies, and now there are so many boats out there’. Parallel to the establishment of tourism businesses in Marahau, DoC improved the visitor facilities in the Park and Marahau. Several respondents commented on these developments. A resident stated: ‘it changed basically, when DoC created the car park in 1991. They cut everything down and filled the whole thing up and built the shelters’. One landowner pointed out that ‘the boardwalk opened up the Park for 24 hours a day, before that there was only tidal access’, and one bach-owner mentioned ‘it went really gradually until the commercial people moved in and it became really commercial’. The visitor numbers started to increase and more permanent residents moved into the community. Some of these newcomers realised that there was an opportunity to work and live in Marahau. This has resulted in an increase of buildings in Marahau since the 1990s (see Figure 7.14, p.181).

A change in perception about tourism occurred around 1995. The statements show that this was linked with the water taxi services' (Aqua Taxi) starting and is described as 'a different kind of tourism'. For one landowner 'it was quite high-speed regarding water taxis, kayak businesses and accommodation all these sorts of things'. At around the same time this landowner recalled that:

'The next thing that happened was that the kayak company competition led to an escalation of the kayak thing, because each of them tried to keep up with each other and both of those expanded, then the camping ground started with a boat and kayaks in 1995'.

Figure 7.14: Looking onto Marahau from Toko Ngawa in the early 1990s

Source: Unattributed Photo from Marahau Bach-Owner

The outside kayak businesses operating from Marahau have become a big issue, for bach-owners especially due to the location of their holiday homes along the main road (see Figure 7.14). In the last five years kayak operations came from places outside Marahau and they operate along the beachfront area. There is resentment against them in the community, as this comment indicated:

'What bothers me are the tourism operators that are not Marahau-based, they come in and actually take up that valuable space that day visitors need, loading and unloading. You get the feeling, that because they are making

money it gives them a greater right to be there than if you go there to enjoy the tranquility and recreational values Marahau has to offer. It should just be thought through more carefully, because it gets to the point that it changes the landscape so much that it changes the whole atmosphere’.

The increasing growth of tourism businesses in Marahau and more kayaking companies coming in from ‘outside’ has led to a shift in the perceptions about tourism.

7.5.2 ‘TOURISM SUDDENLY TOOK OFF’

Tourism growth in the mid-1990s was referred to, by many of those interviewed, as suddenly ‘taking off’. This is reflected in the statements that indicate an increasingly negative attitude towards tourism development. One landowner pointed out that ‘tourism came with a boom. It changed the whole atmosphere here completely, that would have been five to six years ago’. Another landowner mentioned that ‘the whole thing of tourism hit Marahau like a rock’. A bach-owner stated ‘you just accept the slow growth that is happening, but in the last few years it has just increased dramatically’. A bach-owner compared Marahau with Kaiteriteri and recalled: ‘I have been going here all my life. I have seen tremendous change really, but only in last ten years it has really accelerated with the tourism being based out of Marahau, prior to that it was only Kaiteriteri’. For this bach-owner ‘it is still nice, but it is very very different, because it has become a commercial enterprise, which we do not like’. For others there is already too much tourism or they stated that tourism has destroyed Marahau.

The attitudes towards the way tourism developed and the changes it brought to the community are generally negative. One landowner reflected this upon:

‘For me it changes the whole feeling of freedom that I have experienced here. Paradise is getting smaller and smaller, you can’t just go for a walk up the Valley anymore, there are gates and private land. It is getting more compounded and everyone wants a bit and no one else on it. How much more is there going to be?’

She further explained that the change ‘is the combination of tourism and people with a lot of money moving in at the same time. They do go hand in hand, suddenly it is a very attractive place and is worth more and more money’. This resident feels that ‘in a way the numbers keep piling up and it seems that there is much more of a problem than there was’. These statements show that development for Marahau meant more people moving in, more buildings and the roads getting developed. Consequently, respondents feel that ‘the same mistakes are being made here with tourism as anywhere else and this is by developing it, you destroy what people come for’.

The respondents believe that tourism in Marahau has reached its peak, both in number of visitors and businesses. One landowner has noticed a ‘levelling off’ in the last two years: ‘tourism came pretty sudden, over the last seven years. These last two summers it just did not get busier and busier, it seems to level off somewhere and that is great’. Other statements recognise the importance of tourism, but suggested that if it increases anymore Marahau might lose its attraction, as this landowner describes it: ‘personally we are nearly at the stage of no more tourism, maybe some more developments on the accommodation side, but in terms of activities we have reached that state’. Like many others, another landowner said that ‘I am really happy about tourism as long as it does not become too commercial and that people are robbed of their lifestyle’.

The respondents recognised the importance of tourism for the economy in Marahau. As one bach-owner states: ‘it is obvious that something has to happen, people do need to make a living and those who come for pleasure have to remember that’. One landowner points out that ‘tourists come and they bring money and that means jobs and people can live here. Tourist numbers are huge, I am not sure if it is too much yet, it is a hard one’. Other respondents suggested tourism ‘is not a bad thing. I think as many people as possible should see the track and the Park’, and ‘the type of tourism that is happening here now is fine, kayakers, walkers, and backpackers’. One resident accepted the change over the last five years, although she is also nostalgic for the past. She stated:

‘In some ways it is for the best and in some ways it is quite sad compared to what I saw when I grew up. There was tobacco and lots of Kiwifruit and now there is more and more tourism happening. It is good for work and stuff, but it is not the way I remember it. I do not mind change or oppose change and I think there are lots of things about Marahau that are better now, but I just think things have got to be carefully thought through’.

These statements described how tourism has changed Marahau over the last twenty years and how those changes affected Marahau. The discussion has also indicated that at present Marahau is a ‘turning point’.

7.6 THE PRESENT - ‘TURNING POINT’

There have been many socio-economic and cultural changes in the community. These changes have brought it to a ‘turning point’ as whether it can retain its special character. Respondents like Marahau’s rural character, its location near the Park and Nelson, and its tranquility and peacefulness. The lifestyle and a sense of place were also often mentioned. This included the importance of the landscape and scenery in Marahau,

especially the beach, the ocean and the native bush providing possibilities for many recreational activities (see Appendix 7.3, p.247). Marahau as the ‘gateway to the Park’, a ‘holiday-destination’ or a ‘retreat’ and ‘sanctuary’ or a ‘special and magical place’ are the main themes that emerged about Marahau during the interview.

Due to the location of Marahau, one resident suggested ‘Marahau is just the jumping-off point to the National Park, the end of the road’ and further ‘what goes on with that Park has a lot to do with what goes on in this community’. Another resident stated that ‘tourists come because of the attraction of the Park, not because of the attraction of Marahau’. One landowner viewed Marahau as ‘a wee village at the border of the Park with urban sprawl going into a natural environment’. Another argued that:

‘The township is out of the picture and the Park is the attraction. Marahau is just the car park for the Park; it is not a destination in itself. There needs to be more emphasis on Marahau as Marahau, I hate to lose our identity; we are Marahau and Sandy Bay’.

These comments emphasise that changes in management and planning in the Park or in Marahau affect each other.

Marahau is also termed a ‘sanctuary’ or a ‘special and magical place’, with remarks about the rural character, the tranquility and the natural environment (see Appendix 7.2, p.245). Landowners made the most comprehensive comments:

‘It is such a beautiful place and I feel incredibly fortunate to have lived here and known it since it has been. It is such a bounteous place. It is a place that I feel everybody who is living here could live really happily’, and ‘Marahau itself is a beautiful place and it is probably one of the most beautiful parts of New Zealand. It is at the end of a road, which I think is really important. You do not get the through traffic, so people have to go out of their way to get here and you have to come over a hill. It is like an island and it is not an island’.

Another landowner mentioned that ‘the main thing about it to me is its quietness, beauty and scenery, that was what struck me’. Others thought Marahau is all about trees, pasture, islands and the beach. It has a good climate and it is clean, green, and it is natural, beautiful, peaceful, and tranquil. In short the statements described it as paradise.

These comments show the importance of Marahau to the local community as a place of quietness and natural beauty and with spiritual meaning. This spiritual meaning is emphasised through comments such as ‘not many places have that, it has a magical feel to that area’ or ‘it has energies floating around. I can see it and feel it’. Other comments

were: 'Marahau is a really beautiful place and it is really special, very special' and 'Marahau has spiritual significance'. Bach-owners also felt Marahau is the most beautiful place, with something spiritual and dramatic about it. Consequently, for the respondents Marahau is a special place with special values.

The bach-owners consider Marahau also as a holiday destination or a retreat to relax and would like to keep the commercial activities to a minimum. They stated 'when you come over the hill, it just releases the stress out of the system', and 'for me it is tranquility in an unspoiled peaceful place'. Marahau is considered as a place to escape to from the city: 'it is the place I go to get away from town, pleasant place to be'. However, there are already some changes in the perception of Marahau as a retreat, as this respondent pointed out: 'it is not a quiet retreat anymore that is why we came here. I think the commercial activity should be kept out of that area away from the community. The kayak people and the commercial water taxis shouldn't come through the community' (see Appendix 7.3, p.247). The problem is that the majority of baches are located at the beachfront where most of the commercial activities take place. The bach-owners come to Marahau for quietness and to get away from their urban lifestyle. Thus there is bound to be conflict emerging between the tourism operators and the bach-owners.

7.6.1 'SOME QUIET TIME'

The variation in seasonal demand is a concern for many in the private and public sector in the Nelson region. For the people in Marahau it is no concern; rather it is seen as a relief. It means for the respondents having 'some quiet time' and 'socialising with friends' during the winter months (see Appendix 7.2, p.245). One landowner seemed to be happy with the situation, as he hopes that 'it stays that way and people just want to be here in summer. I would find it very disturbing if they come all year around, very very disturbing'. A resident mentioned that 'there is a huge difference between summer and winter. For those four months in summer this place is just crazy, that is when everyone is making money'. In the quieter winter months respondents said 'we enjoy it much more, than in the summer in the way of socialising, and it becomes a really quiet place', and 'I really like the winter, when all the tourists are gone'. The local people avoid going into the Park in summer or to the beach in Marahau, because of the 'constant flow of people'. Two landowners remarked: 'you can't just go down to the

river and have a swim there will be tourist, and it is the same with the beach', and 'I do not go into the Park in summer, because I just can't stand seeing the place full of kayaks'. The winter months are also important for those involved in the tourism industry in Marahau as a 'peaceful and quiet' time. A landowner and tourism operator pointed out: 'we know we have to be flat-out for three to four months in a year and work fifteen to sixteen hours a day, but I hardly get to do what I actually like'. The respondents in Marahau appreciate the seasonality of tourism and hope it stays that way.

The summer season starts on Boxing Day (26.12), and during Christmas and the New Zealand school holidays, visitor numbers to Marahau increase and as this landowner said 'there is not much beachfront left to park on. One bach-owner said:

'Over Christmas you are meeting people at every corner and some people said they should put a signpost up: *Tourists please keep to the left-hand side*. We give way most of the time, they won't, and at that special time of year there are just people everywhere'.

The effects of tourism are mostly related to the tourism activities, as this landowner noted, 'boats zooming around all summer is really a problem'. This bach-owner pointed out that there is a huge impact from tourism in summer, particularly with the kayaks. Many comments were made about the tractors pulling boats (see Figure 7.15).

Figure 7.15: Tractor on Marahau Beach pulling a Water Taxi

A typical comment was from this landowner:

‘The tractors and trailers are a pain, because they drop all the sand onto the road. In summer they line up on the beachfront and spoil the naturalness of the area. The kayaking has a good image, but the tractors are rusty and they park out on the low tide and it is very ugly and commercial-looking’

In this case seasonality is perceived as a positive aspect in tourism for the community in Marahau.

7.6.2 ‘OVERPOPULATED IN SUMMER’

The majority of respondents disliked development and commercialism and the perceived social and environmental impacts of tourism (see Appendix 7.3, p.247). The Park was described as ‘overpopulated’ and ‘too overcrowded’ in summer. Landowners suggested reducing the overuse by putting restrictions on numbers walking and kayaking in the Park. Two landowners’ stories reflected the feeling in the community.

The first was:

‘One autumn morning we went for a walk and within ten minutes six water taxis did a circle around the rock full with people. I wondered how those people felt on the boat about the wilderness of their trip’.

The second story was:

‘We look out sometimes and once counted sixty kayaks go past. One day we went out with friends. They kayaked and we took our boat up and spent the night in the Park, where you can only get by boat. We arrived at two o’clock and there were another two or three people there, and by five o’clock there were fifty people there all in kayaks and with one stinking toilet. It has really changed over time, we used to go up there and not meet anyone, now there are so many boats, especially commercial ones, everywhere’.

One bach-owner commented that ‘if you go to Fisherman’s Island and thirty kayaks turn up, that impacts on you. It seems like busloads of people turn up. It is really the impact of numbers’. Also one landowner explained why she doesn’t visit the Park during summer:

‘There is just no beach to land on that is not full of kayaks, and what kind of wilderness experience is that. It is a joke. Sure, it is nice for people to have that experience, but you are just paddling through a Park and you just see lots and lots of kayaks everywhere. It is different if you could be out there where you pass one or two, that is fine, you can pull up on a beach and be there on your own, that is fine and a lovely feeling and experience’.

The increasing number of kayaking companies and water taxi operations leads to the opinion among some that tourism has reached its saturation point. This comment was

made by a bach-owner: 'it has reached the point that we have too many kayaks here. It is like a rash. There are people who want to go out in the Abel Tasman Park and find a nice cosy beach, but they can't because there are kayakers everywhere'. The respondents expressed their concern about the number of visitors in the Park and the number of kayaks on the beaches (see Figure 7.16). They also point out that this has an influence on the experience of visitors. On the other hand, other comments by bach-owners referred to the subjective nature of crowding. One respondent said: 'I have never felt overcrowded with people. On a scale of one to ten, for my wife overcrowding might arise by three people, but with me it might not arise by eight'. However, there were some unfriendly expressions about visitors, calling them 'little penguins' or 'sea fleas'.

Figure 7.16: Kayakers, Swimmers and Water Taxi on Akerston Beach in the Park

The increase in visitor numbers and operators has also resulted in conflicts between kayakers and motorboats, including water taxis and jet skis. Safety was considered an important factor with the increase in kayaks and water taxis. One landowner pointed out: 'I believe it is just a matter of time until some kayakers get run over' and another

landowner agreed:

‘There is going to be a major accident out there with the speedboats. It is just the pure numbers of kayaks going out to the islands. It seems to me that when the waves are big and they get the white caps, with strong winds, they are really hard to see’.

Some suggested that the kayaks could have little flags on them to be spotted more easily. The conflict between powerboats and kayakers is a major problem in managing the safety on the water (see also Hawke, 2000).

The responses outlined indicate a variety of community perceptions towards tourism in Marahau. The range of comments show that some are happy with status quo of tourism, others are more concerned about commercialism and tourism development in the future and for others tourism has already destroyed Marahau. The particular issues are accessible in PAGIS and are related to development issues directly or indirectly linked with tourism in the community (see CD-ROM).

7.7 THE FUTURE - ‘NICE PLACE’ OR ‘GHOST TOWN’

There was a range of predictions about the future of Marahau. Most community members in Marahau would want to see Marahau unchanged, but at the same time they support the need for economic development. The major concerns of respondents were described as over-development, increasing commercialisation and crowding. This would result in changes in lifestyle (see Appendix 7.4, p.248 and Appendix 7.5, p.252). This landowner summarises his fear, as ‘the worst case scenario would be a city against the National Park’. A resident described her major fear: ‘Marahau will be totally built up, all the hills there and the paddocks and everything, and it will become overrun with tourism’. The fear is that urban development replaces the natural environment and uncontrolled tourism inflows would lead to further destruction of the social and natural infrastructure. In other words many people want require stability and no further changes in the future.

Respondents discussed their concerns in a variety of ways. One landowner said over-development is a situation ‘when it loses the feeling of a peaceful place where he could walk without watching cars all the time and where is not enough space to live in and for recreation. A resident explained that:

‘With over-development we will lose the identity. I listen to the overseas visitors and the reason they come is because of the Kiwi stuff and maybe it

used to be our laid-back attitude. I believe you can still be laid-back and offer a good service, but we are losing that, and the natural environment is my biggest fear’.

Another resident hoped that ‘despite all the development we will not lose the kind of relationships we have and will retain the casualness of interaction’. One resident asked ‘how much more development will there be? It is growing bigger and bigger, when does it stop?’ Another believed that there are too many visitors already and stated:

‘Stop with the development right now, stop, numbers are high enough. All of the people who have set up a business in Marahau are well off; they are making enough money to have a really good living. I can’t see the point of increasing the tourism numbers, just restrict them’.

The statement emphasised that Marahau should ‘stay as it is’. A resident said that ‘I hope Marahau stays special, untouched and beautiful as it is’, and a landowner made a similar wish: ‘we do not want it to grow much more; it would spoil it’. Another landowner stated that:

‘I would like it to be like it used to be, locals here doing our own thing, the slow and quiet way. We had no problem with anything or anybody. Now we have got strange people coming in by the hundreds and passing through the old township here, going through the Park and coming here to Marahau to have a look, but we accept it because we have no option. It is happening and we can’t stop it’.

Many bach-owners have the same hope and that is reflected in these statements: ‘I’d like to see it stay as natural as possible, but it is maybe a dream’, and ‘we love it being peaceful and unspoiled and we would never like to see it lost. It is a very precious part of New Zealand and it would be so sad to see it becoming too commercialised’. Many respondents would like no change in Marahau, although they accept that some change is already occurring.

The statements stress that uncontrolled development will destroy the values that Marahau has to offer. A resident emphasised: ‘it took so long to develop, let’s not just rush in and do things we think we do right at the moment, because we may screw it up. I believe we should focus on keeping it sustainable’. The main fear is reflected in this comment of a resident: ‘development will attract more people. It is going to happen and will impact on Marahau and will ruin it and change it rapidly’. The idea is to have a balanced development between social, economic and environmental factors. The issues relate to growth, which are associated either with the increase in permanent population or the increase in visitor numbers and tourism businesses.

The respondents acknowledge that tourism is important, but do not want it to be 'overdone'. One respondent refers to the tourism sector as a 'necessary evil', and a bach-owner said 'I know we need the money, but I do not want it to develop into a red-tag commercialised situation, where it is overdone. Kaiteriteri has far too much and we do not want that'. The increasing competition might affect the social interaction in the community. As one landowner was concerned that 'businesses will end up fighting for the dollar and everyone trying to get a piece of the cake'. Several respondents refer to the risk of more tourism developments, as these landowners pointed out that 'it depends if the people still want to come when numbers are growing, because if the numbers get out of hand, people will not want to come anymore', and 'more development destroys the rural character, that what people come to look at, that what makes Marahau a nice place, if you push the tourism too much you destroy what you have'. This landowner even hoped that 'tourist numbers increase, so that tourists might not come here anymore'. The statements also show that it is important for a sustainable future to ensure the quality of the visitor experience and not quantity of visitors.

However, a few respondents thought there is scope for more development, growth and tourism in the community. One respondent argued:

'I am not against development, because you can't stop it anyway. On the other hand you have to think twice before you develop. You can't satisfy everybody, but Marahau has changed already quite a lot'.

Landowners pointed out 'I think Marahau could establish some more, without spoiling the whole thing, but again there is a limit at some stage', and 'Marahau can sustain a bit more tourist development'. This range of comments shows that there are divergent views about the degree of further development, although the emphasis is predominantly on sustainable development.

The dislikes about the type of development were expressed in relation to big food chains and in comparison to other tourist centres in New Zealand. Respondents do not want big fast-food chains or another Queenstown or Kaiteriteri (see also Appendix 7.4, p.248).

One landowner explained:

'Progress is inevitable, but it does not mean it has to be hyped up too much. There should be a balance. It shouldn't have to be so commercialised and become Queenstown on a mini-scale, there should be a place for both visitors and residents'.

Other landowners remarked ‘I would not like to see KFC, McDonalds and that sort of thing happening here. I think that could really upset the way the place is and the whole feel of it’, and ‘I would not like Marahau to be like Kaiteriteri’. Residents commented that ‘it would be quite scary if tourism went overboard like in the Bay of Islands’, and that ‘it will never be another Queenstown, but I would not like to see it being close to that’. These comparisons to other examples of tourism development illustrate what kind of tourism development the respondents do not desire.

The proposed tourism development from Wakatu Incorporation was a central topic in the discussion on development (see also CD-ROM). Some of the comments included ‘it goes back to the question of any more major development, and surely the Abel Tasman can’t handle any more kayaks’. The respondents felt that the proposed tourism development will change everything in Marahau. It would be considerable growth, increasing visitor numbers, traffic, accommodation and other businesses. Therefore, a landowner said:

‘For people who live in Marahau, the future is quite frightening with the prospect of the huge development that will cause big changes and could destroy Marahau in that it could become just another tourist resort’.

A few others commented that the proposed development could enhance the place, although it would all depend on how it is done. The biggest fear of respondents for the future was over-development or commercialisation and crowding.

7.7.1 ‘LOW-KEY DEVELOPMENT’

The core concept in addressing the future development directives for Marahau was ‘low-key development’. The characteristics of low-key development in tourism are everything on a small scale, in ‘harmony with the social and natural environment’, low visual impact, and rural with locally-owned and small scale tourism businesses. For landowners, tourism businesses have to be locally-owned in order to sustain the quality of the product and to prevent tourism ‘growing out of control’, because as one landowner explained:

‘The only way of keeping things reasonably under control is to keep companies owned by local people who live here and have a stake in the community. That is the only way to ensure that businesses do not grow to a huge size. That will ensure that those people who are owners or operators of businesses are proud of what they are doing and want to ensure the quality is kept. They are not the sorts of investors who come into the valley and snap up companies’.

The visual impact of construction is another characteristic of low-key development. A landowner explained that construction ‘would be ok if it is low-key, that means low-line buildings, things which blend into the landscape rather than stick out’. Other landowners stated that ‘because of the National Park they should be constructed and designed, in keeping with the environment around them’. Therefore, to minimise the visual impact building should have height restrictions and be designed to blend into the national park environment.

The existing tourism businesses, like Abel Tasman Kayaks, Ocean River Kayaks, the Marahau Lodge and the Chalets, are described as ‘low-key tourism’, because ‘they keep it very quiet and very countrified’. Another description by a landowner was ‘businesses that are not intrusive and insensitive. The characteristics of the businesses here are mainly the family-owned type, small-scale with perhaps a partner thrown in. They are Marahau-based, not an extended arm of a major company, and they are not on a scale which alters the ambience of the place’. With these comments the respondents were also referring to the proposed tourism development. A landowner argued that ‘it is a big investment and they are big and foreign investors’. The tourism resort proposed by Wakatu Incorporation is not considered a low-key tourism venture anymore. Many also fear bus tours and other mass influxes of visitors. The respondents generally oppose the opening of pubs and the expansion of tourist activities in the community, e.g. adventure tourism helicopter and bungee jumping. Other respondents thought flying-fox would be unsuitable ‘right there on the edge of the Park’ and other mentioned that something like a hovercraft would be very noisy and intrusive. All these examples help to identify what sort of tourism activities the respondents would classify as ‘low-key’.

7.7.2 ‘MANAGEMENT’ AND ‘CONTROL’

The categories of management and control emerged as a mechanism to achieve more sustainable future directives for Marahau and the Park. The comments reflect that the community is generally critical about any further tourism development, because they fear that it could get ‘out of control’ and therefore, would ‘destroy what people come for’. Typical comments were: ‘by in large it has been done pretty well. I think it needs more planning now’ and ‘tourism should grow with time and it needs to be controlled growth’. A resident stated ‘I think tourism has a huge potential, because it is such a young place as far as tourism goes, and if managed correctly it will not turn into

Kaiteriteri and the Queenstown of the world'. One resident thinks that 'it needs more control, because when tourism goes into small towns it destroys them, dollars take over and the local government is paid off'. Another resident noted that 'in the height of summer none wants to be in Marahau. Tourism is a bit out of control. Everyone is just getting in on the act, without any strategy. They all fight with each other, they all hate each other'. These statements show that respondents are not opposing any further tourism development, but they emphasise the significance of control and management.

The respondents made a variety of suggestions on how to address the issue of tourism in the future, through controlling or limiting visitor numbers and tourism businesses. One landowner pointed out that 'the number of people going into the Park has to be policed', but also asked 'how would that work?' A bach-owner agreed that 'there could be some sort of control over how many people can be in the Park'. Others recommended the limitation of numbers in the peak season. One landowner even stated:

'The first part of the Park up until Anchorage is the busiest and there is an argument for sacrificing these five kilometres of coastline and providing tourists with an outdoor experience, and saving the rest. It is just those busy six weeks over Christmas and New Year that need management, either side of that it is fine and you can't see any negative impacts of tourism'.

The other suggestion is to control the number of tourism businesses. Landowners argued that 'someone has to control the operators, because the tractors are crushing the marine life and spilling oil and are going out six to ten times a day'. Other statements suggest limiting the number of commercial kayaks and that they should pay higher concessions. As this landowner suggested 'when they limit the number of people in the Park then there will be fewer water taxis needed, and the number of boats will regulate themselves'. These comments indicate that one way to control or manage the increase in visitors would be to limit the number of visitors, kayaks or water taxis to the Park, but also to price the product higher. There were a few comments that development would control itself. As this resident noted: 'the number of businesses starting in the future in Marahau is already regulated with the availability of land they can buy. I do not think it is a major thing to worry about. It will all regulate itself'. However, respondents support the idea of some control over tourism businesses.

The question was raised as to who should take on the role of managing tourism in Marahau and the Park, both DoC and TDC were recommended, but many were

uncertain who should be responsible. This reflects the current debate on who should control the foreshore of the Park. It relates to different legislations with various management mechanisms. A landowner said ‘DoC should have control over the Park to limit kayaks and businesses’. In regards to Marahau, respondents suggested that TDC could put more control on architectural aspects. One bach-owner recalled:

‘During a meeting three or four years ago, I asked the council, if they have a level of development they would permit. They said no more development, because of the water supply and sewage, but they also said no they have no level of development’.

He further argued: ‘I think there ought to be a level where they cut it off, where they say that is enough development and no more’. Another landowner commented that:

‘The TDC had meetings with local residents here, and some really good things have been drawn up and put in operation through those meetings, but it is kind of cosmetic really, it is sort of some rubbish bins here and some toilets there’.

One landowner noted also ‘the problem is that the TDC just can’t be bothered dealing with it’. In general, respondents feel a lack of confidence and trust in the local authorities.

Other respondents suggested ‘a code of practice’ for tourism businesses or a charge for visitors and businesses to the Park. This charge should include different rates for domestic and international visitors based on the experience some respondents had overseas. As this bach-owner said: ‘there ought to be a fee for tourists and the tourist operators ought to pay something towards it, because, the latter depend on tourists for their livelihood’. One landowner remarked:

‘I really think there should be a different rate for overseas tourists and local New Zealanders. Our Parks have been free to us until they invented tourism, and for a lot of New Zealanders they are not available anymore they have to pay. I think it is turning our national heritage into private enterprises and I totally disagree with that’.

Respondents suggest introducing a tax or fee that generates income from visitors and tourism businesses in the context of control and management. Respondents would like to retain their lifestyles and the peacefulness and naturalness of Marahau through ‘low-key development’ that is achieved by better management, control or planning

CHAPTER VIII: CONCLUSION

For Marahau and the Abel Tasman National Park there is still the opportunity to actually get the formula right (Davis, 2000).

8.1 BRIDGING TOURISM AND DEVELOPMENT

There is a growing appreciation that tourism development must occur within acceptable limits with regard to the industry's impacts on society, culture, and the natural environment (Hall, 2000; Milne, 1998; Mowforth and Munt, 1998). Contemporary discourse in the sustainable tourism development literature also highlights the importance of community participation and stakeholder interaction. This thesis has examined stakeholder perceptions towards tourism development in the community of Marahau, New Zealand. The foundations of the theoretical and methodological approaches adopted have been built upon advances made in development theory, especially those embracing participatory approaches and concepts. I adopted a participatory approach to improve the integration of groups and individuals into the planning process. Central to this approach is the importance of understanding the multiple perspectives and roles of these various stakeholders.

The thesis has also explored the role that information technology, in the form of GIS, can play in enhancing our ability to collect, represent and disseminate the data that underpins any participatory planning process. I have built upon the PPGIS literature and combined participatory approaches with GIS to create a tool that has the potential to facilitate the process of stakeholder interaction and communication by integrating 'local' knowledge and 'expert' knowledge.

Although we continue to lack a complete and foolproof array of tools to facilitate the integration of multi-stakeholder perspectives into the planning process this thesis has presented approaches and analysis that may assist our attempts to facilitate more effective participation in New Zealand tourism planning and elsewhere.

8.2 KEY RESEARCH FINDINGS

The research shows that there are no comprehensive and reliable strategies in place to guide management or planning for tourism development in Marahau and the Abel Tasman National Park. Local government and the RTO are the main stakeholders managing and promoting tourism in the region. Other governmental agencies (e.g.

Tourism New Zealand, the Department of Conservation and Ministry for the Environment) are directly or indirectly involved with tourism-related issues at various levels and scales, although their primary focus is usually not tourism and in many cases tourism aspects are not explicitly addressed.

The debate on who should control the foreshore of the Park is an example of the confusion that can emerge in this type of circumstance. The local council has jurisdiction over the foreshore up to the high water mark, while the Department of Conservation is responsible for the conservation estate and visitor management in the Park. There is no effective control over the beaches where there is growing concern about overcrowding, especially in the southern end of the Park. There are no regulations for water taxi or kayaking operators - they receive a concession as long as they conform to the navigational safety guidelines. This has resulted in an uncontrolled expansion of tourism businesses operating in the Park.

The current political structures seem, therefore, to impede the achievement of more sustainable tourism development. Although local government, the Tasman District Council, the Department of Conservation and Latitude Nelson, strive for more sustainable directives as outlined in their policy documents and resource management plans, the reality is perceived differently. These local government agencies appear to have limited influence in managing the effects of tourism growth effectively. This situation might occur because the existing policies are concentrating on the responsibilities confined to one agency and there seems to be little control and cooperation between the various agencies to address common issues with any urgency.

The tourism industry in Marahau and the Park is divided into the tourism operators from 'outside' the community and the Marahau-based tourism businesses. Although there are conflicts between those two groups, their perspectives on tourism development are similar. The results show that the tourism industry is concerned about the consequences of further growth in visitor numbers to the Park. They emphasise that a decline in visitor experience due to perception of overcrowding in the Park during the peak season could result in negative effects for the industry.

Most operators want to avoid volume tourism and maintain a quality experience for visitors. The management of the Park's foreshore and the possibility of controlling visitor numbers emerged as a significant issue for the industry. While not all operators are in favour of restricting the number of visitors several appear to see it as a necessary evil that will have to occur at some stage. Several operators also addressed issues of increasing competition and changing visitor preferences and behaviour. It should also be noted that many tourism business owners do not want to be deprived of their lifestyle. Thus, seasonality is a significant positive factor for many operators, because it provides the community with some 'quiet time' and allows operators to catch up with the rest of their lives. The findings highlight the fact that competition makes it difficult to address wider environmental and social planning concerns. Despite the desire for a quality product, much of the industry depends for its continued existence on strong visitor numbers, price-based competition and the continuing expansions of operations.

The visitor research indicates that the motivation for most who come to Marahau is the Park. Marahau is the gateway, especially for international visitors who are searching for the closest entry point. The remoteness and rurality that is reflected in Marahau and the accessibility of the Park are major components of their choice in destination. The common descriptions about Marahau being beautiful, quiet, relaxing and especially non-commercialised and not overcrowded emphasise the importance of these characteristics in influencing the tourist experience. In regards to the Park the findings indicate that visitors describe its key attributes as stunning beaches, lovely coastline and wonderful scenery. However, perceptions of crowding were also expressed with comments about too many people and too many kayaks and water taxis. The results also show that this is largely a high-season problem. Visitor responses generally indicate that the Park and Marahau should stay as they are rather than encourage further development or commercialisation to occur.

The community of Marahau is made up of a wide range of individuals who have a variety of perceptions on issues that concern their livelihood and quality of life. The community has evolved from a laid-back, small, isolated rural farming community to a tourism dependent locality at its 'turning point'. In the mid-1990s tourism 'took off' with a rapid increase in water taxis and kayaks to serve the growing visitor numbers. The major concern that emerged from the community study relates to further

development, a continuing increase in visitor numbers and permanent residents. The research shows that perceptions are similar on general matters, e.g. the hope for low-key development in the community to retain its special character, as well as sustainable management of the Park. The perceptions differed more at the level of specifics, e.g. the question was raised how to achieve more low-key development for Marahau and the majority agreed on the necessity of control and management. Although, it remained unclear who should control the tourism development and how the number of visitors and tourism operators should be limited. The seasonal nature of the industry is very much supported by community members as they value the ‘quiet time’ that it brings.

The findings show that the Marahau community generally strives for low-key development in the future and that tourism development requires control and management to ensure long-term sustainability. There is considerable current concern over the proposed beachfront tourist resort. Many are sceptical and believe that this development represents the ‘thin end of the wedge’ of Marahau’s transformation into a mini-Queenstown. Clearly these attitudes and concerns need to be dealt with effectively if future development of the industry is to progress and retain broad based local support.

International visitor numbers in New Zealand are expected to reach three million a year by 2010 (Tourism Strategy Group, 2001). The increase will have an effect on visitor numbers to the Abel Tasman National Park, and thus on Marahau. This indicates that there is an urgent requirement for a more sustainable management approach by local government. First steps have been taken with the establishment of the ‘Nelson Tasman Regional Visitor Strategy Forum’ that integrates government stakeholders and provides a platform upon which decisions concerning the future development issues of tourism can be addressed and integrated. There is still no framework to ensure regular coordination or communication between other stakeholders, e.g. the community, tourism industry and iwi, and governmental agencies with a role in tourism. The current political changes initiated by the current government in New Zealand might challenge the existing planning and management structures. Also the ‘New Zealand Tourism Strategy 2010’ might provide some significant changes to the current situation. It proposes to provide a framework for decision-making that aims to allow the tourism industry in collaboration with local government to work towards a sustainable future.

The framework, however, is superficial and lacks clearly identified strategies to achieve the expected outcomes.

The reality is that the self-interest of individuals and organisations are guiding development processes and development objectives. The tourism planning process is ad hoc and addresses short-term profits before long-term sustainability. This study emphasises that only aiming at economic growth and planning for the benefits of a few can't achieve sustainable development for the future. The results showed that the overall aims of various stakeholders were remarkably alike. The expectation for sustainable development is shared by all stakeholders and is manifested in current management plans and legislation. In reality, neither the debate about the foreshore of the Park nor the proposed new tourism development in Marahau, are encouraging examples.

8.3 RESEARCH CHALLENGES AND THE FUTURE

The evaluation of the participatory methods during the interview in this research reveals that there is potential for these approaches to improve community participation and strengthen the communication process. The sheer quantity and complexity of emotions, stories, experiences and perceptions revealed by the research were overwhelming. One of the key challenges of this work was to draw some common threads out of this multitude of responses and then discuss the outcomes with the stakeholders and the community. The PAGIS was perceived by those involved in the research as an innovative tool, although for the majority of community members the GIS needs to be facilitated by someone who is familiar with computer applications. Explaining the meaning and utility of PAGIS to participants encouraged initial discussion on local issues such as the proposed tourism development by Wakatu Incorporation. These discussions highlighted the potential of PAGIS as a tool for interaction and communication between stakeholders.

The evaluation of the interview process reveals that the visual aids, like the aerial photograph and the colour-coded stickers enhanced the process of the interview and made it an innovative experience for the respondents. The comments on the process were: 'really interesting', 'fun' and 'enjoyed using aerial photographs and maps'. As many persons were interviewed, the stickers ensured that the opinions of the other participants were also acknowledged. As one person stated: 'I like the thing with the

little bits of paper that makes me think and put it down and I am a writing kind of person'. The evaluation also revealed that the participatory mapping supported engagement in the discussion and provided a focus throughout the interview. The map 'encourages me to think about Marahau issues and to verbalise them' expressed one respondent. The visual aids used during the interview contributed to the achievement of an interactive and informal interview process.

Respondents found that the semi-structured form of the interview gave them the opportunity to explore issues and topics in more depth. This opportunity is reflected in the statement that 'it feels easier to answer, opens up more topics and is more pleasant than conventional methods'. Another respondent concluded that it is:

'Good that you are leaving us to tell you what we think. I mean if you ask this question it forces us to make a judgement where when you ask me spontaneously what I think about the area and what are my concerns, you give me the chance to bring that up. If you let us have our views first, you get a totally different perspective, you have not thought about. If you put the question first, you kind of channel us in your direction'.

This last quote indicates the way in which the semi-structured interview technique supports the iterative process in participatory approaches. It shows that the respondents felt that through the style of interviewing the voices of the community would be acknowledged.

In many instances the interview provided the respondents with an opportunity for their views to be heard and a platform to contribute to the future development directives for Marahau. These included comments such as: 'I appreciate the opportunity to be able to contribute to the planning for the future of Marahau' or 'we all like hearing our views and you let us hear our views very well, you let us say exactly what we want'. The following comment reflects the responses of many:

'Someone is actually going to listen to us and it is going to contribute to something real in the end. It is the thing of being listened to. That is why you are getting good responses, people are quite passionate about the place'.

Clearly there is a need for more innovative forms of consultation to encourage local people to take part in the tourism planning process and ensure that they can express their views.

8.3.1 TOWARDS A ROLE FOR PARTICIPATORY APPROACHES AND GIS

There is a requirement for approaches to strengthen community participation and facilitate stakeholder interaction in tourism planning. This thesis has suggested drawing upon the concept of participation in development that offers a wide range of approaches to strengthen the process of community participation. Further, I proposed the integration of participatory approaches and GIS to design a tool that has the potential to facilitate stakeholder communication.

The findings show that the usual consultation process adopted by the local government in the Nelson region is functional participation or participation by consultation (see Pretty, 1998). This means that people participate by being consulted or by answering questions. The external agency defines the problem, the information-gathering process and controls the analysis. The goal to be achieved is neither interactive nor self-mobilisation participation. This means that people do not participate in joint development of action plans and analysis. The process would include the involvement of interdisciplinary methodologies that seek multiple perspectives and use systematic and structured learning processes. This would also require locals to take control of local decisions. Self-mobilisation would ensure that people's initiative would be enabled through a framework of support by local government.

The tourism industry and the local community of Marahau feel relatively 'powerless' regarding changes that affect their lives. Thus, participatory approaches offer a way to facilitate more interactive participation that can enhance community involvement and especially foster the relationship between local government and the community. The application of participatory approaches also offers the opportunity to redistribute power, and therefore empowers people to negotiate and be involved in conflict resolution (Chambers, 1997a). These approaches can facilitate more cooperation by local government and other organisations with the community. Through co-learning, sharing of knowledge could occur to develop a new understanding of common issues (see Cornwall, 1996, 96).

Combining participatory approaches and GIS (PAGIS) offers a tool that can be used to facilitate stakeholder communication and interaction in the tourism planning process. Although it needs to be stressed that any GIS is still an agency-driven tool. It can be

administrated and supported by, for example, the local government. PAGIS provides the opportunity to increase the number and range of individuals and groups taking part in spatial decision-making. The information should be freely available to everybody whom it concerns and to the local agencies that integrate it into further planning.

Both qualitative 'local' knowledge and 'expert' knowledge needs to be integrated into the GIS. Although the current PAGIS does not include the visitors' spatial responses they could be integrated and presented in PAGIS with relative ease. A problem in this sense is that visitors are not always familiar with the local area, and therefore may have difficulty identifying the places they have visited on the map. In the future I suggest developing an approach that integrates the visitors' perception. This could be achieved through providing a range of options for specific locations that visitors can choose from and represent it via points in the PAGIS.

In adopting PAGIS in the planning process, it would be desirable to provide the opportunity for participants to access PAGIS through the Internet. This would enable stakeholders to address the complexities and dynamics of the real world more quickly and effectively. PAGIS could be integrated in ArcIMS™ from ESRI that allows for the distribution of geographic information over the Internet. ArcIMS™ provides a common platform for this exchange to integrate, and analyse data in new ways over the Internet with local data for display, query, and analysis (Environmental Systems Research Institute, 2001). The major criticism of this is that the Internet is accessible to only a small range of people and organisations. The application is also not restricted solely to tourism planning, but can integrate any community development perspective. It is also desirable to update the information on a regular basis and again the Internet seems to provide a useful and inexpensive platform to achieve this. PAGIS requires further development to be more efficient in presenting and managing the data.

To 'hand-over' the PAGIS, I designed a CD-ROM that contains the program ArcExplorer to display, query and analyse the results. The tool can be used in discussions on future planning aspects in Marahau. The CD-ROM is also designed to make the data accessible to a wider range of individuals and groups. Due to reasons of confidentiality personal statements are not included in the database and the responses can't be traced back to an individual in the community. For future research, I suggest

that more case studies are needed to identify the potential and pitfalls of participatory GISs. Technological innovations such as PAGIS can marginalise or empower individuals and groups. Appropriate safeguards need to be developed against the misinterpretation and misuse of the data. An important component of every participatory GIS application is, therefore, to identify its social impacts and implications. This requires monitoring and evaluation regimes throughout the design process and the implementation of a participatory GIS.

PAGIS can stimulate debates and aid in the communication of views between various stakeholders. Moreover, the results can be used to enhance the planning processes through better-informed decisions that represent the community perspective. The tool provides a means to raise the understanding of complex local issues and to assist in the conceptualisation of local knowledge. The potential of GIS to generalise data by identifying patterns and categories, while still capturing and presenting individual responses, makes it an important tool for tourism planning.

8.4 IMPLICATIONS AND CONTRIBUTIONS

Although this research is centered on the roles in and perceptions of stakeholders in Marahau as a case study, broader principles have emerged. By applying participatory methods to investigate sustainable tourism development in local communities an innovative approach has been developed. This has addressed the issues of strengthening community participation and providing a tool that demonstrated the potential to enhance stakeholder interaction and communication. I employed the use of existing theoretical and methodological frameworks (e.g. participatory approaches) in a different context (e.g. New Zealand instead of a developing country) and with a different conceptual focus (e.g. stakeholder analysis: a community instead of an organisation). More specifically, I investigated a variety of stakeholders in a particular setting and not only one stakeholder. The research further adopted a qualitative approach through applying participatory approaches to investigate stakeholder perceptions. This is still an underrepresented method in tourism research. The research process also integrated a quantitative element into the investigation. Also drawing upon development theory the research introduced a theoretical framework to tourism planning. The findings of this research also inform development theory with insights from tourism development.

Independently, this study contributes to the GIS and Society debate in providing another case study that integrates qualitative responses into a GIS. Further, I introduced an innovative approach that integrates participatory approaches and GIS with the aim of designing a tool that can enhance stakeholder interaction and communication to achieve more sustainable tourism development. PAGIS also aims at increasing the number and diversity of people that can take part in spatial decision-making.

This study draws upon the momentum of transition occurring in Marahau and the Abel Tasman National Park. To understand the holistic picture, it is necessary to understand the complex nature of the investigation in integrating the relationship between agency and structure. The research shows that the ideology of the free market seems to be incompatible with the participatory approach of contemporary development theory focusing on local community participation. The interests of the community are not served and the pursuit of profit precludes consideration of these wider social issues.

The growing complexity and dynamics of communities and stakeholders pose significant challenges to sustainable tourism development. The planning and management of sustainable tourism development in local communities needs more attention and appropriate policy mechanisms in which local authorities, like TDC, DoC and Latitude Nelson can work effectively together with the local community and the tourism industry. This would support the achievement of sustainable outcomes not only relating to the natural environment and physical resources, but also addressing the social aspects of development. PAGIS provides a tool that has the potential to enhance the process of community participation and stakeholder interaction. There is the unique opportunity to make a difference in Marahau and the Park and ‘get the formula right’.

Some of the directions tourism research has been taking in the late 1990s indicate the extent to which practitioners have attempted to integrate their approaches within the wider theoretical and disciplinary debates to find answers to common problems. This thesis has shown that the situation is complex and dynamic with a wide range of stakeholders being involved in the current debates directing the future in Marahau and the Park. Future research could be directed at striking a better balance between objective and subjective research. This is expressed by Hunt (1991, 52) as ‘critical pluralism’ and describes the type of balance sought in which conciliation is achieved between the

objective, rationalist and scientific approach on the one hand and the subjective, interpretative and constructivist approach on the other. The mainstream tourism literature is currently biased towards objectivist research that privileges more quantitative and scientific methodology. Subjectivism is characterised by qualitative research methods, such as participatory approaches, and provides a better understanding of the processes by which a greater understanding of stakeholder participation and interaction is achieved. The critical pluralist emphasises ways to integrate qualitative participatory approaches, such as those used in the research presented here, with further traditional objectivist research in tourism planning processes. The theoretical framework of critical pluralism and interpretative approaches emphasise that participatory approaches have philosophical implications, not only methodological ones. It provides different light on contested concepts described in this thesis, such as community, sustainability and threshold. In regards to the issue of thresholds this means that is no appropriate level of tourism as such, given the multiple realities and perspectives of different stakeholders at a certain point in time and place.

The pluralist approach involves testing the emergent categories of stakeholder perceptions on tourism by using traditional methods. The resulting comparison between the subjective and objective results can provide a more rigorous theoretical explanation of how to achieve more sustainable forms of tourism development. This includes the requirement for more replicable research and the application to broader settings to achieve more universal value. Furthermore, future research into community participation and stakeholder interaction needs to be supported by developing more monitoring and evaluation regimes that reflect the balance of critical pluralism. The application of GIS needs to be critically reflected upon and the PAGIS tool implemented and tested. Research into tourism development is dependent on the local situation and general principles can vary in different contextual environments. Therefore, this research does not claim to provide the solution for all the dilemmas that researchers have been tackling for many years, but merely aims to provide a platform for further investigation.

The changes that have followed from tourism growth in Marahau are one example of the dynamic and complex situation many local communities are facing in New Zealand and around the world. This thesis has gone some way towards assisting to deal with

some of these issues more effectively by highlighting the real-world complexities of stakeholder perceptions of tourism development. Adopting participatory approaches provides the opportunity for researchers and policy makers to utilise more effective tools for strengthening community participation. This thesis argues that PAGIS can be adopted to provide a means for enhancing the process of interaction and communication between stakeholders. It is only when this communication and understanding is reached that sustainable development outcomes which enjoy the support of most stakeholders will be achieved in communities like Marahau.

REFERENCES

- Abbot, J., Chambers, R., Dunn, C., Harris, T., De Merode, E., Porter, G., Townsend, J., and Weiner, D. (1998). Participatory GIS: Opportunity or oxymoron? *PLA Notes*, 33, 27-34.
- Abel Tasman Aqua Taxis. (1999/2000). *Brochure of tourism business*. Marahau, Nelson.
- Abel Tasman Homestay and Stables. (1999/2000). *Brochure of tourism business*. Marahau, Nelson.
- Abel Tasman Marahau Beach Camp. (1999/2000). *Brochure of tourism business*. Marahau, Nelson.
- Abel Tasman Marahau Lodge. (1999/2000). *Brochure of tourism business*. Marahau, Nelson.
- Adams, B. (1996). Sustainable development and the greening of development theory. In F. J. Schuurman (Ed.), *Beyond the Impasse -New directions in Development Theory* (pp. 207-222). London and New Jersey: Zed Books.
- Adams, W. D. (1995). Sustainable development? In R. J. Johnston and P. J. Taylor and M. J. Watts (Eds.), *Geographies of Global Change: Remapping the World in the Late Twentieth Century* (pp. 354-373). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Aerial Survey Ltd. (Cartographer). (1995). *Aerial photograph of Marahau*, Nelson.
- Aitken-Turner, A., Campbell, C., Chang, A., Davidson, L., and Roddick, M. (1996). *A profile of the arts and crafts and their economic impact in the Nelson region*. Wellington: Victoria University of Wellington.
- Allan, R. M. (1965). *Nelson a History of Early Settlement*. Nelson: Reed.
- Anderson, M., Meaton, J., and Potter, C. (1994). Public participation - an approach using aerial photographs at Ashford, Kent. *Town Planning Review*, 65 (1), 41-58.
- Arnstein, S. R. (1969). A ladder of citizen participation. *American Institute of Planners*, 35, 216-224.
- Ateljevic, I. (1998). *Circuits of Tourism: (Re) producing the Place of Rotorua, New Zealand*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand.
- Ateljevic, I., Doorne, S., Ateljevic, J., and McCready, Z. (1999). *Visitors to Nelson* (Report 9). Wellington: Victoria University of Wellington, Tourism Group.
- Ateljevic, J., Milne, S., Doorne, S., and Ateljevic, I. (1999). *Tourism micro-firms in rural New Zealand - key issues for the coming millennium* (Report 7). Wellington: Victoria University of Wellington, Tourism Group.
- Bank of New Zealand. (1983). *Motueka 1883-1983 - a BNZ century* (Report). Wellington: Griffin (R.H.) Bank of New Zealand.
- Barret, P. (2001). Abel Tasman National Park - walking tracks and kayak trips in a palce of balmy weather and natural beauty. *New Zealand Wilderness*, June, 26-33.
- Belisle, F. J., and Hoy, D. R. (1980). The perceived impact of tourism by residents. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 7, 83-101.

- Bernhard, J. (1973). The sociology of community. In J. Reiss and H. L. Wilensky (Eds.), *Introduction to Modern Society Series*. Pennsylvania State University, Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Co. G. Lenview.
- Bloomfield, R. (1999). *Nga korero o mua: Marahau me Otuwheru* (Draft Report). Wellington.
- Boffa Miskell Ltd. (1998). *Marahau strategic development review*. Wellington, New Zealand: Prepared for Tasman District Council.
- Booth, D. (1996). Development research: From impasse to a new agenda. In F. J. Schuurman (Ed.), *Beyond the Impasse - New Directions in Development Theory* (pp. 49-76). London and New Jersey: Zed Books.
- Bourke, L., and Luloff, A. E. (1996). Rural tourism development - are communities in southwest rural Pennsylvania ready to participate? In W. Husbands and L. C. Harrison (Eds.), *Practicing Responsible Tourism - International Case Studies in Tourism Planning, Policy and Development* (pp. 277-295). New York: John Wiley.
- Boyd, S. W., Butler, R. W., Haider, W., and Perera, A. (1994). Identifying areas for ecotourism in Northern Ontario: Application of a geographical information system methodology. *Journal of Applied Recreation Research*, 19, 40-66.
- Britton, S. (1991). Tourism, capital, and place: Towards a critical geography of tourism. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 9, 451-478.
- Britton, S. (1996). Tourism, dependency and development. In S. Apostolopoulos and S. Leivadi and A. Yiannakis (Eds.), *The Sociology of Tourism: Theoretical and Empirical Investigations* (pp. 155-172). London: Routledge.
- Britton, S., LeHeron, R., and Pawson, E. (Eds.). (1992). *Changing Places in New Zealand: A Geography of Restructuring*. Christchurch: New Zealand Geographical Society.
- Brougham, J. E., and Butler, R. W. (1981). A segmentation of residents' attitudes to the social impacts of tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 8, 569-590.
- Burrough, P. A. (1986). *Principles of Geographical Information Systems for Land Resource Assessment*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bush, G. (1995). *Local Government and Politics in New Zealand* (2nd ed.). Auckland: Auckland University Press.
- Butler, R.W., Hall, C. M., and Jenkins, J. M. (Eds.). 1998. *Tourism and Recreation in Rural Areas*. New York: Wiley and Sons.
- Butler, R. W. (1998). Sustainable tourism - looking backwards in order to progress? In M. C. Hall and A. A. Lew (Eds.), *Sustainable Tourism - a Geographical Perspective* (pp. 25-34). New York: Longman.
- Butler, R. W. (1980). The concept of a tourist area cycle of evolution: Implications for management of resources. *Canadian Geographer*, 24 (1), 5-12.
- Canard, H. (1999). Personal communication, ex-tourism operator in Marahau. Nelson.
- Canard, H. (2000, 14/15th October). *Tourism, conservation and recreation - the need for social psychology research in conservation management coalition building not conflict resolution*. Paper presented at the Federated Mountain Club's Wild Lands Conference, St. Arnaud, Nelson, New Zealand.

- Capenerhust, J. (1994). Community tourism. In L. Haywood (Ed.), *Community Leisure and Recreation - Theory and Practice* (pp. 144-171). Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Ceballos-Lascurain, H. (1996). *Tourism, Ecotourism and Protected Areas*. Gland, Switzerland: The World Conservation Union.
- Cessford, G. R. (1994). *Great walks study - preliminary result notes*. Nelson: Department of Conservation.
- Cessford, G. R., and Dingwall, P. R. (1998). *An approach to assessing the environmental impacts of tourism*. Paper presented at the New Zealand Tourism and Hospitality Research Conference 1998, Third Biennial Conference, Akaroa, New Zealand.
- Chambers, R. (1983). *Rural Development - Putting the Last First*. London: Longman.
- Chambers, R. (1994a). *Paradigm shifts and the practice of participatory research and development* (Working Paper 2). England: Institute of Development Studies.
- Chambers, R. (1997a). *Whose Reality Counts? Putting the First Last*. London, UK: Intermediate Technology Publications.
- Chambers, R. (1997b). Paradigm shifts and the practice of participatory research and development. In N. Nelson and S. Wright (Eds.), *Power and Participation Development - Theory and Practice* (pp. 30-42). UK: Intermediate Technology Publication.
- Chang, T.C. (1997). *Local Uniqueness in the Global Village: Heritage Tourism in Singapore*. Unpublished Ph.D., McGill University, Montreal, Canada.
- Christodoulakis, S., Anastasiadis, M., Margazas, T., Moumoutzis, N., and Kontogiannis, P. (1998). A modular approach to support GIS functionality in tourism application. In D. Buhalis and A. M. Tjoa and J. Jafari (Eds.), *Information and Communication Technologies in Tourism* (pp. 63-72). Istanbul, Turkey: Proceedings of the International Conference Istanbul.
- Clark, A. (1998, 14.10.). Battle for the beaches. *The Nelson Mail*. Nelson, New Zealand.
- Cloke, P., and Perkins, H. C. (1998). "Cracking the canyon with the awesome foursome": Representations of adventure tourism in New Zealand. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 16, 185-218.
- Clough, B. (2000). Personal communication, Department of Conservation Nelson/Marlborough Conservancy: Nelson.
- Clough, B. (2001). Personal communication, Department of Conservation Nelson/Marlborough Conservancy: Nelson.
- Coffey, A., and Atkinson, P. (1996). *Making Sense of Qualitative Data*. London: Sage Publications.
- Collier, A. (1997). *Principles of Tourism - A New Zealand Perspective* (4th ed.). Auckland, New Zealand: Longman.
- Cornwall, A. (1996). Towards participatory practice: Participatory rural appraisal (PRA) and the participatory process. In K. De Koning and M. Martin (Eds.), *Participatory Research in Health* (pp. 94-107). London: Zed Books Ltd.
- Cornway, G. R., and McCracken, J. A. (1990). Rapid rural appraisal and agroecosystem analysis. In M. A. Altieri and S. B. Hect (Eds.), *Agroecology and Small Farm Development* (pp. 221-235). Boca Raton, Florida: CRC Press.

- Cowen, M., and Shenton, R. (1996). The invention of development. In J. Crush (Ed.), *Power of Development* (pp. 27-43). London and New York: Routledge.
- Curtis, D. (1997). Power to the people: Rethinking community development. In N. Nelson and S. Wright (Eds.), *Power and Participation Development - Theory and Practice* (pp. 115-124). UK: Intermediate Technology Publication.
- Davis, D., Allen, J., and Cosenza, R. (1988). Segmenting local residents by their attitudes, interests and opinions towards tourism. *Journal of Travel Research*, 27, 2-8.
- Davis, P. (2000). Personal communication, Chief Executive of Latitude Nelson. Nelson.
- De Araujo, M. L., and Bramwell, B. (1999). Stakeholder assessment and collaborative planning: The case of Brazil's Costa Dourada project. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 7 (3/4), 356-378.
- De Kadt, E. (Ed.). (1979). *Tourism: Passport to Development?* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dennis, A. (1990). *A Park for All Seasons - The Story of Abel Tasman National Park*. Nelson/Marlborough: Department of Conservation.
- Denzin, N., and Lincoln, Y. (Eds.). (1994). *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.
- Denzin, N. K. (1989). *Research Act: A Theoretical Introduction to Sociological Methods* (3rd ed.). New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Department of Lands and Survey (Cartographer). (1984). *New Zealand topographical map: Takaka (NZMS 260; Sheet N26)*. Wellington: Department of Lands and Survey.
- Din, K. H. (1996). Tourism development: Still in search of a more equitable mode of local involvement. *Progress in Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 2, 273-281.
- Department of Conservation. (1995a). *Visitor satisfactions, impact perceptions, and attitudes toward management options on the Abel Tasman National Park* (Science for Conservation: 76). Nelson: Department of Conservation Nelson/Marlborough Conservancy.
- Department of Conservation. (1995b). *Sea-kayaker satisfactions, impact perceptions, and attitudes toward management options on the Abel Tasman National Park* (Science for Conservation: 79). Nelson: Department of Conservation Nelson/Marlborough Conservancy.
- Department of Conservation. (1996a). *Conservation management strategy for Nelson/Marlborough conservancy 1996-2000, Volume 1*. Nelson: Department of Conservation Nelson/Marlborough Conservancy.
- Department of Conservation. (1996b). *Conservation management strategy for Nelson/Marlborough conservancy 1996-2000, Volume 2*. Nelson: Department of Conservation Nelson/Marlborough Conservancy.
- Department of Conservation. (1996c). *Abel Tasman National Park - draft management plan 1996-2006* (Management Plan Series 9). Nelson: Department of Conservation Nelson/Marlborough Conservancy.
- Department of Conservation. (1998). *Foreshore investigation - Abel Tasman National Park* (Report Occasional Publication No. 40). Nelson: Department of Conservation Nelson/Marlborough Conservancy.

- Department of Conservation. (1999). *The Abel Tasman National Park* (Booking Information Sheet). Nelson: Department of Conservation Nelson/Marlborough Conservancy.
- Department of Conservation. (2000). Available: <http://www.doc.govt.nz/local/local.htm> (27.07.).
- Dogan, H. Z. (1989). Forms of adjustment - sociocultural impacts of tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 16, 216-236.
- Doxey, G. V. (1975). *A causation theory of visitor-resident irritants: Methodology and research inference*. Paper presented at the Proceedings of the Travel and Research Association, 6th Annual Conference, San Diego, California.
- Drake, S. (1991). Local participation in ecotourism projects. In T. Whelan (Ed.), *Nature Tourism: Managing for the Environment* (pp. 132-163). Washington D.C.: Island Press.
- Duncan, J., and Ley, D. (1993). *Place/Culture/Representation*. London: Routledge.
- Elias, A. A., Cavana, R. Y., and Jackson, L. S. (2000). *A review of stakeholder literature: Opportunities for system dynamic research*. Paper presented at the International Conference on Systems Thinking in Management, Australia, Geelong.
- Elliot-White, M. P., and Finn, M. (1998). Growing in sophistication: The application of geographical information systems in post-modern tourism marketing. *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing*, 7 (1), 65-84.
- Ernst and Young. (1995). *How and why should local governments should promote tourism* (Report). Wellington: Ernst and Young.
- Escobar, A. (1995). *Encountering Development: The Making and Unmaking of the Third World*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Environmental Systems Research Institute. (2001). *ESRI*. Available: www.esri.com.
- Eyles, J. (1988). Interpreting the geographical world - qualitative approaches in geographical research. In J. Eyles and D. M. Smith (Eds.), *Qualitative Methods in Human Geography* (pp. 1-16). Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Forer, P., and Simmons, D. G. (1998, 01.12-04.12). *Tourism planning: Prospects and challenges of using GIS as an interactive and facilitative tool*. Paper presented at the New Zealand Tourism and Hospitality Research Conference: Advances in Research, Akaroa, New Zealand.
- Forer, P., and Stephen, P. (1998, 01.12-04.12). *Spatial modelling of tourist flows in Northland/Tai Tokerau*. Paper presented at the New Zealand Tourism and Hospitality Research Conference: Advances in Research, Akaroa, New Zealand.
- Frater, P., Andrews, G., Stuart, G., and Harris, F. (1998). *The driver clusters of the Nelson regional economy* (Report). Nelson: Nelson City Council, Tasman District Council, Port Nelson Ltd., Nelson Regional Airport Authority.
- Freeman, E. R. (1984). *Strategic Management: A Stakeholder Approach*. Boston: Pitman Publishing.
- Friedmann, J. (1992). *Empowerment - The Politics of Alternative Development*. Cambridge: Blackwell.
- Gardner, K., and Lewis, D. (1996). *Anthropology, Development and the Post-Modern Challenge*. London: Pluto Press.

- Getz, D. (1994). Residents' attitudes towards tourism - a longitudinal study in Spey Valley, Scotland. *Tourism Management*, 15 (4), 247-258.
- Getz, D., and Jamal, T. B. (1994). The environment-community symbiosis: A case for collaborative tourism planning. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 2 (3), 131-136.
- Gleeson, B. J. (1995). The commodification of resource consent in New Zealand. *New Zealand Geographer*, 51 (1), 42-48.
- Gray, B. (1989). *Collaborating: Finding Common Ground for Multiparty Problems*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Groten, S. (1996, 24.04-30.05). *Aerial photographs as communication tool in participatory land use planning*. Paper presented at the International Training Course on Land Use Planning for Rural Development, Zschortau, Germany.
- Grundy, K. J., and Gleeson, B. J. (1996). Sustainable management and the market - the politics of planning reform in New Zealand. *Land Use Policy*, 13 (3), 197-211.
- Hall, M. C. (1999). Rethinking collaboration and partnership: A public policy perspective. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 7 (3/4), 274-289.
- Hall, M. C. (2000). *Tourism Planning - Policies, Processes and Relationships*. England: Prentice Hall.
- Hall, M. C., Jenkins, J., and Kearsley, G. (1997a). Introduction: Issues in tourism planning and policy in Australia and New Zealand. In M. C. Hall and J. Jenkins and G. Kearsley (Eds.), *Planning and Policy - in Australia and New Zealand, Cases, Issues and Practice*. Australia: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Hall, M. C., Jenkins, J., and Kearsley, G. (Eds.). (1997b). *Tourism Planning and Policy in Australia and New Zealand: Cases, Issues and Practice*. Sydney: Irwin Publishers.
- Hall, M. C., and Lew, A. A. (Eds.). (1998). *Sustainable Tourism - A Geographical Perspective*. New York: Longman.
- Haralambopoulos, N., and Pizam, A. (1996). Perceived impacts of tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 23 (3), 503-526.
- Hardy, A., and Beeton, R. J. (1999, 30.08-02.09). *The use of grounded theory as a tool to facilitate theory on stakeholder perceptions of sustainable tourism*. Paper presented at the Tourism Policy and Planning, Oamaru, Otago, New Zealand.
- Harington, P. (1997). 'community': Language and ideology. In C. Bell (Ed.), *Community Issues in New Zealand* (pp. 17-33): New Zealand: The Dunmore Press.
- Harris, R. (1995). The demands and principles of consultation. *Planning Quarterly*, 117, 5-7.
- Harris, T., and Weiner, D. (1998). Empowerment, marginalization and "community-integrated" GIS. *Cartography and Geographic Information Systems*, 25 (2), 67-80.
- Hasse, J. C. (2000a, 03-08.12.). *The battle for the beaches: Tourism, stakeholders and GIS in Marahau/New Zealand*. Paper presented at the Proceedings of 4th New Zealand Tourism and Hospitality Research Conference, Auckland/New Zealand.
- Hasse, J. C. (2000b). Tourism, stakeholders and sustainable community development: Theoretical and methodological reflections. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 2 (1), 67-75.

- Hawke, N. D. (2000). *Problems in paradise? Conflict Between Sea-Kayakers and Motorised Watercraft Users Along the Abel Tasman National Park Coastline*. Unpublished Masters, Lincoln University, Christchurch, New Zealand.
- Haywood, M. K. (1988). Responsible and responsive tourism planning in the community. *Tourism Management*, June, 105-118.
- Hellström, K. A. (1999). *Conservation Versus Visitor Use: A Case Study within New Zealand's Conservation Estate*. Unpublished Masters, Massey University, Palmerston North, New Zealand.
- Hendee, J. C., Stankey, G. H., and Lucas, R. C. (1990). *Wilderness Management*. Golden, Colorado: North American Press.
- Hettne, B. (1990). *Development theory and the three worlds*. New York: Longman.
- Hill, B. (1993). *The Abel Tasman National Park user survey report 1998/1990* (Occasional Publication No.18). Nelson: Department of Conservation.
- Host, E. (1976). *The Enchanted Coast*. Dunedin: John McIndoe Ltd.
- Hucker, B. (1997). Community and local government reform. In C. Bell (Ed.), *Community issues in New Zealand* (pp. 51- 63): The Dunmore Press.
- Hunt, J. G. (1991). *Leadership: A Synthesis*. Newbury Park, California: Sage Publications.
- Jackson, L. S. (1999). *Contemporary public involvement; towards a strategic approach* (School of Earth Sciences Report No.3): Victoria University of Wellington.
- Jackson, P., and Penrose, J. (1993). Introduction: Placing "race" and nation. In P. Jackson and J. Penrose (Eds.), *Construction of race, place and nation* (pp. 1-23). England: UCL Press.
- Jamal, T., and Getz, D. (1999). Community roundtables for tourism-related conflicts: The dialectics of consensus and process structures. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 7 (3/4), 290-313.
- Jamal, T. B., and Getz, D. (1995). Collaboration theory and community tourism planning. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 22 (1), 186-204.
- Joerger, A., DeGloria, S. D., and Malcolm, N. (1990). Applying geographic information systems: Siting of coastal hotels in Costa Rica. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 40 (4), 48-61.
- Johnston, R. J., Gregory, D., and Smith, D. M. (Eds.). (1998). *The Dictionary of Human Geography* (3rd ed.). Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Jones, C. (1996). *PRA tools and techniques pack* (PRA Topic Pack). Brighton: Institute of Development Studies at the University of Sussex.
- Joppe, M. (1996). Sustainable community tourism development revisited. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 17 (7), 475-479.
- Jurowski, C. (1996). Tourism means more than money to the host community. *Parks and Recreation*, 31 (9), 110-118.
- Kearsley, G. W. (1997). Tourism planning and policy in New Zealand. In M. C. Hall and J. Jenkins and G. W. Kearsley (Eds.), *Planning and Policy - in Australia and New Zealand, Cases, Issues and Practice* (pp. 49-64). Australia: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

- Kearsley, G. W. (1990). Tourism development and users' perceptions of wilderness in southern New Zealand. *The Australian Geographer*, 21(2), 127-140.
- Kelsey, J. (1993). *Rolling Back the State - Privatisation of Power in Aotearoa/New Zealand*. Wellington: Brigit Williams Books Ltd.
- Kelsey, J. (1997). *The New Zealand Experiment - A World Model for Structural Adjustment?* Auckland: Auckland University Press.
- Kliskey, A. D. (1994). Mapping multiple perceptions of wilderness in southern New Zealand, II: An alternative approach. *Applied Geography*, 14, 308-326.
- Kliskey, A. D., and Kearsley, G. W. (1993). Mapping multiple perceptions of wilderness in southern New Zealand. *Applied Geography*, 13, 203-223.
- Krippendorf, J. (1975). *Die Landschaftsfresser*. Bern/Stuttgart.
- Krippendorf, J. (1982). Toward new tourism policies: The importance of environmental and sociocultural factors. *Tourism Management*, 3 (3), 135-148.
- Lane, B. (1994). Sustainable rural tourism strategies: A tool for development and conservation. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 2(1and2), 102-111.
- Lankford, S. V., and Howard, D. R. (1994). Developing a tourism impact attitude scale. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 21, 121-139.
- Latitude Nelson. (2000). *Visitor numbers to the Nelson region*. Available: <http://www.latitudeNelson.co.nz> (15.08.).
- Latitude Nelson, Department of Conservation, Tasman District Council, and Nelson City Council. (2000). *Draft for discussion - Nelson Tasman regional visitor strategy forum*. Nelson.
- Lawson, R. W., Williams, J., Young, T., and Cossens, J. (1998). A comparison of residents' attitudes towards tourism in 10 New Zealand destinations. *Tourism Management*, 19 (3), 247-256.
- Lindberg, K., and Johnson, R. L. (1997). Modeling resident attitudes toward tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 24 (2), 402-424.
- Liu, J. C., and Var, T. (1986). Resident attitudes towards tourism impact in Hawaii. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 13, 193-214.
- Loukissas, P. J. (1983). Public participation in community tourism planning: A gaming simulation approach. *Journal of Travel Research* (Summer), 18-23.
- Maguire, D. J. (1991). An overview and definition of GIS. In D.J. Maquire and M.F. Goochild and D.W. Rind (Eds.), *Geographic Information Systems* (pp. 9-19). UK: John Wiley and Sons Inc.
- Manning, D. (1999, 27.11). Paddling in paradise. *The Nelson Mail*.
- Manning, R. E. (1986). *Studies in Outdoor Recreation - A Review and Synthesis of the Social Science Literature in Outdoor Recreation*. USA: Oregon State University Press.
- Mark, D. (1993, 11.11-14.11). *On the ethics of representation or whose world is it anyway?* Paper presented at the NCGIS Geographic Information and Society Workshop, Friday Harbor, Washington.
- Mason, P., and Leberman, S. (1999, 30.08-02.09). *Planning for recreation and tourism at the local level: Applied research in the Manawatu region of New Zealand*.

Paper presented at the Tourism Policy and Planning, Oamaru, Otago, New Zealand.

- Matheson, P. (1999). Personal communication, Mayor of Nelson. Nelson City Council.
- Matheson, P. (2000). *Abel Tasman foreshore investigation* (Letter). Nelson: Nelson City Council.
- Mathieson, A. and Wall, G. (1982). *Tourism: economic, physical and social impacts*. Harlow: Longman.
- Marahau Association of Tourism Operators. (1999/2000). *Brochure of tourism businesses in Marahau*. Marahau, Nelson.
- Marahau Association of Tourism Operators. (2000). Personal communication, Robert Pfalzer. Marahau, Nelson.
- Mayo, M., and Gary, C. (1995). Community participation and empowerment: The human face of structural adjustment or tools for democratic change? In C. Gary and M. Mayo (Eds.), *Community Empowerment: A Reader in Participation and Development* (pp. 1-11). New Jersey: Zed Books Ltd.
- McAdam, D. (1999). The value and scope of geographical information systems in tourism management. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 7 (1), 77-92.
- McAloon, J. (1997). *Nelson - A Regional History*. New Zealand: Cape Catley Ltd.
- McKinnon, J., Kui, C., McConchie, J., Huan-Cheng, M., and McKinnon, J. (2001). *MIGIS-mobile interactive GIS [online]*. Available: <http://www.geo.vuw.ac.nz/geography/projects/migis/> (March).
- Meadows, D. L., Meadows, D. H., and Erich, Z. (1972). *Die Grenzen des Wachstums. Club of Rome. Bericht des Club of Rome zur Lage der Menschheit*. Stuttgart: Deutsche V.A.
- Memon, P. A., and Gleeson, B. J. (1995). Towards a new planning paradigm? Reflections on New Zealand's Resource Management Act. *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design*, 22, 109-124.
- Ministry for the Environment. (2000). *Resource Management Act 1991*. Available: <http://rangi.knowledge-basket.co.nz/gpacts/public/text/1991/an/069.html> (10.10).
- Milman, A., and Pizam, A. (1988). Social impacts of tourism on central Florida. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 15 (2), 191-204.
- Milne, C. D. A. (Ed.). (1993). *Handbook of Environmental Law*. Wellington, New Zealand: Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society Inc.
- Milne, S. (1997). Beyond the vicious cycle? Tourism, dependency and south pacific microstates. In D. Lockhard and D. Drakkakis-Smith (Eds.), *Island Tourism* (pp. 281-302). London: Mansell.
- Milne, S. (1998). Tourism and sustainable development: The global-local nexus. In M. C. Hall and A. A. Lew (Eds.), *Sustainable Tourism - A Geographical Perspective* (pp. 35-48). New York: Longman.
- Milne, S. (2000). *Tourism in golden bay: Economic impacts and resource use issues - preliminary report*. Auckland: Tourism Research Institute.
- Mitchell, B. (1997). *Resource and Environmental Management*. London: Longman.

- Moncrieff, P. (1965). *People Came Later*. New Zealand: R.W.Stiles and Co.Ltd., Nelson.
- Moore, R. L. (1994). *Conflicts on multiple-use trails: Synthesis of the literature and state of the practice*. Washington, D.C. 2059013: US Federal Government Report No.: FHWA-PD-94-0312. Federal Highway Administration Intermodal Division (HEP-50).
- Morath, P. (Cartographer). (1999). *Torrent Bay, Abel Tasman National Park, Nelson, New Zealand*. Oamaru, New Zealand: Colourview Publications.
- Ministry of Tourism. (1993). *Tourism and local government* (Issue Paper, No.3). Wellington: Ministry of Tourism.
- Mowforth, M., and Munt, I. (1998). *Tourism and Sustainability - New Tourism in the Third World*. London: Routledge.
- Marahau and Sandy Bay Residents' and Ratepayers' Association. (1995). *Interim results of the survey of Marahau and sandy bay ratepayers and residents*. Marahau, Nelson.
- Marahau and Sandy Bay Residents' and Ratepayers' Association. (2001). *Newsletter No 17*. Marahau, Nelson.
- Murdoch, H. (1998, 24.07). Park changes causes concern. *The Nelson Mail*.
- Murphy, P. E. (1985). *Tourism: A Community Approach*. New York: University Press Cambridge.
- Murphy, P. E. (1988). Community driven tourism planning. *Tourism Management*, 9 (2), 96-104.
- Myers, G., and Macnaghten, P. (1998). Rhetorics of environmental sustainability: Commonplaces and places. *Environment and Planning A*, 30 (2), 333-354.
- Nelson City Council. (1998). *Nelson in Profile*. Nelson: Development Office, Nelson City Council.
- Nelson City Council. (2001). *Tourism*. Nelson: Nelson City Council.
- Neal, T. (1999, 26.10). Quiet chief with a loud message. *The Nelson Mail*.
- Neal, T. (2000, 27.11). New forum focuses on tourism. *The Nelson Mail*.
- Nelson, N., and Wright, S. (Eds.). (1997). *Power and Participation Development - Theory and Practice*. UK: Intermediate Technology Publication.
- Nielsen, J. M., Shelby, B., and Hass, E. J. (1977). Sociological carrying capacity and the last settler syndrome. *Pacific Sociological Review*, 20 (4), 568-581.
- New Zealand Tourism Board. (1999). *New Zealand tourism news*. Wellington, New Zealand.
- New Zealand Tourism Board. (2000). Available: <http://www.tourisminfo.co.nz/default.htm>.
- New Zealand Tourism Board, Ministry for the Environment, and New Zealand Tourism Industry Association. (1996). *Tourism's guide to the Resource Management Act. New Zealand*. Wellington.
- Obermeyer, N. J. (1998). The evolution of public participation GIS. *Cartography and Geographic Information Systems*, April 1998, p65 (61).
- Ocean View Chalets. (1999/2000). *Brochure of tourism business*. Marahau, Nelson.

- Old MacDonalds Farm. (1999/2000). *Brochure of tourism business*. Marahau, Nelson.
- Opperman, M. (2000). Triangulation - a methodological discussion. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 2(2), 141-146.
- O'Riordan, T. (1989). Contemporary environmentalism. In D. Gregory and R. Walford (Eds.), *Horizons in Human Geography* (pp. 395-414). London: Macmillan.
- Page, S. J., and Thorn, K. J. (1997). Towards sustainable tourism planning in New Zealand: Public sector planning responses. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 5(1), 59-77.
- Palmer, K. (1999). Personal communication, Chief Executive of Wakatu Incorporation. Nelson.
- Pandit, N. R. (1996). The creation of theory: A recent application of the grounded theory method. *The Qualitative Report*, 2 (4).
- Parsons, W. (1995). *Public Policy: An Introduction to the Theory and Practice of Policy Analysis*. London: Edward Elgar.
- Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative Evaluation and Research Methods* (2nd ed.). London: Sage Publications.
- Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment. (1996). *Public participation under the Resource Management Act 1991 - The management of conflict* (Report). Wellington: Office of the Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment.
- Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment. (1997). *Management of the environmental effects associated with the tourism sector* (Report). Wellington: Office of the Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment.
- Pearce, D. G. (1992). *Tourist Development* (2nd ed.). New York: Longman.
- Pearce, D. G. (1993). Domestic tourist travel patterns in New Zealand. *Geojournal*, 29, 225-232.
- Pearce, D. G., and Simmons, D. G. (1997). New Zealand: Tourism - the challenges of growth. In F. M. Go and C. L. Jenkins (Eds.), *Tourism and Economic Development in Asia and Australasia* (pp. 197-220). London: Cassell.
- Pearce, P. L., Moscardo, G., and Ross, G. F. (1996). *Tourism Community Relationships*: Pergamon.
- Peart, J. D. (1998). *Old Tasman Bay* (2nd ed., original published by R. Lucas and Sons Ltd. in 1937). Nelson: Avondale Copy Studio.
- Penrose, J., and Jackson, P. (1993). Conclusion: Identity and the politics of difference. In P. Jackson and J. Penrose (Eds.), *Construction of Race, Place and Nation* (pp. 202-209). England: UCL Press.
- Perdue, R. R., Long, P. T., and Allen, L. (1990). Residents support for tourism development. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 17, 586-599.
- Perkins, H. C., Devlin, P. J., Simmons, D. G., and Batty, R. (1993). Recreation and tourism. In P. A. Memon and H. C. Perkins (Eds.), *Environmental Planning in New Zealand* (pp. 169-191). New Zealand: The Dunmore Press.
- Perry, K. (1997). *Enhancing Adaptability: A Grounded Theory of Organisational Leadership as a Social Process*. Unpublished Ph.D., Monash University, Melbourne, Australia.

- Pfalzer, R. (2001). Personal communication, tourism business in Marahau. Marahau, Nelson.
- Pickles, J. (Ed.). (1995). *Ground Truth - The Social Implications of Geographic Information Systems*. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Pizam, A. (1978). Tourism's impacts: The social costs of the destination community as perceived by its residents. *Journal of Travel Research*, 16, 8-12.
- Place, S. E. (1998). How sustainable is ecotourism in Costa Rica? In M. C. Hall and A. A. Lew (Eds.), *Sustainable Tourism - A Geographical Perspective* (pp. 107-118). New York: Longman.
- Poon, A. (1992). *Tourism, Technology and Competitive Strategies*. Wallingford: C.A.B. International.
- Prentice. (1993). Community-driven tourism planning and residents' preferences. *Tourism Management*, 14 (2), 218-227.
- Pretty, J., N. (1998, April-Dec.). *Participatory learning for integrated farming*. Paper presented at the Integrated Bio-Systems in Zero Emissions Applications., Proceedings of the Internet Conference on Integrated Biosystems. Available: <http://www.ias.unu.edu/proceedings/icibs/jules>.
- Pretty, J., N., and Scoones, I. (1997). Institutionalizing adaptive planning and local-level concerns: Looking to the future. In N. Nelson and S. Wright (Eds.), *Power and Participation Development - Theory and Practice* (pp. 157-169). UK: Intermediate Technology Publication.
- Pretty, J. N., Guijt, I., Thompson, J., and Scoones, I. (1995). *Participatory Learning Action: A Trainer's Guide*. London, UK: International Institute for Environment and Development.
- Pritley, B. (1999). Personal communication, Outdoor Recreation Center. Nelson.
- Przeclawski, K. (1993). Tourism as the subject of interdisciplinary research. In D. G. Pearce and R. W. Butler (Eds.), *Tourism Research: Critiques and Challenges* (pp. 9-19). London: Routledge.
- Pusinelli, M. (1999). *Wakatu Incorporation - Marahau hotel feasibility* (Report). Auckland: M.L. Pusinelli Associates.
- Reason, P. (1994). Three approaches to participatory inquiry. In N. K. Denzin and Y. Lincoln, S. (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (pp. 324-339). California: Sage Publications.
- Redcliff, M. (1987). *Sustainable Development: Exploring the Contradictions*. London: Methuen.
- Reed, M. G. (1997). Power relations and community-based tourism planning. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 24 (3), 566-591.
- Reed, M. G. (1999). Collaboration tourism planning as adaptive experiments in emergent tourism settings. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 7 (3/4), 331-355.
- Richards, L. (1999). *Using NVivo in Qualitative Research*. Melbourne, Australia: Qualitative Solutions and Research.
- Richards, P. (1995). *Participatory rural appraisal: A quick-and-dirty critique* (PLA Notes 24). London: International Institute for Environment and Development.
- Rist, G. (1997). *The History of Development*. London and New York: Zed Books.

- Robinson, G. M. (1998). *Methods and Techniques in Human Geography*. USA: John Wiley and Sons.
- Roche, S. (1999, 20.06-22.06). *The social construction of geographical information systems*. Paper presented at the An International Conference on Geographical Information and Society, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, USA.
- Rocheleau, D., and Slocum, R. (1995). Participation in context: Key questions. In R. Slocum and L. Wichhart and D. Rocheleau and B. Thomas-Slayter (Eds.), *Power, Process and Participation - Tools for Change* (pp. 17-29). London, UK: Intermediate Technology Publications.
- Rubin, H. J., and Rubin, I. S. (1995). *Qualitative Interviewing - The Art of Hearing Data*. London: Sage Publications.
- Ryan, C., and Simmons, D. (1999). Towards a tourism research strategy for New Zealand. *Tourism Management*, 20, 305-312.
- Sachs, W. (Ed.). (1992). *The Development Dictionary: A Guide to Knowledge as Power*. London: Zed Books.
- Sancar, F. H. (1994). Paradigms of postmodernity and implications for planning and design review process. *Environment and Behavior*, 26 (3), 312-337.
- Schuurman, F. J. (1996a). Introduction: Development theory in the 1990s. In F. J. Schuurman (Ed.), *Beyond the Impasse - New Directions in Development Theory* (pp. 1-48). London and New Jersey: Zed Books.
- Schuurman, F. J. (Ed.). (1996b). *Beyond the Impasse - New Directions in Development Theory*. London and New Jersey: Zed Books.
- Seal Swim and Water Taxi. (1999/2000). *Brochure of tourism business*. Marahau, Nelson.
- Selin, S. (1999). Developing a typology of sustainable tourism partnerships. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 7 (3/4), 260-273.
- Shelby, B. B., and Heberlein, T. A. (1986). *Carrying Capacity in Recreation Settings*. Corvallis: Oregon State University Press.
- Simmons, D. G. (1994). Community participation in tourism planning. *Tourism Management*, 15 (2), 98-108.
- Slater, D. (1995). Trajectories of development theory: Capitalism, socialism, and beyond. In R. J. Johnston and P. J. Taylor and M. J. Watts (Eds.), *Geographies of Global Change - Remapping the World in the Late Twentieth Century* (pp. 63-76). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Slocum, R., and Thomas-Slayter, B. (1995). Participation, empowerment, and sustainable development. In R. Slocum and L. Wichhart and D. Rocheleau and B. Thomas-Slayter (Eds.), *Power, Process and Participation - Tools for Change* (pp. 3-8). London, UK: Intermediate Technology Publications.
- Smith, D. (1997). *Abel Tasman Area History*. Nelson: Department of Conservation.
- Smith, S., J. (1988). Constructing local knowledge - the analysis of self in everyday life. In J. Eyles and D. M. Smith (Eds.), *Qualitative Methods in Human Geography* (pp. 17-38). Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Smith, S., and Newman, K. (2001, 12.06). Castles in the sand. *The Nelson Mail*.
- Smith, V. L. (1977). *Hosts and Guests: The Anthropology of Tourism*. Oxford: Blackwell.

- Statistic New Zealand. (1999). *Tourism satellite account 1995*. Wellington, New Zealand.
- Statistic New Zealand. (2000). *Supermap 3*. Statistic New Zealand, Wellington.
- Statistic New Zealand. (2001). *Tourism satellite account (year ended march 1997) - media release*. Available: www.stats.govt.nz (10.05).
- Stake, R. E. (1994). Case studies. In N. K. Denzin and Y. Lincoln, S. (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (pp. 236-247). California: Sage Publications.
- Stephens, B. (2001). Personal communication, Senior Lecturer in public policy at Victoria University of Wellington. Wellington.
- Strauss, A., and Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of Qualitative Research - Grounded Theory Procedures and Techniques*. California: Sage Publications.
- Tabor, J. A., and Hutchinson, C. F. (1994). Using indigenous knowledge, remote sensing and GIS for sustainable development. *Indigenous Knowledge and Development Monitor*, 2 (1), 2-6.
- Taylor, G. (1995). The community approach: Does it really work? *Tourism Management*, 16 (7), 487-489.
- Taylor, N., and Warren, J. (1998, 01.12-04.12). *Community initiatives for rural development*. Paper presented at the New Zealand Tourism and Hospitality Research Conference: Advances in Research, Akaroa, New Zealand.
- Taylor, R. (Cartographer). (2000). *Sandy Bay and Marahau adjoining Abel Tasman National Park in the Nelson district, South Island, New Zealand* [Postcard].
- Taylor, R., and Smith, I. (1997). *The State of New Zealand's Environment 1997*. Wellington, New Zealand: The Ministry for the Environment - GP Publications.
- Tasman District Council. (1994). *Harbour Bylaw*. Richmond: Tasman District Council.
- Tasman District Council. (1996). *Environment today - the state of the Tasman district environment 1995/96*. Nelson: Tasman District Council.
- Tasman District Council. (1998a). *Proposed Tasman resource management plan*. Richmond, Nelson: Tasman District Council.
- Tasman District Council. (1998b). *Proposed regional policy statement*. Richmond, Nelson: Tasman District Council.
- Tewdwr-Jones, M., and Allmendinger, P. (1998). Deconstructing communicative rationality: A critique of habermasian collaborative planning. *Environment and Planning A*, 30, 1975-1989.
- The Barn and Backpackers. (1999/2000). *Brochure of tourism business*. Marahau, Nelson.
- The Nelson Mail. (1998a, 3.06). A business for Maori and Nelson. *The Nelson Mail*.
- The Nelson Mail. (1998b, 07.11). Marahau resort Wakatu priority. *The Nelson Mail*.
- The Nelson Mail. (2000, 18.01). Many opposed to Park's foreshore change. *The Nelson Mail*.
- Thomas, B. (2000). Personal communication, Kaupapa Atawhai Adviser, Department of Conservation Nelson. Nelson.
- Timothy, D. J. (1998). Cooperative tourism planning in developing destination. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 6 (1), 52-68.

- Tourism New Zealand. (2000). *Photo CD - media pack*. Wellington: Tourism New Zealand.
- Tourism New Zealand. (2001). *Tourism news*. Wellington, New Zealand: Tourism New Zealand.
- Tosun, C., and Jenkins, C. L. (1998). The evolution of tourism planning in third world countries: A critique. *Progress in Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 4, 101-114.
- Tourism Nelson. (1995). *Strategic direction and issues report 1995-2000, tactics 1995/1996* (Report). Nelson: Tourism Nelson Tasman Ltd.
- Tourism Nelson. (1999). *Tactical plan 1999-2000* (Report). Nelson: Tourism Nelson Tasman Ltd.
- Truebridge Callender Beach Ltd. (2000). *Marahau beach development project - assessment of environmental effects* (Report). Wellington, New Zealand: prepared for Wakatu Incorporation and Tasman District Council.
- Tourism Strategy Group, (2001). *New Zealand tourism strategy 2010*. Wellington: Office of Tourism and Sports.
- Turner, L., and Ash, J. (1975). *The Golden Hordes*. London: Constable.
- Van der Knaap, W. (1999). Research report: GIS-oriented analysis of tourist-space patterns to support sustainable development. *Tourism Geographies*, 1 (1), 59-69.
- Waitangi Tribunal. (2001). *About the tribunal*. Available: <http://www.knowledge-basket.co.nz/waitangi/about/about.html> (18.05).
- Wahab, S. and Pigram, J. L. (Eds.). (1997). *Tourism, Development and Growth: The Challenge of Sustainability*. London: Routledge.
- World Commission on Environment and Development. (1987). *Our Common Future*. Oxford: University Press.
- Weiner, D., and Harris, T. (1999, 20.06-22.06). *Community-integrated GIS for land reform in South Africa*. Paper presented at the GISOC '99 An International Conference on Geographic Information and Society, The University of Minnesota, Minneapolis.
- White, A. (1999). Personal communication, community relations' officer, Department of Conservation Nelson. Nelson.
- Williams, M. (2001, 21.01). Long summer of tourists takes toll on national park. *The Dominion*, pp. 12.
- Wishart, C. (1999). Personal communication, Motueka Area Manager, Department of Conservation Motueka. Motueka.
- Wolf, K., and Jurczek, P. (1986). *Geographie der Freizeit und des Tourismus*. Stuttgart, Germany: Verlag Eugen Ulmer.
- Woodley, A. (1993). Tourism and sustainable development: The community perspective. In J. G. Nelson and R. W. Butler and G. Wall (Eds.), *Tourism and Sustainable Development: Monitoring, Planning, Managing* (Department of Geography Publication Series No.37). Waterloo: University of Waterloo.
- Wright, S., and Nelson, N. (1997). Participation research and participant observation: Two incompatible approaches. In N. Nelson and S. Wright (Eds.), *Power and Participation Development - Theory and Practice* (pp. 43-59). London, UK: Intermediate Technology Publication.

- Yin, R. K. (1989). *Case Study Research Design and Methods*. London: Sage Publications.
- Young, G. (1973). *Tourism, Blessing or Blight?* Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Yuskel, F., Bramwell, B., and Yukel, A. (1999). Stakeholder interview and tourism planning at Pamukkale, Turkey. *Tourism Management*, 20, 351-360.

APPENDICES

Appendix 4.1: Human Ethics Approval

Appendix 4.2: Introduction Letter to the Community of Marahau

VICTORIA UNIVERSITY OF WELLINGTON

Te Whare Wananga o te Upoko o te Ika a Maui

Marahau, 25.03.1999

Dear Marahau Resident,

I am a PhD student in Tourism and Geography at Victoria University of Wellington. I am undertaking research in Marahau and the Abel Tasman Park this autumn. My aim is to gain a better understanding of how various interest groups and individuals view tourism relating to the future management of Marahau and the Abel Tasman Park. This research is based on the principle that effective planning related to tourism should begin from the priorities identified by those effected by and involved with it.

To achieve this, I would like to do individual interviews with a wide cross section of local residents, tour operators, visitors, local government and other organisations. The questions are about a broad range of issues relating to tourism and the future management of Marahau and the Abel Tasman Park. For example, on your views about the impacts of tourism, what you like and dislike about it and how it could be managed in the future, as well as any other issues you think are important. I have approached a number of different people to see if they are willing to participate in the study and the response to date has been extremely positive.

I must stress that only I will have access to the information - which will be treated in a strictly confidential manner. The results will be presented back to you next summer and the opportunity will be given to share the outcomes with other participants during a public meeting. Also, a report will be put together, which will include the information collected during my research about different views on the future management of tourism in Marahau and the Abel Tasman Park.

The reason why I am writing this to you is to see whether you would like to participate in this project. If it is possible, I would like to meet with you in the near future. I will contact you shortly to provide you with more information about the study and to arrange with you.

I look forward to perhaps meeting with you in the near future.

Kind Regards, Julia Hasse

TOURISM and SERVICES MANAGEMENT

Appendix 4.3: Consent Form for Respondents

VICTORIA UNIVERSITY OF WELLINGTON

Te Whare Wananga o te Upoko o te Ika a Maui

CONSENT TO PARTICIPATION IN RESEARCH

TITLE OF PROJECT: TOURISM, STAKEHOLDERS AND SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITY

DEVELOPMENT IN MARAHAU

RESEARCHER: JULIA C. HASSE

I understood what this research project is about. I have had an opportunity to ask questions and have had them answered to my satisfaction. I understand that I may withdraw myself or any information I have provided without having to give reasons of any sort.

I understand that the information I provide will be kept confidential to the researcher, the published results will not use my name, and that no opinions will be attributed to me in any way that will identify me. Results will be used in the preparation of a thesis, which will be lodged in the University Library. Journal and conference papers may be drawn on the results of the project.

I understand that the tape recording of interviews will be electronically wiped at the end of the project.

I agree to take part in this research.

Name:

Signed:

Date:

Appendix 4.4: Questionnaire for Marahau Community

VICTORIA UNIVERSITY OF WELLINGTON

Te Whare Wananga o te Upoko o te Ika a Maui

FOR INDIVIDUAL PARTICIPANTS

The following questionnaire is intended to monitor, who is participating in this research. It intends to ensure that a wide cross section of people are involved. I would appreciate your co-operation in providing the information. All information will remain confidential to the researcher. Please tick the appropriate boxes provided.

1. Please indicate which age group you are in:

0-14		15-19		20-24		25-34		35-44		45-54		55-64		65-74		over 75	
------	--	-------	--	-------	--	-------	--	-------	--	-------	--	-------	--	-------	--	---------	--

2. Which ethnic group do you identify with?

New Zealander		NZ European		NZ Maori		Pacific Island		Asian	
---------------	--	-------------	--	----------	--	----------------	--	-------	--

Other (please specify)	
------------------------	--

3. What is your sex?

Male		Female	
------	--	--------	--

4. Please indicate your family status: (tick if applicable)

Single no children		Couple with children		Couple with no children	
--------------------	--	----------------------	--	-------------------------	--

Single with children		Other (please specify)	
----------------------	--	------------------------	--

5. What is your highest educational qualification?

High School		Bachelor Degree		Technical Qualifications	
Diploma (tertiary)		Honours/Masters Degree		Ph.D	

Other (please specify)	
------------------------	--

6. Please indicate your occupation status at the moment? (tick as many as applicable)

Full timer worker		Employer		Not working		Retired	
Part timer worker		Self-Employed		Seasonal Worker		Student	
Casual worker		Other (please specify)					

7. Please provide an estimate of your gross personal income in NZ\$?

Less 10 000		20 001-30 000		40 001-50 000		70 001-100 000	
10 001-20 000		30 001-40 000		50 001-70 000		More 100 000	

FACULTY OF COMMERCE AND ADMINISTRATION
TOURISM AND SERVICES MANAGEMENT

PO Box 600, Wellington, New Zealand, Telephone +64 495 8386, Facsimile +64 4 495 5186

Appendix 4.5: Visitor Survey for Short Interview

Appendix 4.6: Visitor Survey for In-Depth Interview

Appendix 4.7: Representing the Data – Letter to Community

VICTORIA UNIVERSITY OF WELLINGTON

Te Whare Wananga o te Upoko o te Ika a Maui

Wellington, 11.08.2000

Dear Community of Marahau,

I hope you still remember my visit about one year ago. I did a community survey last winter and a visitor survey last summer in Marahau.

The aim of my research was to gain a better understanding of how various interest groups and individuals view a broad range of issues relating to tourism and the future of Marahau and the Abel Tasman National Park. This research is based on the principle that effective tourism planning should begin from the priorities identified by those affected by and involved with it.

Since then I have been working on entering all the information, creating a map on a computer and drawing up graphs showing the information collected - I am still in the process of analysing it. The results look great and I want to show them to you and get some feedback on them from you.

I will be in Marahau from the 21st until the 26th of November 2000 and will display the results in the fire-station hall during the day from 10 am to 2 pm and 7 pm to 9 pm.

I am looking forward to coming back to Marahau and meeting you again.

Have a lovely day,

Yours,

Julia Hasse

Contact in Wellington: Victoria University of Wellington; c/o Tourism; PO Box 600, Wellington, Tel: 04-463 5717; E-mail: Julia.Hasse@vuw.ac.nz

Manual

Using

Participatory Geographical

Information System

(PAGIS)

By Julia C. Hasse

Victoria University of Wellington

1. Getting Started.....	2
2. Displaying Data	3
3. Querying Data	5

1. Getting Started

Welcome to PAGIS! To use PAGIS you need to have some basic PC skills. This manual is only a short introduction to get started. If you want to explore the application of PAGIS in more depth, please go to the menu 'Help' provided in the program 'ArcExplorer™'.

The program 'ArcExplorer™' will give you the opportunity to visualise, explore and query geographical data. This data, called 'community data', represents the information that was collected during the community interviews and mapped out by respondents on the aerial photograph of Marahau. It consists of the responses of 96 individuals of Marahau on the context of issues (areas of importance, areas of concern and areas with future issues), the issue itself and its location.

The '*community data*' is the only information that can be queried. PAGIS also contains data that was made available by the local government (Tasman District Council and Department of Conservation). This information can only be presented in themes and layers. It can't be queried. The base map is an aerial photograph of Marahau.

To start:

- Copy all the files on the CD-ROM into a directory on your computer (IBM). They **must** be located under the directory c:/. Keep the sequence of the folders and files as they are on the CD-ROM. Otherwise the existing project Marahau_PAGIS can't be opened!!
- How to do this? Select the folder 'Marahau_Data' on the CD-ROM and drag it into the c:/ directory on your PC and drop it.
- Read the information '**Copyright**'!

- Install the program '**ArcExplorer 2.0™**' onto your computer (it is free)!
If you double-click on the file 'arc_explorer2setup.exe' located in the folder 'Marahau_Data' the installation will begin.

Your session can begin!!

2. Displaying Data

This section will guide you through the process to display the data.

- Start 'ArcExplorer™'. When the 'ArcExplorer™' opens you will see the ArcView application window. Another window 'Welcome to ArcExplorer™' will appear, click ok and it will disappear.

- From the '*Files*' menu select '*Open Project*' and click ok. A project is a file that stores the work you do in 'ArcExplorer™'. In this case, the project has already been designed, but it can be changed at any time.
- Open the project '**Marahau_PAGIS**'. It is located in the folder c:/Marahau_Data.

- You will see the aerial photograph of Marahau appear in the application window. If you use the tool bar you can investigate the themes through zooming the picture, drag and drop it or select the information icon to gain more information about the location you have chosen. Please go to the 'Help' menu for further support.

- A view in this window is made up of layers of geographical information for Marahau. Each layer is called a *theme* and can be selected or

deselected by ticking the box next to it. It is important to note that the first theme is the layer on top of all other data. You can drag it below another theme or even add or delete themes. (see '*Help*' for more information)

As mentioned earlier, the community data can be queried by context, issue and location through double clicking onto the theme 'community data'.

3. Querying Data

- The community data represents the view of the community and is organised under one theme. This theme contains a lot of information that can be displayed on the aerial photograph. The best way to view this data is to reduce the amount of layers through querying for specific information.

- Therefore you will need to query information with the '*Query Builder*' under '*Tools*' located in the menu bar.
- There you need to select the 'issue', 'context' or 'location' by double-clicking them.
- For example: You click on 'issue' and then click on '=' and then click on 'development' and then press execute. All the comments made about the issue development will be displayed in the box below (Note: you can adjust the box by dragging it towards the side with the mouse). If you press 'highlight results' you can view the location on the aerial photograph that were mentioned in the context of development.

- You can also save the comments as a *.txt-file to a file/folder and print out all the comments made about the issue development. This function is located in the 'query builder' window and has a 'save-icon'.

This was only one example. You can query for more information. I hope you will enjoy using PAGIS and that it is being used to facilitate communication and interaction between various groups and individuals. I will be looking forward to hearing from you about the usefulness of PAGIS. My interest is especially on what can be improved and how it is used. Please contact me and let me know!!

Thanks for your consideration!! Regards, Julia C. Hasse

Julia C. Hasse

Victoria University of Wellington
 School of Business and Public Management
 Department of Tourism Management
 P.O. Box 600
 Wellington, New Zealand
 E-mail: Julia.Hasse@gmx.de

Appendix 6.1: Gender Profile of Domestic vs. International Visitors

Appendix 6.2: 'Likes' about Marahau and the Abel Tasman National Park

'Likes' about Marahau and the Abel Tasman National Park identified by Visitors		
Categories	Comments (N=378)	Total ²⁶
Beaches/ Coastline	• Beaches/ natural beach(es)/ beautiful beaches/ great beaches/ bays/ stunning nice bays/ small bays/ nice beaches/ sandy golden beaches/ sand/colour of the sand/ beaches are pretty/ pleasant beaches/ lots of small beaches/ beach front	84
	• Coastline/ stunning coastline/ lovely coastline/ coastal/ coastal scenery/ beautiful coastal area	11
	• Tide/ big tide difference/ beach at low tide/ Torrent Bay crossing at low tide	4
	• Nice lagoons/ estuary	4

²⁶ This total reflects the number of 'likes' mentioned for each category by visitors.

Abel Tasman National Park (ATNP)	• ATNP/ ATNP is beautiful/ ATNP is wonderful/ lovely ATNP/ Park looks great/ wonderful trip through the ATNP/ scenery in the Park/ ATNP as it is now/ very nice/ dinky/ like a dream/ a great place (for a holiday)/ nice and beautiful place/ beautiful/ generally an excellent place to visit/ wonderful/ place on haven/ I love this place/ lovely/ it was fun/ not bad/ quite good	49
	• Looking forward to enjoying the ATNP/ here for the ATNP	2
	• Not having dogs in the ATNP	2
	• Toilets along the way/ DoC facilities/ taken care of/ toilets clean	5
	• Near the sea/ light and not too dark places	2
	• Interesting historical facts/ sights	2
	• Cleanliness/ clean/ very clean	11
	• No litter/ no rubbish	5
	• Clean and green/ New Zealand is the country you have to have seen/ really like the country and it was like a dream/ the country	5
	• Highly recommend it	1
	• Walking track(s)/ good walking/ great walking/ good track/ tracks are very nice/ walking/ forest walks	26
	• (Nice) easy track/ easy track for kids/ easy walking/ walking for all age groups/ no stressful walk/ good directions when walking/ walking fitness/ easy accessibility (to walking tracks)/fantastic place for walks/ nature walk	21
	• Enjoyed walk immensely/ the most beautiful walk/ nice walk/	4
	• Well maintained track/ - hiking trails/ -path/ good quality bridges/ well sign posted/ organised walking trails in the park	8
	• Will come again/ tell my friends to go/ enjoyed visit/ will certainly come back/ we will be back and do the walks/ come back some day	7
Landscape Scenery	• Scenery/ great scenery/ wonderful scenery/ beautiful scenery/ nice scenery/ native scenery/ scenic/ scenic beauty/ amazing scenery/ awesome scenery/ spectacular scenery	45
	• Views/ beautiful views/ magnificent views/ nice views/ nice lookout/ good view/ good view from the track/ sea views/ views on beaches	28
	• Landscape/ nice landscape/ nice environment/ clean nature/ beautiful/ it's very beautiful/ beauty/ natural beauty/ beauty of the area/ beautiful setting	20
	• Green/ green environment	3
	• Mountain/ hills	3
Flora	• Mixture between water and forest scenery/ surroundings	2
	• Nature/ pure nature/ near the nature/ lots of nature/ wonderful nature/ diverse nature/ nature beauty/ plants/ flora/ vegetation	37
	• Bush/ native bush/ bush natural/ forest	10
	• Big ferns/ ferns/ fern trees/ places with the ferns	4
	• Native tree species/ name of trees/ the trees	3
Not Crowded	• Eucalyptus	1
	• Not (too) crowded/ uncrowded/ not overcrowded/ not too touristy/ not (too) many people/ lack of people/ not too many tourists/ no mass tourism/ not close to people on campsite/ not as many people on the beach as in Kaiteriteri/ quieter than Kaiteriteri/ our guidebook told us that it's very busy, so if you don't like many people you shouldn't come here/ increased tourism/ did not find it crowded/ not many tourists in NZ, seems to be soft tourism/ does not matter to meet 5 or 20 people	29
	• Low population/ sparsely populated	2
	• Space/ open space/ wide open space/ wide open space of the beach/ freedom	10
Location/ Access	• Close to the Park/ close to (sea and) the ATNP/ closest village to the Park/ proximity to ATNP/ gateway to the ATNP/ it's close to the track/ close to good beaches/ starting point to ATNP, proximity to the start of the Park/ location/ good situated/ access to the Park/ access to activities in the ATNP/ easy access/ accessibility	25
	• Close to Nelson/ close to Wellington/ close to home/ nearest to Motueka/Nelson to visit the ATNP	4
	• Good transportation to and from Marahau/ good transport system (taxis, buses)/ easy to reach by public transport as well as on foot/ transportation is very well organised	2
Social Interaction	• Friendliness and helpfulness of the people/ (really) friendly people/ very nice people/ relaxed and friendly people/ hospitable people/ nice and kind people/ lovely people/ locals/ friendly people at the campsite/ the service is friendly/ friendly staff	22
	• General campsite life	1
	• Like to meet other people/ meeting people from all over the world	5
	• Community spirit/ friendly atmosphere	3
	• DoC employees/ DoC man in the Park nice guy	2

Weather/ Air/Sun/ Atmosphere	• Weather/ great weather/ nice weather/ climate/ warm/ hot sunny weather which we haven't seen much so far in New Zealand	20
	• Sun/ sunny/ sunshine	5
	• Clouds	1
	• Fresh air/ clean air/ very clean	3
Sea/ Water	• Water/ ocean/ the ocean is very beautiful/ sea/ beautiful sea	19
	• Blue water/ colour of the sea/ water/ green colour of water nice/ clear water	11
	• Sheltered sea	1
Accommo- dation	• Well maintained camping facilities/ excellent camping facilities/ good campground facilities/ beautiful sites/ decent campsite/ well equipped site/ campsites/ large campsites/ lots of big and small campsites/ Old Macdonald's Farm (OMF)/great camp OMF/ Marahau Beach Camp/ nice shady campsite	18
	• The Barn Backpackers/ hostel and showers/ truck at Barn	5
	• Accommodation	1
Tourist Information Services	• Good management/ tour operators seem well organised/ good organised activities/ good service/ well organised/ quick and flexible to the desired routes/ good (tourist) services/ it's well organised for travellers/ keep up the good work	14
	• Good Park information/ information about ATNP/ the very nice stuff in the Info Centre	3
	• Ocean River Company professional leaflet	3
	• No entrance fee	1
Fauna	• Birds/ bird life	14
	• Wildlife/ fauna/ animals/ touching seals/ seals	14
	• Shells/ big shells/ shells nice memory and souvenir	3
Recreational Experience/ Activities	• Kayaking/ kayaking the park/ kayak through the waves/ the waves/ cruise on the water	10
	• Good kayak guide/ the kayak guide/ nice meal	3
	• Lots of activities if you want them/ plenty of outdoor activities/ adventure activities/ a little bit of everything	4
	• The trekking/ tramping/ walking	3
	• Swimming/ sunbathing	3
	• Cockles/ collecting cockles/ fishing	3
	• Water taxi/ aqua taxi	2
Tranquility Remoteness	• Peaceful/ quietness/ tranquility	9
	• Away from civilisation/ privacy	2
Development	• Not commercialised/ non commercial/ not over commercialised/ undeveloped/ lack of development	8
	• Unspoiled/ country unspoiled/ almost untouched/ not touched except of walking track	5
	• Balance between well-built and left-alone	1
	• Changes to six years ago: water taxis/ hut wardens/ sanitary facilities on the track	1
Café/Art and Craft	• Café/ banana thick shake in the café/ café was nice/ relaxed coffee shop	5
	• Art shop/ gallery/ Woody's/ arts and craft/ awesome craft shop/ shop was nice/ carvings	12
Marahau	• All/ (just) everything/ everything very nice/ Marahau in total	11
	• Fantastic/ it's lovely/ beauty/ pretty cool here/ lovely place to visit/ glad to see that/ looks good/ nice place/ good place to chill out and relax/ we do not look for high life vacation/ to be by yourself or with others as long as you don't expect to much/ nice and quiet/ a great place/ the nicest place we've stayed so far/ very beautiful and a good place to stay/ Marahau is nice, better than Kaiteriteri/ beautiful/ absolutely beautiful/ excellent feeling, like it/ good casual feeling/ good to have in short time/ the ambience	33
	• Nice and small	2
	• Family orientation	1
	• That is what we had expected, looks like every other starting point into a National Park/ like anywhere else in New Zealand	3
	• My opinion is not good enough, because I have been here not long enough/ not enough time to do everything/ not seen anything in Marahau/ wish we had longer/ nothing seen in Marahau/ just came here for day trips so far/ last region in the world not having serious environmental problems/ Id love to stay longer/ should have more time	10
Infra- structure/ Roads/ Facilities	• Road access/ shortage of roads/ great flat roads for bikers	3
	• Since the road is sealed it's more tidy	1
	• Facilities/ good facilities/ nice facilities/ top conditions/ good infrastructure/ everything well maintained	8
	• Computer facilities	1
No 'Likes'	• Just arrived/ have not seen Marahau	4

Appendix 6.3: ‘Dislikes’ about Marahau and the Abel Tasman National Park

'Dislikes' about Marahau and the Abel Tasman National Park identified by Visitors		
Categories	Comments (N=378)	Total ²⁷
No 'Dislikes'	• Nothing	56
	• Haven't seen Marahau/ not here long enough to say/ just arrived	4
Marahau	• Too much noise and maybe pollution/ noise of tractors/ noisy cars/ noise	6
	• Round about trip here/ would not be a great area to stay/ do not like it at all	4
	• Too small for all the people to come	1
	• Lack of a decent swimming beach	1
	• Need transportation/ lack of transport/buses brake down	3
	• Someone broke into the car	1
	• Tides go out too far/ low tide/ tidal/ too tidal for boating	4
	• Fishing the bay out	1
Crowding	• Got busier this year than last year/ got more crowded over the years/ ATNP is much busier than it was/ getting too busy/ crowded/ lots of people here/ 100 people in two hours/ so many people/ too many people/ too busy/ crowded beaches/ too busy in the main season/ sometimes too many people/ lots of people at southern end of the park/ really touristy parts/ busy in the main season/ too many people on the track (50-70)/ too many Dutch people/ too many tourists like me/ the crowds/ it's getting more and more crowded/ quite a lot of people here/ there's tons of people walking the track/ so many tourists from overseas/ it got busier the last years which I don't mind/ hasn't been so busy last time/ more traffic than six years ago/ I tend to avoid the crowds and so I'll be moving on/	43
	• Too many kayakers/ too many kayaks	2
	• Too many water taxis/ smell from the boats was annoying/ too many boats	4
Weather	• Wind/ cold wind/ strong wind/ (cold) weather/ cloudy weather/ the weather was bad/ weather is changeable/ no sun/ clouds/ lack of sunshine/ cloudy mornings/ too cold/ it could be warmer/ cold winter/ rain/ rainy	34
Location/ No Facilities	• Nothing to do/ a bit far from town/ a little out of town/ in the evening there is nothing to do/ would be a good idea to provide some facilities for evening entertainment/ distance/ a long way to essential services e.g. bank, post office/ far from supermarket/ too far from good shop supplies/ not much else to do	12
Flora	• Bush not as nice as expected/ gorse/ too much gorse/ not enough native bush, scrub in first 1.5h of walk in ATNP/ clearout forests/ the bush is really scrubby (small and thin)	11
	• Lack of trees on the foreshore	1
	• Looks like the North Island	1
	• Sandflies/ mosquitoes	23
Shops and Restaurants	• Expensive prices/ price of beer/ expensive shop/ expensive café/ expensive to buy/ prices at café/ too expensive/ expensive café	8
	• Not enough restaurants/ no pub/ no supermarket/ no bottle store/ shops for provisions or extended stay/ lack of shops/	12
	• Shops close early	1
Abel Tasman National Park	• Septic toilets/ toilets are smelly/ toilets/ stinky smelly toilets	5
	• Not enough toilets on the track/ no toilets	2
	• Lack of rubbish removal facilities/ missing garbage bins in the huts/ have to carry rubbish	3
	• More rest areas on the track	1
	• Giardia	1
	• Track was long	1
	• Drinking water should be here at info centre	1
	• Smell of the beach/ water not so clean as it used to be	2
	• Private land that does not belong to the ATNP there were the nice places	1

²⁷ This total reflects the number of ‘dislikes’ mentioned for each category by visitors.

Recreational Experience/Activities	• Getting in and out of the kayaks takes too much time/ Abel Tasman Kayaks because they had to shorten the trip	5
	• No short term kayaks	1
	• Prices are quite high for kayaking/ kayak tour quite expensive	2
	• Silly tractor ride/ having to be on a boat on the road like you are too stupid to walk/ tractor boat ride for aqua taxi	3
	• Limited offer at Christmas	1
	• Prices are quite high for water taxi	1
	• Jet skis/ power boats/ motorboats in the park/ noisy race boats/ water-skiing in the park/ noise in the water	10
	• Bad booking/ too much preplanning like booking/	2
	• Naked people	1
	• No bikes	1
Tourist Information Services	• Lack of signs (e.g. ferry)/ departure point of boats should be better sign posted/ signs should have distances/ distances on signs on hiking trail	4
	• Park info centre	1
	• No telephone at info centre	1
Commercialism	• Too commercial/ very commercialised/ its getting too commercialised	4
Accommodation	• Too many campgrounds	3
	• Not much middle range accommodation (e.g. tourist flats)/ more choice of accommodation/	2
	• The facilities at the campground (Old MacDonald's) are very low standard compared to the rest of them in New Zealand/ beds very uncomfortable/ did not like Marahau Beach Camp (esp. the backpacker accommodation)/ the campground is moderate	4
	• No camping at car park outside Park Café/ camper vans can camp where ever they want/ no free camping	3
Roads/ Parking/ Infrastructure	• Dust/ dusty roads	2
	• Winding roads/ the windy roads/ access road windy	4
	• Crossing the street	1
	• Not enough parking	1
	• Trash/ broken glass on the beach/ horse droppings on Marahau beach/ rubbish being thrown away	4
	• No jetty for getting out of the boat	2
	• No mobile phone access	2
	• No petrol station	1
		1

Appendix 6.4: 'Improvements' for Marahau and the Abel Tasman National Park

'Improvements' for Marahau and the Abel Tasman National Park' identified by Visitors		
Category	Comments (N=378)	Total ²⁸
Nothing	• Leave it as it is/ should be kept like this/ keep it as it is/ it's all right how it is/ do not alter anything/ this is nice just like it is/ don't change a thing/ it must remain as it is/ stay the same/ should stay as it is/ the same/ the area should be kept like this for many years/ just perfect/ perfect place/ looks fine so far/ looks fine as it is/ it can't be improved/ everything will be ok/ stay as beautiful and unspoiled/ nice place/ should be left alone/ keep it quiet and natural/ pretty awesome	42
	• Nothing	24
Development	• Not commercial/ keep commercialism to a minimum/ no commercial things/ not to become more commercialised/ keep small and not commercial/ would be disappointed with any significant further commercialism/ no more development/ stay undeveloped/ not developed/ don't let more development happen/ no further development unless environmentally friendly/ keep development to a minimum not to spoil the area/ don't want a Kaiteriteri situation/ don't spoil it like Rotorua or Taupo/ not too many motels/ not become too big/ less taxi services/ no five star hotel/ danger of tourism	30
	• Please try to keep this place as a haven of peace and tranquility/ also in 10 or 20 years like this/ try not to ruin it/ it will probably be a lot bigger in a few years	6

²⁸ This total reflects the number of 'improvements' mentioned for each category by visitors.

Shops and Restaurants Prices	• (More) local shops/ store/ no supermarket	13
	• Pub/ bistro/ cafés / restaurants	16
	• Souvenirs/ make Woody's shop bigger	2
	• Cheaper café/ prices at café	4
	• Cheaper shop/ prices at shop	3
	• For camping not so expensive	1
Tourist Information Services	• Needs an information centre/ tourist info needs improvement/ where and when more detailed information/ more info about fishing/ more info/ more info on what the trail will be really like/ the tramp from Torrent Bay is longer than four hours/ DoC office	9
	• Signpost on the ramp to get to the beach	1
	• Guides for freedom walkers and kayakers	1
Accommodation	• (More) accommodation/ more tourist flats at better prices/ better motel accommodation/ more upper market accommodation	6
	• Free camping	2
	• Bigger campgrounds	1
	• More hot water in the showers at Old Macdonald's	1
	• Kitchen facilities at campsite are limited	1
Weather	• Better weather, warmer climate, less rain, sunshine	5
Flora	• Shrub cutting along roadside, gorse clearing	5
	• Replanting/ regenerating native bush/ save the nature/ forest	9
	• Plant native trees on streets/ more flowers	2
Marahau	• Not long enough here to say/ not long enough here to comment/ too soon to say/ not sure	4
	• Would like to live here	1
Crowding	• Less tourists/ not too many tourists/ not too many backpackers to make it crowded/ shouldn't be too crowded	4
	• It is just starting with boat developments	1
	• Not become too overrun with us tourists, otherwise may lose it's charm/ don't want it busier	2
	• Not too much population	1
Management Control	• Controlling number of people on the track/ limit the number of people on trails and kayak/ spread tourism industry	3
	• Control operators	1
Facilities/ Parking/ Roads	• Planned access	1
	• Steps down to the beach	1
	• Jetty suitable for water taxi in rough weather	1
	• More toilets	2
	• Playground	1
	• More facilities/ better infrastructure	2
	• Garbage cans	1
	• Telescope for bird watching	1
	• Parking/ Secure car park	5
	• More (frequent) buses/ public transportation/ bus service leaving Nelson between 10-11am/ in seasonal times more buses to Nelson/ bus connection to Nelson/ air taxi	8
	• Improve Awaroa airstrip	1
	• Roads could be sealed	1
	• Email facilities	1
	• Road signs to slow down	1
	• Petrol station	1
Recreational Experience/ Activities	• Speed up starting and stopping the kayak tour	1
	• Slightly more development in kayaking	1
	• Slightly cheaper kayaking	1
	• Windsurfing	3
	• Bad weather activities/ evening facilities (e.g. cinema) for bad weather/ more choice in activities in the ATNP/ public entertainment	4
	• Boat charter	1
	• Horse riding	1
	• Golf course	1
	• More tours into ATNP to other places	1
	• How about the development of a dive spot?	1
		1

Appendix 7.1: Gender Profile of the Marahau Community

Appendix 7.2: 'Likes' about Marahau

'Likes about Marahau' identified by Marahau Community (N=96) ²⁹				
Categories	Landowners (N=51)	Bach-owners (N=31)	Residents (N=14)	Total ³⁰
Rural Character/Location	Location; access to ATNP +5; access to the Bays; closeness to Nelson +1; size; space; open spaciousness; open unspoiled Bay; country; great place to live; rural character; not overpopulated	Not far to drive to Motueka and Nelson; so accessible; the National Park +3, location; its proximity; coastal and two minutes to beach; away from people; on the open beach with only our family; wide open spaces +7; size; relatively isolated, not overpopulated; lack of traffic hustle and bustle; living in a smaller community area; its situation; low-key tourism	Unique setting; beach access; National Park +3; one way in, end of the road community; rural character +1; the size of the community; open space +2; small population;	60
Tranquility/Seasonality	Relaxing; peaceful +5; quiet +1; tranquility +1; like winters; seasons; beach in summer; winter tranquility; isolation	Peace +2, quietness +6; the quietness in winter +4; the beauty and peace in winter	Peace and quiet +1; quietness +1, tranquility; small quiet in winter +1	43

²⁹ The + (number) means the comment has been expressed x more times.

³⁰ This total reflects the number of 'likes' mentioned for each category by respondents.

Lifestyle/ Sense of Place	Good family memories; our home and ATNP; it is home; uniqueness +1; our property and home; yet in other world; lifestyle; creative; freedom of 'life'+1; to be yourself; possibility to make a living; atmosphere +2; ambience; no phone	Feel of the place; safe and protected; living in community relatively quiet and peaceful; my home +1; the natural look; Marahau is magic; like paradise; still retains some degree of naturalness; nice place to work; opportunity to be self-employed (artist) or work in tourism; being able to grow my own food due to enough space	Feeling of peace and safety; setting and feel; safe and freedom for bringing up children; mauri-the atmosphere coming from the past; commercial potential of the area	38
Beach/Coast	Beach with major tidal movements; estuary +2; beach-foreshore +7; foreshore at low tide patterns; changing tidal area (visual); sand for children to play on	Sand +2; beach +5; estuary by high tide; islands; beachfront	Beach +2; sandflats; mountains,	31
Landscape/ Scenery	Views +4; beautiful scenery +1; everything; beautiful; view on Park +2 and sea; surrounded by bush; land	Old wharf area; beauty of landscape +2; variety (land, sea); cleanliness +1; scenery; wonderful and natural beauty +3	Views +1; view in every direction; scenery; beauty; natural features	30
Recreational Experience	River access; great walking tracks and cycling; boating +3; walks; walks on beach; swimming hole - river; cockle fishing +4; shell fishing; collecting different sea foods; activities	Fishing; walks+1; boating; sailing; kayaking; shellfish	Hiking and camping; fishing and walking	27
Sea/Water	Water +2; rivers; sea/islands +3	Sea +5; water; rivers and ocean; abundant sea	Sea +4; river, ocean	24
Flora/Fauna	Bird life +5; wilderness; trees; poplar trees; hills with regenerating bush +3	Native birds around the country +1; wildlife; bush +4	Lots of fish and wildlife	21
Social Interaction	Satisfying tourists; families; nice people +6; friendly +2; friendly relaxing environment; interesting people	Interesting people - diverse and different +1; feeling of community with others	Diverse friendly people; mixed community; potential to meet travelers;	20
Air/Climate/ Sun	Wind; weather; climate and sun +4; air	Sea breeze; sunsets; climate, weather +3	Clouds, sunlight shifts, changing light; great climate; windless	20

Appendix 7.3: 'Dislikes' about Marahau

'Dislikes about Marahau' identified by Marahau Community (N=96) ³¹				
Categories	Landowners (N=51)	Bach-owners (N=31)	Residents (N=14)	Total ³²
Development/ Commercialism	Tourist development away from housing area; developments; scale of tourism; Wakatu development; landowners in one family dictates growth or the lack of it; jet skis; commercialism +2; camping ground (visual impact); advertising signs on beach front; private property signs; houses on skyline; lack of public space especially for children	Threat of development; some buildings in Toko Ngawa; businesses; growth out of control; no certain paths of the place of Marahau; lack of good places to live and costs; some architecture; become over commercial+1; tourist operators +1; commercialised boats; kayak operators from outside the Bay; the quiet is being upset by noisy tourism operators e.g. megaphone on tour boats +1; jet skis; loopy time; visitors with dogs	Too many 'castles' being built +1; character of the valley disappears with increased tourist development; no picnic spots; uncontrolled future development; lack of accommodation for staff; domination by tourism operators (tractors, kayaks); increasing activity; 4wheel drives; no tolerance of external operators; 'loss of what Marahau is'; planning skyline buildings +1 - cuts views	45
Road/Traffic	Speed/amount of traffic +9; gravel roads; the road; traffic congestion in summer; congestion traffic +1; narrow road +1; inappropriate road care and maintenance; increased traffic on bad road	Traffic +2; speeding cars; having to drive over Marahau Rd.	Marahau Valley Road; traffic road; road fronting access; traffic and dust; beachfront road, speed on all roads; streetlights	31
Social Interaction/ Behaviour	People do not listen; greedy attitudes; tourist driving attitudes; only fire brigade as community focus, need for more community; shop; tourism operators' change in temperament in the busy season; low awareness of environmental issues; visitors inappropriately dressed; tourist dollar before the environment; insufficient social structure and community feeling; people not being willing to become permanent inhabitants; people's shallowness; selfish attitudes; extreme views of some residents	Gossipy introspection and narrow fantasising propensity of some locals; lots of bullshit really; the atmosphere in the village is dominated and dictated by the tourist operators in the summer; no community centre and local people do not even know how to pronounce Marahau; arrogance of some operators; losing the history; tourist operators clambering, fighting over clients; lack of co-operation; small mindedness some residents; money-driven; no ethics	Bickering among people - 'politics'; stropopy opinionated owners; have to travel daily for employment; competition among tourist operators	29
Control/	Poor environmental	Lack of foresight by local	Management of	18

³¹ The + (number) means the comment has been expressed x more times.

³² This total reflects the number of 'dislikes' mentioned for each category by respondents.

Planning/ TDC	attitudes local and local authority; slack Council attitude towards it; river rates; erosion can be controlled; high rates; haphazard planning for the future; judicial insecurity; concerning consents for development	authorities (TDC etc.); TDC's slackness and sloppiness dealing with responsibilities; wishy-washy environmental standards; lack of controlled planning	foreshore; council no requirement plan; foreshore - lack of discussion; lack of enforcement of planning; lack of Park planning enforcement and long term sustainability	
Boat Ramp/ Tractors	Poor boat ramp - over run by water taxis; tractor pile-up; tractor noise+3; boat ramp; commercial tractor parking; tractors +1; noisy tractors congesting road	Tractors; clutter of vehicles and tourists +1	Kayaks taking up all the beach at the North end of ramp; no parking; seeing trailers parking on waterfront	17
Vegetation/ Forestry/ Fishery	Gorse; too much shade from tall trees; forestry	Bare hills after foresting; forestry destruction, practice +6	Forestry in surrounding hills+3; forestry impact on the estuary; fish exploitation	17
Beach/ Erosion	Erosion +1; erosion on foreshore +2; poor walking access along the beach front; beach access at high tide, over the rocks +1; vehicles crossing foreshore +1	Eroding of beach; lack of awareness i.e. estuary; rubbish on beach; erosion; witnessing changes e.g. heaps of vehicles driving over sand; sea breezes in summer		17
Crowding	Too many people passing through; overweight tourist, too many kayaks; too many kayak companies	Too many tourists without enough planning ahead for the community as a whole; too many people on beaches and islands; pollution by people, boats, kayaks; overcrowding in summer +2;	Too many people living here (not visiting); too many tourists in summer on the track; overcrowding tourism; too many kayaks at sea;	15
Pollution/ Protection/ Safety	Pedestrian safety lacking; boats that ignore the speed registration; pollution-potential for more; soil contamination	Dogs +1; litter in the Park	People spraying; lack of protection for natural resources; noise of jet skis and danger +1	11
Facilities	Rubbish; toilets+1; lack of rubbish disposal on foreshore; water supply; facilities lacking	Recreation Centre noise +1 - terrible sometimes; no near shop		10

Appendix 7.4: 'Hopes' for the future of Marahau

'Hopes for the future of Marahau' identified by Marahau Community (N=96) ³³				
Categories	Landowners (N=51)	Bach-owners (N=31)	Residents (N=14)	Total ³⁴
Lifestyle/ Sense of Place	Great retirement opportunity +1; to retain the beauty of the area; would be nice to have the peacefulness of the old Marahau; stay a friendly resort; self-sufficient;	Leaving its natural look; that things should work out with a plan and community; community gets together more to share ideas and stand up for rights; which preserves the place; that there will always remain	Marahau nice place for residents and visitors; vision what it might be; for a sense of community with varied interests; tidy	65

³³ The + (number) means the comment has been expressed x more times.

³⁴ This total reflects the number of 'hopes' mentioned for each category by respondents.

	<p>community activities; live in Marahau for many years; stays small; it will remain a naturally beautiful place for our grandchildren to enjoy; a really nice place to live; peaceful and beautiful place still in the future; try to keep the atmosphere of Marahau; still easy to live in Marahau; safe place to live; it facilities opportunities; no change; place for families; stays tranquil; quiet; peaceful; enjoyable; retain the beauty; retain casualness of interaction; peaceful occupation; more community-minded; hope for positive influence of your work; maintaining rural character; always portray relaxed image, life here is a great thing; decrease of 'gold fever' back to normal community conscience</p>	<p>pockets and areas of quietness and beauty even in the midst of the peak season; retain its special character; retain the current character; maintenance of special character; re-establishment of a sense of community; community in harmony with spiritually and physically with National Park values; that I will be able to experience peace and quiet in and around Marahau which is the main benefit of living and visiting here; continuing work for the future; just a place for those with money to live; stay special; remain a place that people want to go to; retains its natural beauty; there is more community feeling; recognition of the cultural history in this area; original nature of Marahau will not be changed; quiet and undeveloped as it is</p>	<p>community; combination of past - many resources i.e. fish/future; people friendly; to keep local character as it is; to still be here; keep it like it is from now on; remains as the special place it is; permanent community; remain a pleasant stage of occupancy resident and commercial; the community has more in common in future; Marahau a relaxed community</p>	
Development	<p>Develops quality facilities; moves ahead, but retains its peacefulness; low-key; café or gathering place +1; they do not allow too many inappropriate buildings; no more subdivisions +1; controlled future development, well thought-out planning; controlled planning of area- a balance; development is contained; does not go ahead too quickly; no high rise buildings +1; limited development</p>	<p>Development is planned and consulted; it does not get like Kaiteriteri; ecological approach; development alongside protecting natural resources; developed, but not over the top; Wakatu to go ahead small time; well developed; not too many changes, a balance between lifestyle and making a living; sustainable development; architectural control; low-key development; well planned development, that only further development be done in full consultation in locals and in a tasteful and 'low impact' way +1; stay low-key, not overdeveloped; Wakatu development, golf course and small scale 100 beds?</p>	<p>Only allow low-impact development retain rural nature of Valley; I survive Wakatu; maintain develop Marahau as a National Park village; lovely well planned, well organised</p>	33

Commercialism	No more tourist accommodation; not continue too become too commercial; tourist operators recognise the tranquil values of Marahau; it remains as is so that visitors can enjoy it; Marahau as a eco-tourist destination, with only controlled eco-tourist activities; low impact tourism; creating high quality recreational place; solution recognised by operators;	Tourist numbers increase so that tourists do not come anymore; not too commercial; less tourist come to the Park and fewer commercial enterprises, commercial operators contribute to the people like Marahau - generally people look after things they like; fewer tourists; that visitors will leave Marahau with a greater love appreciation and respect for mother earth (education and conservation issues); move to adventure tourism; no tourism activities; stop more tourist; tourism will die; closer understanding between commercial and non commercial; tourism will become not too overwhelming that there will be a carefully planned future for tourism here, so it will be balanced with values of local people;	Only operators with affinity for area (as compared to overseas consortiums); low impact tourism; levy operators to fund local developments - toilets, picnic tables, rubbish bins etc.; not cluttered with kayaks; owner operators not selling to big companies; development not only look at business progress	25
Control/ Planning/ TDC/DoC	River management; sensible controls on Park; access to the Park remains i.e. toll free; planning with community input; I hope the Council provides better facilities; responsible environmental considerations from TDC (with proper advice); they will act on erosion; sustainable management of the Park; protection and enhancement of special environmental features, not being spoiled; we will still enjoy coming to enjoy the environment; won't get spoiled; sustainable tourism in Park	Design Park laws; cohesion among stakeholders; control over amount of people moving in; organisations and control of the local; upkeep of the Park and local pay less; codes of environmental practice by locals; that there is a definite plan and stick to it; retain and improve public access; future planning that will protect the environment; Park status will provide protection for that area; to stay pristine environment	Free unlimited daily use of Park; that residents have their concerns heard; planning of this as a regional responsibility, institutional hands off stop (TDC/DoC) that they become more involved	22
Facilities/ Infrastructure	Waterfront-shop; picnic area on front beach; clean toilets, better public toilet facilities; showering facilities; better parking; good water supply; good water reticulation; planned sewage system +2; sewerage carefully monitored; water supply +1; Marahau Valley road gets sealed; upgrading of Marahau Valley Road to at least standard	Resist using too many lamp posts	Move more services there i.e. living doctor; hope that we will never have any streetlights +1	19
Beach/ Foreshore	Easier access to beach; improved beach frontage +1, tourist operators	Protection for beaches +1	No developments in the foreshore; foreshore does not	16

	move away from foreshore; erosion and road maintained;		look like a promenade, still natural; climate changes not severe; Otuwhero stays tidal Estuary; seashore protected; lagoon and Otuwhero Inlet remain; redevelopment of eroded beachfront to make more; Park remains the same with beaches	
Road/Traffic Boat Ramp	Less traffic; better roads; implementation of plan to take road behind settlement and development of beachfront as pedestrians reserve area; better road; less visual with tractors along the road; wharf for ferry passengers; get a better boat ramp+1; better beach access and safer ramps and small boat launching	The road is maintained for future residents and tourists		10
Vegetation/ Forestry/ Fishery	20% trees planted; trees nurtured a good planting plants; planted up; bush, estuary; scallop beds for recreational fishing; hope this ridge bush covered; bush or hill retained	Preservation of bush area; stop 'old mans beard' (weed); more landscape on split; no more depletion of shellfish and fish; more fish; better fishing; bird sanctuary; forestry gets designated regeneration of natives; people will still gather cockles from the beach	Hope that all forestry left alone to regenerate to bush	6
Pollution	Pollution free; the Park not overrun and polluted as seems to be happening	To resist pollution	Hope noise levels do not increase with growth; visual entrance appealing to cars and pedestrians	5

Appendix 7.5: 'Fears' for the future of Marahau

'Fears for the future of Marahau' identified by Marahau Community (N=96) ³⁵				
Categories	Landowners (N=51)	Bach-owners (N=31)	Residents (N=14)	Total ³⁶
Crowding	More kayaks; more water taxis; water-skis and jet skis especially in hire+2; over population (permanent) +2; too many tourists; overcrowded like Kaiteriteri or Queenstown or similar; tourism; becoming too crowded; too many people will spoil the area; roads and facilities too congested for enjoyment; overcrowding traffic and persons; full; excess of tourism; too many people; overcrowding-cars along beach and road	Too many tourists; escalating numbers in the Park; millions of sea kayakers, where will that end?; over population +1; overcrowding +3; Park overuse; overcrowding by tourists from all of NZ and the world; locals will be overwhelmed by tourists ; will become too busy; it gets busier; that local people will get pushed away because of business and there will no longer be a local community	Overcrowding +1; too busy, no space on the beach, over population of area like Whangamata; too many tourists	40
Development	Over-use of the area; wealthy landowners erecting large buildings; too many subdivisions; over development; large scale development; unlimited tourist development+1; wrecking what people have come here for; becomes like Kaiteriteri, mini-Queenstown +2; inappropriate tourist development (environmentally or visually polluting or noise); development; high rise houses; expansion of retailing e.g. shops selling tacky souvenirs and snack food; more roads; too much tourist development (big plans of Wakatu); Marahau build up with tourism; tourist resort +2	Intrusive development; too many buildings and businesses along main road; developments not notified; development; development i.e. housing; large tourist development; over development +1; bad development, building design; need code of practice for development; buildings structures; subdivision	This place turns into little Queenstown; too much construction; fear growth will bring too much; over development	37

³⁵ The + (number) means the comment has been expressed x more times.

³⁶ This total reflects the number of 'fears' mentioned for each category by respondents.

Commercialism	Too commercialised +6; over commercialised +1; too many commercial operators; too many kayak companies; overexploitation by tourists and operators; tourist money factories; run by tourist people; overrun by tourism; type tourist; day visitors have nowhere to go; more shops	Too much commercialism operations; commercialism; commercialisation overboard with tourist ventures; uncontrolled incompatible commercial development; more boats +1; companies moving in without any real connection with community; too many businesses	Bus-tourism (fast way); a place of business activity only environment (nature) will suffer a lot lose character of place through over development; spoilt by growth in commercial; uncool tourist business i.e. helicopter base; downturn in tourism	32
Lifestyle/ Sense of Place	Loses the 'bach' feel about it; loss of the Outdoor Centre; lose freedom of 'life'; lose peaceful atmosphere; loss of natural beauty	Losing NZ identity; that the community becomes too large; that a corner of beauty will get ruined and the very reason tourists come here will be gone; lose focus on real reasons Marahau is Marahau; racial tensions; outside interests and no feeling for the Marahau environment	No sense of the past; division between tourist operators and those who live here; no attempt to make community - there is no community place area; place for the rich; haven only for rich people; no room for locals; peace and quiet gone; lose rural charm	19
Beach/Erosion	Uncontrolled erosion +4; beach overuse; further erosion of beachfront; spoiling of beach from increased tourist boat activity or development next to beach	More erosion +2; the sea claiming more land from beach; erosion by sea; loss of beaches with erosion and rock walls; natural environment	Inlet filled with silt; removal of sandspit for parking; coastal erosion; degradation of Park; losing access to the beach	19
Forestry/ Fishery/ Natural Hazards	Possible commercial harvesting cockles; allowing commercial fishing too close too shore; forest; lack of fishing and cockles; pine forest operations; fire in the Park; fire; flooded out	Forestry erosion; impact on bush; bush fires +3; flood	Cockle depletion; forestry; big earthquake; sea level rise (erosion)	18
Infrastructure Facilities	Present roads too congested already; lack of domestic water; noisy busy road; not enough facilities in the Park for tourism numbers; visual impact of too many signs	Infrastructure; rubbish; road safety; increase traffic on front beach road	Motorization, cars at Park; more tourism development without facilities; too noisy vehicles, boats, cars and buses; water issues; street lights; losing water right to Wakatu	16
Pollution	Pollution of sea; pollution factor; further pollution in Abel Tasman; polluted; pollution of the beach; pollution through septic tanks; pollution	Environmental impact in National Park area, loss of natural character through weeds (pines); pollution need a sewage scheme; sewerage; pollution, less bird life	Pollution in the waterways; pollution; noise	13
Control/	The future let alone; overuse of Park	That tourist operators are overpowered by large		12

Planning/ TDC	facilities; no flood protection; pay to enter the Park; limitation of access to the Park; not being able to walk the dogs on the beach; rates might go sky high; TDC not thinking, a responsible overview; too many controls on residents; mismanagement	corporations; Park people 'pressure'; to much control from a few		
------------------	--	--	--	--

Appendix 7.6: PAGIS – TABLE: Context, Location, Issue and Comments

CONTEXT	LOCATION	ISSUE	COMMENTS
IMPORTANT	"ARTS UNIQUE"	TOURISM INFRASTRUCTURE	
IMPORTANT	"ARTS UNIQUE"	TOURISM INFRASTRUCTURE	
IMPORTANT	"ARTS UNIQUE"	TOURISM INFRASTRUCTURE	it is a special place and should be protected to stay there
IMPORTANT	"MARAHAU BEACH CAMP"	TOURISM INFRASTRUCTURE	the shop for everyone is good to have
CONCERN	"MARAHAU LODGE"	SEWAGE	pollution through large tourist developments
IMPORTANT	"OCEAN RIVER KAYAKS"	WATER SUPPLY	water supply is important, all companies use groundwater sucking the water out get saltwater intrusion and we all got septic tanks and that goes into the groundwater as well
CONCERN	"OCEAN VIEW CHALETs"	SEWAGE	pollution through large tourist developments
CONCERN	"OLD MACDONALDS FARM"	DEVELOPMENT	I am really worried about more development here
IMPORTANT	"OLD MACDONALDS FARM"	COMMUNITY	is a really lovely place
IMPORTANT	"OLD MACDONALDS FARM"	RECREATION	the kids use it lots; they do not charge local kids to go up there
IMPORTANT	"OLD MACDONALDS FARM"	TOURISM INFRASTRUCTURE	fish and chips at MacDonalds is great to have
CONCERN	"THE BARN BACKPACKERS"	DEVELOPMENT	
CONCERN	"THE BARN BACKPACKERS"	SEWAGE	pollution through large tourist developments
FUTURE	"THE BARN BACKPACKERS"	SEWAGE	
IMPORTANT	"THE FARM"	COMMUNITY	community place
IMPORTANT	"THE FARM"	COMMUNITY	
IMPORTANT	"THE FARM"	FORESTRY	still native forest on Maori land
IMPORTANT	"THE FARM"	PRIVATE	it is a beautiful place and I feel fortunate to have lived here
IMPORTANT	"THE PARK CAFE"	COMMUNITY	community place
IMPORTANT	"THE PARK CAFE"	COMMUNITY	place to meet others in the community
IMPORTANT	"THE PARK CAFE"	COMMUNITY	community place
IMPORTANT	"THE PARK CAFE"	COMMUNITY	meeting lots of people there
IMPORTANT	"THE PARK CAFE"	COMMUNITY	is really important as a focus point and that is were the buses stop

IMPORTANT	"THE PARK CAFE"	COMMUNITY	it is a needing community, they need each other, they build a rock bank and that effects the cafe by spring time - it gets surrounded by water
IMPORTANT	"THE PARK CAFE"	COMMUNITY	is really important as a social place
IMPORTANT	"THE PARK CAFE"	TOURISM INFRASTRUCTURE	
CONCERN	"WATER TAXI BASE"	TOURISM ACTIVITY	
CONCERN	"WATER TAXI BASE"	TOURISM ACTIVITY	location too close to residential places
CONCERN	ABEL TASMAN NATIONAL PARK	MANAGEMENT	the gorse on the track; pine trees and the possums
CONCERN	ABEL TASMAN NATIONAL PARK	OVERCROWDING	it is getting so much busier and I think it needs a limit; more speedboats and yet skis and people are surprised to see that in a National Park
CONCERN	ABEL TASMAN NATIONAL PARK	OVERCROWDING	they are too many people in the Park; suddenly it is a very attractive place and it is worth and worth more money and become unaffordable for us
CONCERN	ABEL TASMAN NATIONAL PARK	OVERCROWDING	there are too many people on the track
CONCERN	ABEL TASMAN NATIONAL PARK	OVERCROWDING	too many people in the Park and campsites
CONCERN	ABEL TASMAN NATIONAL PARK	OVERCROWDING	overcrowding
FUTURE	ABEL TASMAN NATIONAL PARK	IMPROVEMENTS	I like to see a lookout on the track
FUTURE	ABEL TASMAN NATIONAL PARK	INFRASTRUCTURE	no road there
FUTURE	ABEL TASMAN NATIONAL PARK	PROTECTION	
IMPORTANT	ABEL TASMAN NATIONAL PARK	HERITAGE	name of this place: "Porters Rock"
IMPORTANT	ABEL TASMAN NATIONAL PARK	MANAGEMENT	the Park needs better management system to regulate access to the place
IMPORTANT	ABEL TASMAN NATIONAL PARK	NATURAL FEATURE	
IMPORTANT	ABEL TASMAN NATIONAL PARK	NATURAL FEATURE	I like the track just before Tinline, it is a really pretty nature walk, I really like it
IMPORTANT	ABEL TASMAN NATIONAL PARK	NATURAL FEATURE	in the off-season I go walking in the Abel Tasman National Park
IMPORTANT	ABEL TASMAN NATIONAL PARK	NATURAL FEATURE	is very important to us
IMPORTANT	ABEL TASMAN NATIONAL PARK	NATURAL FEATURE	regenerating bush
IMPORTANT	ABEL TASMAN NATIONAL PARK	NATURAL FEATURE	coastlines and mountains and Fishermans and Adele Island
IMPORTANT	ABEL TASMAN NATIONAL PARK	OVERCROWDING	I am not going up there so often, it is overcrowded
IMPORTANT	ABEL TASMAN NATIONAL PARK	PROTECTION	we really enjoy the Abel Tasman National Park and the access to it
IMPORTANT	ABEL TASMAN NATIONAL PARK	RECREATION	for going walking and jogging
IMPORTANT	ABEL TASMAN NATIONAL PARK	RECREATION	to go jogging in winter
IMPORTANT	ABEL TASMAN NATIONAL PARK	RECREATION	would be good to restore the nature walk at Tinline Bay

IMPORTANT	ABEL TASMAN NATIONAL PARK	RECREATION	track for walking
IMPORTANT	ABEL TASMAN NATIONAL PARK	RECREATION	
IMPORTANT	ABEL TASMAN NATIONAL PARK	RECREATION	that is were we are walking to Coquille Bay and it is my running track, I love it
IMPORTANT	ABEL TASMAN NATIONAL PARK	RECREATION	for day walking; I actually like the whole coast
CONCERN	BEACHFRONT	EROSION	
CONCERN	BEACHFRONT	EROSION	the waterfront is a problem
CONCERN	BEACHFRONT	EROSION	I see the erosion and I think nature is taken its course
CONCERN	BEACHFRONT	EROSION	
CONCERN	BEACHFRONT	EROSION	it is going to be taken away, you can not stop it by putting some rocks out there, it is also changing the natural way of it
CONCERN	BEACHFRONT	EROSION	
CONCERN	BEACHFRONT	EROSION	because the council is not doing anything around here with the erosion they are causing this to come around some other way and too many people driving around with tractors and making around
CONCERN	BEACHFRONT	EROSION	
CONCERN	BEACHFRONT	EROSION	is a major thing for Marahau
CONCERN	BEACHFRONT	EROSION	
CONCERN	BEACHFRONT	EROSION	
CONCERN	BEACHFRONT	EROSION	they need to extent the rock wall and control the erosion
CONCERN	BEACHFRONT	EROSION	
CONCERN	BEACHFRONT	EROSION	I am really concerned about the erosion
CONCERN	BEACHFRONT	EROSION	is a big problem
CONCERN	BEACHFRONT	EROSION	they can not have the beachfront eroded
CONCERN	BEACHFRONT	EROSION	erosion, the road will be gone soon, if they do not fix it
CONCERN	BEACHFRONT	EROSION	beach conservation, has been a major issue to me
CONCERN	BEACHFRONT	EROSION	the erosion on the beach front is a big problem and nothing seems to happen about it, the beach used to be 50 meters further out, it was all a natural process, there used to be dressing sheds
CONCERN	BEACHFRONT	EROSION	
CONCERN	BEACHFRONT	EROSION	

CONCERN	BEACHFRONT	EROSION	the whole beach is a problem here and the major erosion we had retreats the beach about 50-60 m
CONCERN	BEACHFRONT	RECREATION	speeding traffic is a problem for the people swimming
FUTURE	BEACHFRONT	ACCESS	
FUTURE	BEACHFRONT	ACCESS	maintain beach access
FUTURE	BEACHFRONT	ACCESS	public access should remain, although Wakatu has blue water right up to medium high tide
FUTURE	BEACHFRONT	EROSION	protection of the beach usually means rock protection of some sort and usually means no beach anymore
FUTURE	BEACHFRONT	EROSION	
FUTURE	BEACHFRONT	EROSION	it should be preserved, it is eroding and we need more parking space for the tourist
FUTURE	BEACHFRONT	EROSION	needs to improve the beach frontage
IMPORTANT	BEACHFRONT	ACCESS	they can close it and put signs up: 'No Entry'
IMPORTANT	BEACHFRONT	EROSION	it is most important to me, the erosion has to be done properly and make it look better along the coast
IMPORTANT	BEACHFRONT	HERITAGE	that was were the old school used to be 30 odd years ago
IMPORTANT	BEACHFRONT	NATURAL FEATURE	
IMPORTANT	BEACHFRONT	RECREATION	I like the beach, because not everyone is on the beach the whole time
IMPORTANT	BEACHFRONT	RECREATION	the foreshore
IMPORTANT	BEACHFRONT	RECREATION	
IMPORTANT	BEACHFRONT	RECREATION	we go walking and swimming here
IMPORTANT	BEACHFRONT	RECREATION	the whole foreshore
IMPORTANT	BEACHFRONT	RECREATION	you can go along here without meeting people
IMPORTANT	BEACHFRONT	RECREATION	
IMPORTANT	BEACHFRONT	RECREATION	
IMPORTANT	BEACHFRONT	RECREATION	the beach area and the launching area for kayaks
IMPORTANT	BEACHFRONT	RECREATION	it also represents a place of pleasure as a family
IMPORTANT	BEACHFRONT	RECREATION	
IMPORTANT	BEACHFRONT	RECREATION	dog walking and recreation; fishing shellfish and crabs
IMPORTANT	BEACHFRONT	RECREATION	sandflats, shellfish, where I flounder; walking at the beach

IMPORTANT	BEACHFRONT	TOURISM INFRASTRUCTURE	high-tide turn around important to launch kayaks
CONCERN	BEACHFRONT/ROCKWALL	ACCESS	ramp to beach
CONCERN	BEACHFRONT/ROCKWALL	ACCESS	the access for elderly people, at the moment there is only the very steep and slippery access, which might prevent people from going
CONCERN	BEACHFRONT/ROCKWALL	ACCESS	
CONCERN	BEACHFRONT/ROCKWALL	EROSION	
CONCERN	BEACHFRONT/ROCKWALL	EROSION	
CONCERN	BEACHFRONT/ROCKWALL	EROSION	extend the foreshore, build up the rocks and replenishment
CONCERN	BEACHFRONT/ROCKWALL	PARKING	all along here are problems and that is all parking problem
FUTURE	BEACHFRONT/ROCKWALL	IMPROVEMENT	they need to rebuild this here and have to stop vehicles going out on the beach
FUTURE	BEACHFRONT/ROCKWALL	IMPROVEMENT	I would like to see a esplanade, a walkway away for pedestrians away from the road, planting with some benches, make it more attractive and safe to walk on
FUTURE	BEACHFRONT/ROCKWALL	PARKING	
FUTURE	BEACHFRONT/ROCKWALL	RECREATION	a promenade with cafes on the beachfront and a children's play area, with slides onto the beach
IMPORTANT	BEACHFRONT/SANDSPIT	RECREATION	the whole area is important; walking
CONCERN	BOAT RAMP	CONFLICTING USAGE	commercial vs. private users
CONCERN	BOAT RAMP	CONFLICTING USAGE	conflict between commercial and private users
CONCERN	BOAT RAMP	CONFLICTING USAGE	commercial parking is a problem, some operators leave their trailers there until the boat comes back, others are better, they take their stuff away
CONCERN	BOAT RAMP	CONGESTION	
CONCERN	BOAT RAMP	CONGESTION	operators just block up the whole area
CONCERN	BOAT RAMP	CONGESTION	this is my biggest concern, it creates noise and pollution, in summer there are just tractors, trailers, tractors...
CONCERN	BOAT RAMP	CONGESTION	too much traffic
CONCERN	BOAT RAMP	CONGESTION	the congestion and that boats come up the ramp concerns me; it harms the area
CONCERN	BOAT RAMP	CONGESTION	too many cars now, the boat ramp is too steep, too much off an angle, comes right onto the road is a hazards
CONCERN	BOAT RAMP	CONGESTION	all the businesses are up the other end, passed the community
CONCERN	BOAT RAMP	INFRASTRUCTURE	incorrect location, should be moved to where the kayaks get launched; there are too many boat users

CONCERN	BOAT RAMP	PARKING	parking at the boat ramp is a problem, they need a place where they can park all the tractors
CONCERN	BOAT RAMP	PARKING	during Christmas there is a lot of traffic coming through and day trippers park along the front, but there is not much beachfront left
CONCERN	BOAT RAMP	SAFETY	it is quite dangerous were all the tractors park, they just stand around and no one else can park there
CONCERN	BOAT RAMP	SAFETY	the boat ramp worries me
CONCERN	BOAT RAMP	SAFETY	the boat ramp is dangerous and should be moved
CONCERN	BOAT RAMP	SAFETY	dangerous with the tractors
CONCERN	BOAT RAMP	TRACTORS	the beach access of tractors is a problem and we do not know anything about the impacts
CONCERN	BOAT RAMP	TRACTORS	it is not a good solution to have tractors and trailers here
CONCERN	BOAT RAMP	TRAFFIC	I have a problem with the 'bottleneck' caused here
FUTURE	BOAT RAMP	IMPROVEMENT	needs to be improved
FUTURE	BOAT RAMP	IMPROVEMENT	
FUTURE	BOAT RAMP	INFRASTRUCTURE	it would be nicer to have a shop than a tractor parking place
FUTURE	BOAT RAMP	TOURISM INFRASTRUCTURE	
FUTURE	BOAT RAMP	TOURISM INFRASTRUCTURE	better boat ramp
FUTURE	BOAT RAMP	TRACTORS	no vehicles driving into the water or beach
IMPORTANT	BOAT RAMP	CONFLICTING USAGE	the local residents put in the boat ramp and the commercial operator use it, they have improved it, I grant them that
IMPORTANT	BOAT RAMP	CONGESTION	
IMPORTANT	BOAT RAMP	INFRASTRUCTURE	the ramp is very important to the community
IMPORTANT	BOAT RAMP	INFRASTRUCTURE	boat launching
IMPORTANT	BOAT RAMP	RECREATION	
IMPORTANT	BOAT RAMP	RECREATION	
FUTURE	BOAT RAMP/ESTUARY	TRACTORS	launch boat at hide tide - no vehicles
CONCERN	COASTLINE	CONFLICTING USAGE	number of boat users in peak season, conflict between motorised and non-motorised water users, foreshore water surface activity
CONCERN	COASTLINE	EROSION	that is a natural process

FUTURE	COASTLINE	DEVELOPMENT	under-utilised beaches, when the tide is out they are good beaches to swim in and Tinline has a nice beach with an old PA-side, which is one of the best lookout points
FUTURE	COASTLINE	PROTECTION	should become a marine reserve; limits on vehicles in the beach, what ATK is doing with their little bicycle trolleys makes the whole kayak thing so much more acceptable to me
IMPORTANT	COASTLINE	ACCESS	'Queens chain' is important to me, we all have the full freedom to walk down our beaches, rocks, riverbanks and coastlines
IMPORTANT	COASTLINE	EROSION	is a problem, but it is natural as well
IMPORTANT	COASTLINE	NATURAL FEATURE	coastline and beach
IMPORTANT	COASTLINE	RECREATION	
CONCERN	DOC CARPARK	PARKING	there is a parking problem in peak season
FUTURE	DOC CARPARK	RECREATION	picnic area
FUTURE	DOC CARPARK	SIGNS	too many signs around
CONCERN	DOC VISITOR CENTER	SEWAGE	I wonder about the sewage from here were it goes at the 'Park Cafe', it gets huge amount of use
CONCERN	DOC VISITOR CENTER	SEWAGE	
CONCERN	DOC VISITOR CENTER	SEWAGE	too much usage
FUTURE	DOC VISITOR CENTER	SEWAGE	there are disgusting toilets there
IMPORTANT	DOC VISITOR CENTER	ACCESS	park entrance
FUTURE	ENHANCEMENT PROJECT	IMPROVEMENT	the land is no-mans land, it can be an asset to the community; would be nice to have a nature walk around the river mouth
FUTURE	ENHANCEMENT PROJECT	PUBLIC SPACE	I would also like to see a soccer ground to play on, where people can kick a ball, just a small place, where it is not hidden, so people coming passed and see a few people there can join in
FUTURE	ENHANCEMENT PROJECT	SIGNS	too many signs around
IMPORTANT	ENHANCEMENT PROJECT	BIRDS	the wetland is important; bird sanctuary
IMPORTANT	ENHANCEMENT PROJECT	COMMUNITY	community spirit
IMPORTANT	ENHANCEMENT PROJECT	COMMUNITY	quite important pond-work, it has shown that a couple of people got in there and did something; they made it really good, it shows that residents can take it on themselves, that is really nice

IMPORTANT	ENHANCEMENT PROJECT	NATURAL FEATURE	
IMPORTANT	ENHANCEMENT PROJECT	PROTECTION	the wetland is ecologically the most important feature here
IMPORTANT	ENHANCEMENT PROJECT	PROTECTION	
FUTURE	FIRE STATION	COMMUNITY	this could be a place for community happening
FUTURE	FIRE STATION	RECREATION	the fire station needs more land around it, communities need a sport field; needs much more work done
IMPORTANT	FIRE STATION	COMMUNITY	community place
IMPORTANT	FIRE STATION	COMMUNITY	place for the community of Marahau
IMPORTANT	FIRE STATION	COMMUNITY	brings the community together, has common goals, is like a social place and the place is used by kids for table tennis
CONCERN	KAYAK LAUNCH AREA	CONFLICTING USAGE	kayak people need to respect others
CONCERN	KAYAK LAUNCH AREA	CONFLICTING USAGE	kayaks and private
CONCERN	KAYAK LAUNCH AREA	DEVELOPMENT	
CONCERN	KAYAK LAUNCH AREA	KAYAKS	traffic across weed beds
FUTURE	KAYAK LAUNCH AREA	ACCESS	to keep access to the beach
FUTURE	KAYAK LAUNCH AREA	TRACTORS	tractor access on beach should be low key
IMPORTANT	KAYAK LAUNCH AREA	ACCESS	the beach to the left and the right could be kept
CONCERN	MARAHAU BACKDROP	DEVELOPMENT	could never stand being build on these hills, because it is so fragile, you just slip away and wreck Marahau
CONCERN	MARAHAU BACKDROP	DEVELOPMENT	
CONCERN	MARAHAU BACKDROP	DEVELOPMENT	low key development otherwise it could be a disaster
CONCERN	MARAHAU BACKDROP	WATER SUPPLY	will be the community and TDC job; conflict of water users; all the companies use groundwater so sucking water out and get saltwater intrusion
FUTURE	MARAHAU BACKDROP	CONTROL	put up a notice that this is tutu, poisonous (Valerie), you get sick off it
FUTURE	MARAHAU BACKDROP	NATURAL FEATURE	community asset
FUTURE	MARAHAU BACKDROP	PROTECTION	
FUTURE	MARAHAU BACKDROP	PROTECTION	
IMPORTANT	MARAHAU BACKDROP	DEVELOPMENT	I hope it never gets developed; the whole area is magic
IMPORTANT	MARAHAU BACKDROP	NATURAL FEATURE	I love the paths here and the bush
IMPORTANT	MARAHAU BACKDROP	NATURAL FEATURE	should be retained as reserve land

IMPORTANT	MARAHAU BACKDROP	NATURAL FEATURE	
IMPORTANT	MARAHAU BACKDROP	NATURAL FEATURE	
IMPORTANT	MARAHAU BACKDROP	NATURAL FEATURE	the natural backdrop of the hills
IMPORTANT	MARAHAU BACKDROP	PROTECTION	it is a visual thing, because of the outstanding value of this place it retains some of the national heritage of the area
IMPORTANT	MARAHAU BACKDROP	PROTECTION	it is really important and it is in danger
IMPORTANT	MARAHAU BACKDROP	PROTECTION	I just love all that bush
IMPORTANT	MARAHAU BACKDROP	PROTECTION	the whole backdrop should remain as a greenbelt and stay green and in particular
IMPORTANT	MARAHAU BACKDROP	PROTECTION	should be protected under Queen Elisabeth II Trust
IMPORTANT	MARAHAU BACKDROP	PROTECTION	
IMPORTANT	MARAHAU BACKDROP	PROTECTION	
IMPORTANT	MARAHAU BACKDROP	PROTECTION	preservation of this bush is needed
IMPORTANT	MARAHAU BACKDROP	PROTECTION	
CONCERN	MARAHAU ESTUARY	BIRDS	I could tell you about oyster catchers who do not nest there anymore because of people with dogs; wildcats might also be a problem
CONCERN	MARAHAU ESTUARY	DEVELOPMENT	this beach is nice and you are on your own
FUTURE	MARAHAU ESTUARY	BIRDS	bird life needs protection
FUTURE	MARAHAU ESTUARY	BIRDS	the wetland is important; bird sanctuary
FUTURE	MARAHAU ESTUARY	PROTECTION	this area needs protection
FUTURE	MARAHAU ESTUARY	PROTECTION	
FUTURE	MARAHAU ESTUARY	PROTECTION	the swamp should not be touched, it is a natural waterway for birds, DoC has a watch on it, we not always agree on what they do, but they should look after it, they are doing well so far
FUTURE	MARAHAU ESTUARY	PROTECTION	estuary edges for the ecological values, during whitebating full of breeding fish, should be under QEII protection
IMPORTANT	MARAHAU ESTUARY	BIRDS	
IMPORTANT	MARAHAU ESTUARY	FISHING/SHELLFISH	good fishing of whitebate
IMPORTANT	MARAHAU ESTUARY	NATURAL FEATURE	this is actually quite important to me, here it would be possible to make a lovely walking track around here
IMPORTANT	MARAHAU ESTUARY	NATURAL FEATURE	

IMPORTANT	MARAHAU ESTUARY	NATURAL FEATURE	
IMPORTANT	MARAHAU ESTUARY	NATURAL FEATURE	
IMPORTANT	MARAHAU ESTUARY	NATURAL FEATURE	the area here is original really beautiful
IMPORTANT	MARAHAU ESTUARY	PROTECTION	this is governed area, a private scheme, this area is under Queen Elisabeth II Trust, because it includes the kanuka-kahikatea-kamahi-coprosma forest margin of the estuary
IMPORTANT	MARAHAU ESTUARY	RECREATION	
IMPORTANT	MARAHAU ESTUARY	RECREATION	the estuary is important to me
IMPORTANT	MARAHAU ESTUARY	RECREATION	we spend a lot of time there, really nice landscape and I can see it, they will touch it one day, maybe for jetties
CONCERN	MARAHAU FOREST	EROSION	the logging has definitely silted up the river and the beach heaps
CONCERN	MARAHAU FOREST	EROSION	
CONCERN	MARAHAU FOREST	EROSION	it would have been nice to not have planned it up with pines again, just the visual and it will all be logged again and in 30 years will be ugly again
CONCERN	MARAHAU FOREST	FLOODING	forestry runoff and flooding; in 5 years they replant it, but roots are not holding it, it is pure country has not got a bedrock, it is rotten rock; they planted it right into the creeks
CONCERN	MARAHAU FOREST	FLOODING	the logging has an impact on the river and causes flooding, is nature wood, it shows us changes an moods of nature, it is a disaster as far as soil conservation goes, a rape and depletion
CONCERN	MARAHAU FOREST	FORESTRY	
CONCERN	MARAHAU FOREST	FORESTRY	it is a major worry when they came in and ripped out those trees and the way they did it
CONCERN	MARAHAU FOREST	FORESTRY	the visual impact and the erosion concerns me
CONCERN	MARAHAU FOREST	FORESTRY	
CONCERN	MARAHAU FOREST	FORESTRY	soil is sterile after three generations of trees, they put lots of chemicals in the ground which effects the water supply
CONCERN	MARAHAU FOREST	SEDIMENTATION	they cut trees down all sorts of stuff comes down this estuary
CONCERN	MARAHAU FOREST	SEDIMENTATION	silting up the bay, when the forest has been cut and after the rain the bay is filthy
FUTURE	MARAHAU FOREST	FORESTRY	not too replant with pines

FUTURE	MARAHAU FOREST	FORESTRY	I liked to see the pine trees on the fringes of Marahau not replanted and be put back into native bush and see some nice walkways developed up on those hills
CONCERN	MARAHAU RIVER	EROSION	I like the river
CONCERN	MARAHAU RIVER	FLOODING	
CONCERN	MARAHAU RIVER	FLOODING	better river management is needed
CONCERN	MARAHAU RIVER	FLOODING	it is building up on banks and basically what happens is the level of the river gets higher each year and the farm gets more flood prime
CONCERN	MARAHAU RIVER	FLOODING	river changes
CONCERN	MARAHAU RIVER	FLOODING	flooding a big problem, the whole valley will be flooded
CONCERN	MARAHAU RIVER	MANAGEMENT	needs better management
CONCERN	MARAHAU RIVER	SEDIMENTATION	the river used to be so deep that boats used to come up it and they used to flood down logs when they were cutting timber, all those hills have been milled
FUTURE	MARAHAU RIVER	PROTECTION	I would like to see the river protected and looked after in a way
IMPORTANT	MARAHAU RIVER	FISHING/SHELLFISH	fishing
IMPORTANT	MARAHAU RIVER	FISHING/SHELLFISH	whitebating
IMPORTANT	MARAHAU RIVER	FISHING/SHELLFISH	whitebating, fishing, you can see an outdoor resource concept
IMPORTANT	MARAHAU RIVER	FLOODING	swimming and we spend lots of time there, it is nice to have the river, it is a constant reminder to us that we are quite vulnerable and if there is a major flood the area will be wiped out
IMPORTANT	MARAHAU RIVER	NATURAL FEATURE	
IMPORTANT	MARAHAU RIVER	NATURAL FEATURE	
IMPORTANT	MARAHAU RIVER	NATURAL FEATURE	it is a really nice river, it looks like it will not be a nice river anymore
IMPORTANT	MARAHAU RIVER	RECREATION	we go swimming there
IMPORTANT	MARAHAU RIVER	RECREATION	swimming hole
IMPORTANT	MARAHAU RIVER	RECREATION	we use lot of it and to go swimming
IMPORTANT	MARAHAU RIVER	RECREATION	the swimming hole is very important to us
IMPORTANT	MARAHAU RIVER	RECREATION	swimming
IMPORTANT	MARAHAU RIVER	RECREATION	swimming
IMPORTANT	MARAHAU RIVER	RECREATION	swimming hole
IMPORTANT	MARAHAU RIVER	RECREATION	swimming

IMPORTANT	MARAHAU RIVER	RECREATION	the swimming hole at 'Old MacDonalds Farm'
CONCERN	MARAHAU RIVER MOUTH	BIRDS	the dogs on the beach
CONCERN	MARAHAU RIVER MOUTH	EROSION	
CONCERN	MARAHAU RIVER MOUTH	FLOODING	the whole estuary is important, I love water
IMPORTANT	MARAHAU RIVER MOUTH	NATURAL FEATURE	is really important
IMPORTANT	MARAHAU RIVER MOUTH	NATURAL FEATURE	that area is really beautiful of the river mouth
IMPORTANT	MARAHAU RIVER MOUTH	RECREATION	I love the whole area of the beach and where the river runs out
IMPORTANT	MARAHAU RIVER MOUTH	RECREATION	swimming
CONCERN	MARAHAU VALLEY ROAD	DEVELOPMENT	no major tourist development around here
CONCERN	MARAHAU VALLEY ROAD	TARSEALING	because of the amount of traffic on this road (1996 - 220 cars)
CONCERN	MARAHAU VALLEY ROAD	TARSEALING	should be tar sealed not to user expenses, dust, corrugations, potholes
CONCERN	MARAHAU VALLEY ROAD	TARSEALING	it should get tar sealed
CONCERN	MARAHAU VALLEY ROAD	TARSEALING	the road here that enjoys me, the more you make a road better the faster people go, but it would be nice without the dust
CONCERN	MARAHAU VALLEY ROAD	TARSEALING	is hazards, dusty, stones flying everywhere, there is no ditch to jump into, as a walker or cyclist you try to avoid it, it needs to be tar sealed for the amount of people living there
CONCERN	MARAHAU VALLEY ROAD	TARSEALING	dust and traffic, it should be sealed and a place where people can walk
CONCERN	MARAHAU VALLEY ROAD	TARSEALING	that road should be sealed
FUTURE	MARAHAU VALLEY ROAD	TARSEALING	there are too many cars, it would be good to tar seal the road
FUTURE	MARAHAU VALLEY ROAD	TARSEALING	the road is always an issues there is never money
CONCERN	NEW ROAD	INFRASTRUCTURE	the big thing is the road frontage, I think they should leave it as it is and widen the road in the front, instead of destroying peoples bit of left can be done out here
CONCERN	NEW ROAD	INFRASTRUCTURE	why not put the road there
FUTURE	NEW ROAD	INFRASTRUCTURE	
FUTURE	NEW ROAD	INFRASTRUCTURE	it is a good idea
FUTURE	NEW ROAD	INFRASTRUCTURE	the new road would be so much better and take the pressure of the beach
FUTURE	NEW ROAD	INFRASTRUCTURE	we do not want this road

FUTURE	NEW ROAD	INFRASTRUCTURE	they want to make the road go around in a one-way system and back around the front, that is alright, but they really do not solve the problem, because were the jetty is the congestion
FUTURE	NEW ROAD	INFRASTRUCTURE	put the road long the back
FUTURE	NEW ROAD	INFRASTRUCTURE	the road around the houses I do not think it is any good
FUTURE	NEW ROAD	INFRASTRUCTURE	road around here is a good idea
FUTURE	NEW ROAD	INFRASTRUCTURE	that would be great, the old road would be a lot slower and just one-way; you can have benches here and nice trees at the old road would be safer
CONCERN	OTUWHERE INLET	BOAT RAMP	people driving tractors around
CONCERN	OTUWHERE INLET	SEDIMENTATION	this land in here becomes more and more build up
CONCERN	OTUWHERE INLET	SEDIMENTATION	outwash problems from forestry
CONCERN	OTUWHERE INLET	SEDIMENTATION	you could not see the boats sitting out there so deep was it
CONCERN	OTUWHERE INLET	SEDIMENTATION	the estuary is filling up with sand
CONCERN	OTUWHERE INLET	SEDIMENTATION	the forestry silts up the whole area here
CONCERN	OTUWHERE INLET	SEDIMENTATION	there was a big lagoon over a number of years, it was big and deep and they used to keep the boats there
CONCERN	OTUWHERE INLET	SEDIMENTATION	concerns me it is silting up, the spit is moving back here
CONCERN	OTUWHERE INLET	SEDIMENTATION	this area is getting full with sedimentation
CONCERN	OTUWHERE INLET	SEDIMENTATION	the general impression is that it is gradually filling up and that is a shame, it is an excellent breeding ground for fish
CONCERN	OTUWHERE INLET	SEDIMENTATION	long term it would be the amount of erosion from forestry, because this is building up
FUTURE	OTUWHERE INLET	HERITAGE	boats got built at the Wharf out of timber
FUTURE	OTUWHERE INLET	NATURAL FEATURE	I want it to stay as nature has given it
FUTURE	OTUWHERE INLET	PROTECTION	
FUTURE	OTUWHERE INLET	PROTECTION	I hope it stays the same
FUTURE	OTUWHERE INLET	PROTECTION	
FUTURE	OTUWHERE INLET	PROTECTION	preservation especially from commercial activity
FUTURE	OTUWHERE INLET	SEDIMENTATION	

IMPORTANT	OTUWHERE INLET	FISHING/SHELLFISH	up the estuary, I go flaudering; I like the whole area; the best time of day is before sunrise
IMPORTANT	OTUWHERE INLET	FISHING/SHELLFISH	important for whitebating
IMPORTANT	OTUWHERE INLET	FISHING/SHELLFISH	I spend a lot time during the whitebate season there
IMPORTANT	OTUWHERE INLET	NATURAL FEATURE	the estuary is absolutely critical too in terms of its live and sea life all the little crabs and the well regarded environment
IMPORTANT	OTUWHERE INLET	NATURAL FEATURE	
IMPORTANT	OTUWHERE INLET	NATURAL FEATURE	the whole area here in the estuary
IMPORTANT	OTUWHERE INLET	NATURAL FEATURE	
IMPORTANT	OTUWHERE INLET	NATURAL FEATURE	I would like it to stay the same
IMPORTANT	OTUWHERE INLET	NATURAL FEATURE	
IMPORTANT	OTUWHERE INLET	NATURAL FEATURE	the whole of the inlet; lots of birds, nesting season goes along with the tourist season
IMPORTANT	OTUWHERE INLET	NATURAL FEATURE	very important amenity
IMPORTANT	OTUWHERE INLET	PROTECTION	I would like to see replanting projects - Otuwhero Park
IMPORTANT	OTUWHERE INLET	PROTECTION	nature appreciation
IMPORTANT	OTUWHERE INLET	RECREATION	we used to go there and it is so different now
IMPORTANT	OTUWHERE INLET	RECREATION	swimming
IMPORTANT	OTUWHERE INLET	RECREATION	it is a lovely place to walk and lots of bird life, a real calming place, safe place for children to swim and surf
IMPORTANT	OTUWHERE INLET	RECREATION	the estuary is a really calming place, we go kayaking, windsurfing and sailing there
IMPORTANT	OTUWHERE INLET	RECREATION	windsurfing
IMPORTANT	OTUWHERE INLET	VIEWS	nice views
CONCERN	OTUWHERE RIVER	CONTROL	we have a willow and too many old mans beard, it is a horrible vine, which strangles all the trees
CONCERN	OTUWHERE RIVER	INFRASTRUCTURE	when they put these bridges in they diverted the river out here, that is when all the sedimentation started
IMPORTANT	OTUWHERE RIVER	FISHING/SHELLFISH	these are places I go mostly
IMPORTANT	OTUWHERE RIVER	FISHING/SHELLFISH	whitebating
IMPORTANT	OTUWHERE RIVER	NATURAL FEATURE	important ecological feature

IMPORTANT	OTUWHEREO RIVER	NATURAL FEATURE	ecological area, pristine
CONCERN	OUTDOOR RECREATION CENTER	PLAYGROUND	the local children used to play there and got kicked off, that is really sad
FUTURE	OUTDOOR RECREATION CENTER	HERITAGE	should not be closed down, there is lots of historical value for Nelson people, who went there as a child
IMPORTANT	OUTDOOR RECREATION CENTER	PLAYGROUND	
IMPORTANT	OUTDOOR RECREATION CENTER	PRIVATE	
CONCERN	RIDGELINE	PROTECTION	leave it alone
CONCERN	RIDGELINE	PROTECTION	the ridgeline should not be build on, places overlooking Marahau should not be build on
IMPORTANT	RIDGELINE	PROTECTION	the ridgeline should not be build on and be left alone
IMPORTANT	RIDGELINE	PROTECTION	I do not want to see anything being put on the hills
IMPORTANT	RIDGELINE	PROTECTION	I do not want to see anything being put on the hills
CONCERN	ROAD BEACHFRONT	CONGESTION	the speed of the traffic and the amount in summer
CONCERN	ROAD BEACHFRONT	CONGESTION	there is real congestion around here with vehicles; the road in the front is hazardous
CONCERN	ROAD BEACHFRONT	CONGESTION	operators just block up the whole area
CONCERN	ROAD BEACHFRONT	CONGESTION	the roading is a concern
CONCERN	ROAD BEACHFRONT	CONGESTION	for the amount of traffic, which is in Marahau at the meantime
CONCERN	ROAD BEACHFRONT	EROSION	it is prime to erosion and the houses and people walking close on the road; rather have a foot promenade around here
CONCERN	ROAD BEACHFRONT	IMPROVEMENT	would be nice to have few seats around the front, some happening tables
CONCERN	ROAD BEACHFRONT	IMPROVEMENT	road is too narrow, do not believe we need a wider road, because people would just speed, just a place were people can walk
CONCERN	ROAD BEACHFRONT	NARROWNESS	
CONCERN	ROAD BEACHFRONT	NARROWNESS	the road needs to be widened
CONCERN	ROAD BEACHFRONT	NARROWNESS	it is dangerous on the road with the tractors
CONCERN	ROAD BEACHFRONT	NARROWNESS	there is no room, the road is too narrow not enough parking; there is such a lot for traffic coming through and they are then all lined up
CONCERN	ROAD BEACHFRONT	PARKING	the tractors and trailers take up all the space, the people are coming for a day should be able to park and swim
CONCERN	ROAD BEACHFRONT	PARKING	it upsets me that all the tractors park here and I can not park my trailer there, the commercial operators are take over the whole space

CONCERN	ROAD BEACHFRONT	PARKING	there is a problem with all the tractors and trailers parked along here
CONCERN	ROAD BEACHFRONT	PARKING	I do mind that the commercial operators park there and they are taking up space day visitors should be able to use
CONCERN	ROAD BEACHFRONT	PROTECTION	they have not done anything and the sea might take it away
CONCERN	ROAD BEACHFRONT	SIGNS	the signage is illegal as well and advertising signs on beachfront
CONCERN	ROAD BEACHFRONT	TRACTORS	visual impact
CONCERN	ROAD BEACHFRONT	TRACTORS	congestion with traffic and I do not like the noisy tractors going down the street; they all trundle up and down this road and it adds to the congestion
CONCERN	ROAD BEACHFRONT	TRAFFIC	
CONCERN	ROAD BEACHFRONT	TRAFFIC	the road is a bit for a worry that is the future
CONCERN	ROAD BEACHFRONT	TRAFFIC	the speed of traffic and there is no footpath for children, maybe put in a series of chicanes to reduce the speed
CONCERN	ROAD BEACHFRONT	TRAFFIC	dangerous; the endless stream of traffic; people always speed
CONCERN	ROAD BEACHFRONT	TRAFFIC	it is a race track, people drive so quickly and it is dangerous; it gets really noisy in the day
CONCERN	ROAD BEACHFRONT	TRAFFIC	the traffic has really spoiled the beach front location; it is still lovely, but it has changed; traffic and the speed is a problem; it is unsafe for children
FUTURE	ROAD BEACHFRONT	CONGESTION	too much traffic
FUTURE	ROAD BEACHFRONT	DEVELOPMENT	safe walkway for pedestrians along roadway where the rocks are
FUTURE	ROAD BEACHFRONT	EROSION	rock wall needs improvement to save the road
FUTURE	ROAD BEACHFRONT	IMPROVEMENT	I would like to see the road widened with another stonewall, the traffic can move out a bit and people could walk, I would like to see a nice esplanade with trees and picnic places
FUTURE	ROAD BEACHFRONT	NARROWNESS	like to widen the road and have a safe walkway in the front and a parking area, maybe a playground for the public to use
FUTURE	ROAD TO MARAHAU	HERITAGE	old access to Marahau, marble quarry, only for horse drawn vehicles only go across when tide is out and through the inlet
FUTURE	ROAD TO MARAHAU	TOURISM INFRASTRUCTURE	they are going to build an information kiosk here
IMPORTANT	ROAD TO MARAHAU	ACCESS	road
IMPORTANT	ROAD TO MARAHAU	VIEWS	
CONCERN	ROCKWALL	EROSION	the Council spent lots of money on the road

CONCERN	ROCKWALL	EROSION	beach and road is in danger
CONCERN	ROCKWALL	EROSION	maintain beach
FUTURE	ROCKWALL	IMPROVEMENT	
FUTURE	ROCKWALL	IMPROVEMENT	I want a properly done seafront
CONCERN	SANDFLATS	KAYAKS	they have a passageway were the kayaks are taken out and they come up with the marked area now and thousand of cockles get smashed
CONCERN	SANDFLATS	OVERCROWDING	too many people on the sandflats; too many shellfish taken; I worry about the foreshore
CONCERN	SANDFLATS	SEDIMENTATION	through forestry sandflats are building up
CONCERN	SANDFLATS	SEWAGE	pollution of shellfish in front of the beach; the motor camp is full, the outdoor centre is full and all those houses hundreds of people there and most septic tanks where build in the 60s
CONCERN	SANDFLATS	TRACTORS	I am dead against any tractors going across, but the rules are you can drive from there to there
CONCERN	SANDFLATS	TRACTORS	were the boats are taken out and they smashed thousands of cockles
CONCERN	SANDFLATS	TRACTORS	
CONCERN	SANDFLATS	TRACTORS	no vehicles on beach, the little bicycles are more acceptable and have a lower impact on shellfish
CONCERN	SANDFLATS	TRACTORS	10-11 a day tractors they drive them up and down the beach
FUTURE	SANDFLATS	EROSION	I would build a rock wall along here and out of granite
IMPORTANT	SANDFLATS	FISHING/SHELLFISH	at low tide people go out and collect shellfish
IMPORTANT	SANDFLATS	NATURAL FEATURE	it beauty and the foreshore, I would not want to see much happening in there
IMPORTANT	SANDFLATS	NATURAL FEATURE	the whole beach is important
IMPORTANT	SANDFLATS	NATURAL FEATURE	those sandflats are really important
IMPORTANT	SANDFLATS	RECREATION	
IMPORTANT	SANDFLATS	RECREATION	
IMPORTANT	SANDFLATS	RECREATION	I just like the whole area
IMPORTANT	SANDFLATS	RECREATION	the whole area out to low tide; we go swimming and launch kayaks; we can get cockles
IMPORTANT	SANDFLATS	RECREATION	at low tide it is really important for children playing, we go for evening walks there

CONCERN	SANDSPIT	BIRDS	the dogs are harming the birds; there is no control, you can take your dogs anywhere and they can do what ever they want to
CONCERN	SANDSPIT	EROSION	it might disappear soon
CONCERN	SANDSPIT	PARKING	
CONCERN	SANDSPIT	PARKING	they need to fill that in and make it a car park
CONCERN	SANDSPIT	PARKING	commercial parking has grown, I would be horrified when they fill in the sandspit for a car park
CONCERN	SANDSPIT	RECREATION	this is a wonderful place were we take the children
CONCERN	SANDSPIT	TOURISM BUSINESSES	outside ones are a problem
CONCERN	SANDSPIT	TOURISM BUSINESSES	the tourism operators coming from outside park here and give their briefings
FUTURE	SANDSPIT	NATURAL FEATURE	keep as they are, should never be interfered with
FUTURE	SANDSPIT	PARKING	no parking area; the kayaking people there are no problem
FUTURE	SANDSPIT	PARKING	it is a natural area and should not be filled in for a car park
FUTURE	SANDSPIT	PARKING	
FUTURE	SANDSPIT	PARKING	public area-parking, there is just one toilet and no are to just sit
FUTURE	SANDSPIT	PROTECTION	
FUTURE	SANDSPIT	PROTECTION	this area needs protection
FUTURE	SANDSPIT	PROTECTION	I would like to see this as a recreational area
FUTURE	SANDSPIT	PROTECTION	
FUTURE	SANDSPIT	PROTECTION	
FUTURE	SANDSPIT	PROTECTION	as a bird sanctuary, this is were we spend most of our time with the children
IMPORTANT	SANDSPIT	BIRDS	birds are nesting out there and at Christmas time at least the Council have put up signs that is the time when you get locals and tourists at the beach
IMPORTANT	SANDSPIT	IMPROVEMENT	the place on the spit, if not everyone would park there it would be nice for a picnic place
IMPORTANT	SANDSPIT	IMPROVEMENT	amenity values, pristine, there are too many rabbits
IMPORTANT	SANDSPIT	NATURAL FEATURE	
IMPORTANT	SANDSPIT	NATURAL FEATURE	
IMPORTANT	SANDSPIT	NATURAL FEATURE	
IMPORTANT	SANDSPIT	NATURAL FEATURE	

IMPORTANT	SANDSPIT	NATURAL FEATURE	this area is special to me
IMPORTANT	SANDSPIT	NATURAL FEATURE	I spend the most time around the spit with the kids
IMPORTANT	SANDSPIT	NATURAL FEATURE	it is nature and created it and it is dynamic shoreline, there are lots of birds
IMPORTANT	SANDSPIT	NATURAL FEATURE	
IMPORTANT	SANDSPIT	PROTECTION	I like this place developed as in planted out into a natural reserve
IMPORTANT	SANDSPIT	PROTECTION	beautiful; I would not allow cars up here, only foot access; could be enhanced; needs pest control (rabbits)
IMPORTANT	SANDSPIT	RECREATION	I always like going down the sandspit
IMPORTANT	SANDSPIT	RECREATION	safe place for children
IMPORTANT	SANDSPIT	RECREATION	
IMPORTANT	SANDSPIT	RECREATION	swimming and windsurfing, people stay here the whole day and they come from everywhere
IMPORTANT	SANDSPIT/OTUWHERE INLET	RECREATION	it is out this and that way; we use it all
CONCERN	SANDY BAY ROAD	SPEED BUMPS	are in the wrong place and they need to be marked with fluoresced yellow road paint
CONCERN	SANDY BAY ROAD	WASTE	there is no place to put rubbish for visitors, the council took the bins away, so people put it down the toilets
CONCERN	TASMAN SEA	FISHING/SHELLFISH	the tables were full of crawfish, that has all changed there is no fish out there anymore, because of commercial fishing
CONCERN	TASMAN SEA	FISHING/SHELLFISH	trolleys can come right in here
CONCERN	TASMAN SEA	FISHING/SHELLFISH	we are concerned of how much is taken out
CONCERN	TASMAN SEA	FISHING/SHELLFISH	retain shellfish
CONCERN	TASMAN SEA	SEWAGE	septic tank leakage
FUTURE	TASMAN SEA	FISHING/SHELLFISH	fishing is not as plentiful anymore as it used to be; the commercial fishing boats come right into shore
FUTURE	TASMAN SEA	NATURAL FEATURE	the whole area is magic, I love the ocean
FUTURE	TASMAN SEA	PROTECTION	I would like to see a marine reserve, the whole water, no fishing; the whole coastline locked away and it can be an opportunity for 'eco-tourism'
FUTURE	TASMAN SEA	RESOURCES	the ocean holds the key for future prosperity
IMPORTANT	TASMAN SEA	FISHING/SHELLFISH	scallops
IMPORTANT	TASMAN SEA	NATURAL FEATURE	the whole foreshore is important to me

IMPORTANT	TASMAN SEA	NATURAL FEATURE	the bay; the whole place
IMPORTANT	TASMAN SEA	RECREATION	the whole area of Marahau and the coast until Separation Point (Abel Tasman National Park)
IMPORTANT	TASMAN SEA	RECREATION	the seashore, the frontage, it is lovely in winter and it is quite; I love the view of it; too many cockles taken
IMPORTANT	TASMAN SEA	RECREATION	I just love the sea, boating and kayaking
IMPORTANT	TASMAN SEA	RECREATION	the whole bay we use lots and islands are important, we use a lot, cockles, access to the beach, the beachfront
CONCERN	TOKO NGAWA	DEVELOPMENT	people can get away with building houses on the skyline, that is getting build up and has a huge impact
CONCERN	TOKO NGAWA	DEVELOPMENT	it is probably the worst thing happened to Marahau; those ugly scares
CONCERN	TOKO NGAWA	DEVELOPMENT	scaring of hillside
CONCERN	TOKO NGAWA	DEVELOPMENT	all the scaring is significant; there is lot of history in there and it is all gone and people have forgotten about it and all the stuff is gone bulldosed over; there is a pa as well
CONCERN	TOKO NGAWA	DEVELOPMENT	conspicuous houses on the horizon
CONCERN	TOKO NGAWA	DEVELOPMENT	aesthetics of houses and tracks; when you come back on a water taxi, were the mad mile starts, you can see the houses on the ridgeline, they should be low key
CONCERN	TOKO NGAWA	EROSION	the sand is building up that is why it takes land here and we have erosion problems
CONCERN	TOKO NGAWA	SEWAGE	we are also concerned about the sewage from there
CONCERN	TOKO NGAWA	VISUAL IMPACT	the houses should not be build on the skyline
CONCERN	TOKO NGAWA	VISUAL IMPACT	that is visual pollution, you have a lovely native flat hill and then you plunk a great big house on the top, especially at night you can see the lights pretty bright
CONCERN	TOKO NGAWA	VISUAL IMPACT	houses dominating the skyline
CONCERN	TOKO NGAWA	VISUAL IMPACT	roof colour, unsightly houses
CONCERN	TOKO NGAWA	VISUAL IMPACT	eyesore, hill building sites, no control of the skyline
FUTURE	TOKO NGAWA	HERITAGE	the sites should be recognised with its sense of history in the future, like the marble wharf here
IMPORTANT	TOKO NGAWA	FISHING/SHELLFISH	this coastline, because I love to use it, cockles and I like the sandbars
IMPORTANT	TOKO NGAWA	HERITAGE	need to be known that this was the old wharf, where the railway tracks where and the marble got shipped away in 1920

IMPORTANT	TOKO NGAWA	HERITAGE	wharf
IMPORTANT	TOKO NGAWA	HERITAGE	there is lot of history in there, there is a pa-site
IMPORTANT	TOKO NGAWA	HERITAGE	the old wharf is important
IMPORTANT	TOKO NGAWA	PROTECTION	it should be part of the Abel Tasman National Park
IMPORTANT	TOKO NGAWA	RECREATION	one reason we have invested the rest of our lives here is because it is just such a fantastic scenery, peaceful place and the contradiction with the rugged bushline, soft sand and water
IMPORTANT	TOKO NGAWA	RECREATION	rocks where the mussels are
FUTURE	TOKO NGAWA/APPLE SPLIT	HERITAGE	pa site identified, sense of history in the future, need protection
IMPORTANT	TOKO NGAWA/APPLE SPLIT	RECREATION	
IMPORTANT	TOKO NGAWA/APPLE SPLIT	RECREATION	apple split rock
IMPORTANT	TOKO NGAWA/APPLE SPLIT	RECREATION	apple split rock
IMPORTANT	TOKO NGAWA/APPLE SPLIT	RECREATION	
CONCERN	TOKO NGAWA/SANDSPIT	SEDIMENTATION	caused through erosion building up sand and I would like to see a floodgate to keep the tide in longer in summer
CONCERN	TOKO NGAWA/SANDSPIT	SPEEDING	I am worried about the boats coming through here with high speed and it is so much watercraft
CONCERN	TOWNSHIP	DEVELOPMENT	concentration of shops and stuff; I do not think the gateway to the Park should be a big shopping centre
CONCERN	TOWNSHIP	DEVELOPMENT	
CONCERN	TOWNSHIP	DEVELOPMENT	I am concerned with more commercialism sneaking its way up, before it was just one area; one subdivision is filled and then comes another one
CONCERN	TOWNSHIP	DEVELOPMENT	this area is too developed
CONCERN	TOWNSHIP	DEVELOPMENT	they have to put a limit on population density
CONCERN	TOWNSHIP	DEVELOPMENT	we are concerned with any further development here
CONCERN	TOWNSHIP	DEVELOPMENT	there a too many subdivisions here, numbers, water supply
CONCERN	TOWNSHIP	DEVELOPMENT	
CONCERN	TOWNSHIP	DEVELOPMENT	no more subdivision here, concern of more houses when residential
CONCERN	TOWNSHIP	FLOODING	forestry increased risk of flooding
CONCERN	TOWNSHIP	SEWAGE	septic tanks

CONCERN	TOWNSHIP	SEWAGE	What is an adequate sewage system?
CONCERN	TOWNSHIP	SEWAGE	they should not all have septic tanks in that area and should put in a sewage plant; we are concerned about any development outside this urban area
CONCERN	TOWNSHIP	SEWAGE	a big concern in Marahau is the pollution with septic tanks an the sandy country seepage will get into the ground and pollute the sea
CONCERN	TOWNSHIP	SEWAGE	
CONCERN	TOWNSHIP	WATER SUPPLY	people are running out of water in summer
CONCERN	TOWNSHIP	WATER SUPPLY	
CONCERN	TOWNSHIP	WATER SUPPLY/SEWAGE	leakage of septic tanks; all the population here is obviously a concern; any kind of high-rise would be wrong
CONCERN	TOWNSHIP	WATER SUPPLY/SEWAGE	
CONCERN	TOWNSHIP	WATER SUPPLY/SEWAGE	population grows affluent and I think it is going to be everyone's responsibility to have septic tanks that are performing correctly; water supply is at presently a private water scheme
CONCERN	TOWNSHIP	WATER SUPPLY/SEWAGE	some have legal water right and other do not have that and we need a sewage scheme
CONCERN	TOWNSHIP	WATER SUPPLY/SEWAGE	water right issue; in winter it is alright, in summer we have a problem, there are too many people on there; need proper supply
CONCERN	TOWNSHIP	WATER SUPPLY/SEWAGE	we have trouble with water
CONCERN	TOWNSHIP	WATER SUPPLY/SEWAGE	water is a problem, there are three groups: those have legal water right and other have no legal right and then those who have no right at all
CONCERN	TOWNSHIP	WATER SUPPLY/SEWAGE	new development is fine, but needs to be properly planned caring on the whole area demands on water and affluent and litter; all those things need attention
CONCERN	TOWNSHIP	WATER SUPPLY/SEWAGE	I feel that something is not done for the township about the sewage and water and it end up to become a major problem and will drain into the sea
CONCERN	TOWNSHIP	WATER SUPPLY/SEWAGE	sewage should not be going track into the ground at a place like this; not that it is effecting anything yet, but if it gets bigger, than you get bigger problems and water is a problem for everyone
FUTURE	TOWNSHIP	DEVELOPMENT	that is were they could have the township type piece, because the people will stop there at the base point and there is heaps of land
FUTURE	TOWNSHIP	SEWAGE	
FUTURE	TOWNSHIP	TOURISM INFRASTRUCTURE	would be a nice place for another cafe

IMPORTANT	TOWNSHIP	DEVELOPMENT	keep this area rural
IMPORTANT	TOWNSHIP	HERITAGE	
IMPORTANT	TOWNSHIP	RECREATION	
CONCERN	WAKATU PROPERTY	ACCESS	access problems in the future
CONCERN	WAKATU PROPERTY	DEVELOPMENT	within the rules you should be able to do what you want to do with your land, as long as it comes up to building standards
CONCERN	WAKATU PROPERTY	DEVELOPMENT	what is going to happen here, what is being planned is a 160 people coming in more than double Marahau and that is going to have a huge impact or what other people do to serve those clients
CONCERN	WAKATU PROPERTY	DEVELOPMENT	what they want to do here is mad
CONCERN	WAKATU PROPERTY	DEVELOPMENT	I am concerned with this Maori development
CONCERN	WAKATU PROPERTY	DEVELOPMENT	
CONCERN	WAKATU PROPERTY	DEVELOPMENT	the last two summers in did not get busier and busier, it seems to levelling off somewhere and that is great, but the whole Wakatu thing will change that
CONCERN	WAKATU PROPERTY	DEVELOPMENT	what I heard they will do it nicely, but it will have a huge impact
CONCERN	WAKATU PROPERTY	DEVELOPMENT	
CONCERN	WAKATU PROPERTY	DEVELOPMENT	I worry about this area of were the Wakatu development takes place
CONCERN	WAKATU PROPERTY	DEVELOPMENT	this development is too big, they have to do something about sewage and water around that area
CONCERN	WAKATU PROPERTY	DEVELOPMENT	it concerns me how Wakatu will develop their land
CONCERN	WAKATU PROPERTY	DEVELOPMENT	it concerns me, when Wakatu does what they want to do
CONCERN	WAKATU PROPERTY	DEVELOPMENT	it is going to change everything
CONCERN	WAKATU PROPERTY	DEVELOPMENT	another 180 people on the beach, that would ruin it for us; in mid summer it is already too busy
CONCERN	WAKATU PROPERTY	DEVELOPMENT	unsure about future development
CONCERN	WAKATU PROPERTY	DEVELOPMENT	proposed tourist development can cause environmental problems for the coast, that should be a reserve area and plant some trees
CONCERN	WAKATU PROPERTY	DEVELOPMENT	uncertain about development, no hotel and no pubs
CONCERN	WAKATU PROPERTY	DEVELOPMENT	it is important what will happen there, any changes will have an impact on us, needs to be low key development

CONCERN	WAKATU PROPERTY	DEVELOPMENT	uncertainty of style of tourism development; the 'Keep Out' signs did not go very well with me, too aggressive
CONCERN	WAKATU PROPERTY	DEVELOPMENT	that land could be a problem, because of sewage, groundwater and erosion
CONCERN	WAKATU PROPERTY	DEVELOPMENT	low key development
CONCERN	WAKATU PROPERTY	SIGNS	private property sign, it symbolises something
FUTURE	WAKATU PROPERTY	ACCESS	like a footpath through this land
FUTURE	WAKATU PROPERTY	BOAT RAMP	I think they should move the boat ramp to here, they should shift all the traffic away
FUTURE	WAKATU PROPERTY	BOAT RAMP	this could be a good place for a new boat ramp
FUTURE	WAKATU PROPERTY	BOAT RAMP	launching area for commercial operator separate
FUTURE	WAKATU PROPERTY	DEVELOPMENT	this could be a real enhancement to the place; I would not like to see a great deal of high-rises here, if they can be tastefully done it is ok
FUTURE	WAKATU PROPERTY	DEVELOPMENT	
FUTURE	WAKATU PROPERTY	DEVELOPMENT	it will be a major change when this development will go ahead
FUTURE	WAKATU PROPERTY	DEVELOPMENT	I think it is good to develop that land
FUTURE	WAKATU PROPERTY	DEVELOPMENT	I do not know what it is going to be like
FUTURE	WAKATU PROPERTY	DEVELOPMENT	this can become a problem in the future
FUTURE	WAKATU PROPERTY	DEVELOPMENT	
FUTURE	WAKATU PROPERTY	DEVELOPMENT	
FUTURE	WAKATU PROPERTY	DEVELOPMENT	all development should conform ascetically to kind of strict regulation, housing material, colours and should be as much a possible to blend into the natural environment, no high-rises
FUTURE	WAKATU PROPERTY	DEVELOPMENT	
FUTURE	WAKATU PROPERTY	DEVELOPMENT	
FUTURE	WAKATU PROPERTY	DEVELOPMENT	I am quite happy what is happening there, no high rise, will add more business
FUTURE	WAKATU PROPERTY	DEVELOPMENT	it should be all colour coded in green, low key
FUTURE	WAKATU PROPERTY	DEVELOPMENT	uncertainty; I really do not like to see the rural land subdivided into a village
FUTURE	WAKATU PROPERTY	DEVELOPMENT	I like the idea of a town centre to meet and that everything is happening there
FUTURE	WAKATU PROPERTY	DEVELOPMENT	it will be lovely made, but a man-made thing is not going to be natural thing and that is not a good feeling

FUTURE	WAKATU PROPERTY	DEVELOPMENT	low key development that is constructed to keep with the environment around them
FUTURE	WAKATU PROPERTY	HERITAGE	Maori cemetery uru-pa site
FUTURE	WAKATU PROPERTY	PICNIC AREA	I feel Marahau needs a place a big reserve area for people to play a game or two and needs to be away from the residential areas
FUTURE	WAKATU PROPERTY	PUBLIC SPACE	there needs to be community space in Marahau
FUTURE	WAKATU PROPERTY	PUBLIC SPACE	playground; we need more space for kids to kick a ball
FUTURE	WAKATU PROPERTY	PUBLIC SPACE	there is a lack of space to sit down and relax
FUTURE	WAKATU PROPERTY	WATER SUPPLY/SEWAGE	it might also become a problem in the township, decisions on the management of Wakatu will be very significant
FUTURE	WAKATU PROPERTY	WATER SUPPLY/SEWAGE	will have lots of waste water and sewage and that will all go into the estuary
IMPORTANT	WAKATU PROPERTY	ACCESS	
IMPORTANT	WAKATU PROPERTY	BIRDS	birds breeding here, needs to be protected
IMPORTANT	WAKATU PROPERTY	BIRDS	birds nesting; people walk around and disturb them and trample all over them
IMPORTANT	WAKATU PROPERTY	DEVELOPMENT	change from agriculture to tourism
IMPORTANT	WAKATU PROPERTY	DEVELOPMENT	unclear what will happen and it should not spoil the atmosphere
IMPORTANT	WAKATU PROPERTY	HERITAGE	kumera growing