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ABSTRACT

Place identities have become contested subjects in contemporary tourism place promotion. The growing importance of difference and uniqueness in an increasingly competitive global tourism environment has made it more pressing than ever that tourism places brand globally recognisable, yet locally unique, place identities. A tension exists between this need to be globally recognisable and locally unique, however. Risks of increasing homogenisation and of alienation of local residents have led to increasing calls for the inclusion of local residents’ values in tourism place promotion. The realities of the international tourism marketing context, by contrast, necessitate the creation and maintenance of internationally competitive, demand-oriented place products.

This tension inherent in place making leads to a more fundamental theoretical question at the heart of the structure-agency debate in the social sciences generally and the space-place debate in geography in particular: how best to conceptualise the relationship between structure and agency in general and in contemporary tourism-based place making in particular?

In this thesis, I explore and compare two different theoretical attempts to conceptualise this structure-agency relationship using two case studies of tourism place making in Queenstown and Glenorchy in the South Island of New Zealand. I explore both Lefebvre’s (1991a) *The Production of Space* and two spatial applications of Habermas’ critical theory (critical regionalism and communicative planning theory) in order to establish how they contribute to an understanding of the tension inherent in place making evidenced in the Queenstown and Glenorchy case studies. I conclude by suggesting that a synthesis of Lefebvrian understandings of power and material spatial practice with the normative, guiding stance drawn from critical theory may provide direction for the design of planning tools that support the development of critical versions of local place identity.
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SECTION ONE

1 CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

1.0 Introduction

Globalisation, combined with shifts in established patterns of production and consumption and resultant local economic restructuring, have led to changing uses of places. Major economic changes have transformed many rural and urban economies in the Western world in the 1970s and 80s. Some have become centres for consumption, focused on post-industrial futures through regeneration. Others have declined, with a consequent loss of population and essential services and infrastructure. Many have attempted to address the factors essential to attracting inward investment and migration, in order to break out of vicious cycles of decline associated with continuing population loss.

One of the outcomes of these changes has been an increasing competition between places all over the world for mobile capital, as decreasing transport costs and developments in communications technology have diminished the monopoly power of places, giving capital a much freer choice of location. As a result, competition between places (exacerbated by a degree of speculative place construction) has increased, and the selling of place, in order to capture mobile capital, has become an important tool in urban governance.\textsuperscript{1} The management of places, consequently, has often taken on what Harvey (1989b, 7) calls a ‘new entrepreneurialism’, characterised by public-private partnership, civic boosterism and an emphasis on place promotion as a form of place management (see Ashworth and Goodall 1990; Ashworth and Voogd 1990; Barke and Harrop 1994; Bell 1996; Bell and Lyall 1995; Bramwell and Rawding 1996; Burgess and Wood 1988; Cloke and Perkins 1998b; Cohen 1995; Fountain and Thorns 1998; Gold 1994; Gold and Gold 1994; 1995; Gold and Ward 1994; Goss 1993; Hall and McArthur 1993; Heaton 1996; Holcomb 1993; 1994;

\textsuperscript{1} This argument does, of course, not only apply to urban places, but to all manner of places. However, most of the literature in this area refers to urban governance only. There is clearly a need to extend this.
Tourism is perhaps the foremost example of an industry which employs such place promotional strategies, and many communities in New Zealand, as elsewhere in the world, look towards tourism as an alternative form of economic development (Butler, Hall and Jenkins 1998; Hall and Jenkins 1998; World Tourism Organisation (WTO) 1998). Spatial differentiation, through the construction and promotion of particular place identities, becomes the bread and butter for such communities, as they attempt to slot their places-as-destinations into an eclectic international menu of representations of places on offer for tourist consumption. The case of Queenstown, New Zealand, serves to illustrate this.

1.1 Queenstown, New Zealand

Figure 1.1: Queenstown, New Zealand
(McLeod and Ross 1999, 15)

With just over one million visitors per year, more than half of whom are international tourists, Queenstown, a year round tourist resort in the Southern Lakes region of New Zealand’s South Island, is often called the “Adventure Capital of the World”. Queenstown is renowned for its breathtaking scenery, but is perhaps most famous for its association with bungy jumping and other adventure tourism activities.
Many Queenstown tourists participate in thrilling, and physically challenging, activities in scenic places. Many more others come to watch such activities. This leads to the production and consumption of particular imagined geographies for the region. The resort is promoted as a thrillseekers’ domain, with many opportunities for exciting, adventurous activities in scenic settings. This leads to the consumption and production of new geographies, as Queenstown has had to accommodate rapid changes both to its physical infrastructure and its representations, “building up an image of the place through the events and activities it attracts and repels” (Shields 1991, 6; Cloke and Perkins 1998a).

Popular attractions include adventure activities such as jet boating, bungy jumping, white water rafting, skydiving, kayaking, parasailing, hang gliding and many others, all activities that draw thrillseekers to Queenstown. The built-in obsolescence of these thrills calls for a “frequent reproduction of experience (and therefore place) if the fresh and adventurous place-meanings are to be sustained” (Cloke and Perkins 1998a, 211). As Lefebvre (1991a, 390) argues, “the … evanescent³ space of images and signs does not … manage to attain consistency. It is a world that flees, a world with a perpetual, indeed a dizzying, need for rejuvenation” (Lefebvre 1991a, 390). In recent years, therefore, a bewildering number of new and ever more spectacular activities (e.g. white water sledging, canyoning, funyaking, river boarding, see Figure 1.3) have been added to the adventure tourism repertoire in Queenstown. In addition, stalwart adventure activities such as bungy jumping have been further spectacularised by, for example, including higher jumps, or going further into remote, scenic or
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2 Source titles for figures and quotes in italics (sometimes with, but mostly without dates) refer to postcards or brochure material and are listed separately at the end of the reference list.

3 transitory
The nature of this place promotion has led to a particular type of promoted place identity associated with Queenstown, and this has shaped the demand by international tourists for certain features of the resort’s land- and townscapes. Such demand not only imbues Queenstown’s land- and townscapes with certain symbolic meanings, but there are also resultant management modifications, including physical changes to places. In Queenstown, there are strong concerns that such modifications may kill the very goose that lays the golden eggs. The resort depends almost entirely on tourism for its business, and its impressive natural landscapes, in combination with adventure tourism activities in scenic settings, are its main attraction. It is feared that the growth of commercial adventure tourism developments in scenic and remote settings, and unchecked residential and tourism development on the slopes of the surrounding mountains and in the rural hinterland as well as in Queenstown itself (Figure 1.4), may destroy the very landscape appeal that makes the resort attractive. It is this issue, more than anything else, that occupies local debate. As the New Zealand magazine *North & South* put it recently: “Basically, if the landscape wasn’t out of this world, who’d bother? You can ski and bungy[jump] more cheaply elsewhere” (Chamberlain 2001, 73).
1.1.1 The Queenstown Problem

There is growing discontent in certain sectors of the Queenstown community over the level and nature of tourism - and associated residential - development in Queenstown and its surrounding Wakatipu Basin. This has come to national attention recently, with a spat between then Queenstown Lakes District Council (QLDC) mayor Warren Cooper⁴ and actor Sam Neill (of Jurassic Park fame). The former was at the helm of what was seen to be a pro-development Council for a number of years, and the latter, between movie stints, is a local resident who owns a vineyard and other property in the Wakatipu Basin. The two men were engaged in a very public dispute over the level of development in the Wakatipu Basin which brought to national attention the level of concern⁵ that groups of locals have over the rate of landscape change introduced through residential subdivision and commercial adventure tourism development in what has been termed by the New Zealand Environment Court (“the Court”) the “outstanding natural landscapes” of the Wakatipu Basin (Figure 1.5).⁶

---

⁴ Warren Cooper was mayor of Queenstown for many years, including at the time of this research. He retired in 2001 and was replaced, in the New Zealand local government elections in October 2001, by Clive Geddes, then head of the Chamber of Commerce.

⁵ It is possible that this concern has led to the landslide victory of Council newcomer Clive Geddes in the recent local government elections. Clive Geddes’ campaign spoke to the concerns of many Wakatipu Basin residents regarding unchecked development.

⁶ In a November 2000 ruling, the New Zealand Environment Court (EC) categorised Wakatipu Basin landscapes into three categories: ONLs (outstanding natural landscapes), including the mountain tops and upper slopes of the mountains surrounding Lake Wakatipu and the Wakatipu Basin; VALs (visual
A scan of the local Queenstown newspaper, the Mountain Scene, shows further discontent with development in the Wakatipu Basin and in the resort itself (Figure 1.6). There is ongoing debate over the level and type of subdivision development allowable in the Basin. There are also concerns in some corners of the community about ever-increasing commercial adventure tourism developments in scenic landscapes, and about accommodation development in central Queenstown.

Ironically, just before this very public argument, in August 2000, the QLDC, in conjunction with Destination Queenstown (DQ), the regional tourism organisation (RTO), won a New Zealand Tourism Award for its entry in the amenity landscapes), including hillsides and pastoral land; and the valley floors. Depending on the categorisation, different types of developments are permitted (EC 2000a).

7 New Countryside Battle: Mountain Scene, May 17 2001, 1; QLDC’s Spin Win: Mountain Scene, August 17 2000, 1; Growth Could Kill Us: Mountain Scene, July 6 2000, 1.
regional development category. In the Queenstown case, the award created controversy, with sectors of the local Queenstown community questioning the Council's commitment to sustainability, as emphasised in the winning entry, on several counts. In particular, it was pointed out by community groups that in September 1999, the New Zealand Environment Court, in a landmark case, criticised development in the Wakatipu Basin as inappropriate and damaging to its outstanding natural landscapes. In this same ruling, the Court recommended management under a plan, in order to avoid inconsistent decisions and cumulative deterioration of the sort that had already occurred.

There are further disagreements over the content of Queenstown's promotion. Branding the resort as the "adventure capital of the world", for example, as certain sectors of the business community do, is regarded by some residents as destructive to the nature of Queenstown as their place of residence. In addition, even sectors of the tourism community express concern at this label, as it effectively excludes other values that less 'adventurous' tourists may be attracted to. There is, then, disagreement over what is and what is not an appropriate label for the town and, moreover, who should determine this label.

There are concerns about the possible alienation of local residents in the face of strongly tourism-oriented promoted place identity. Some sections of the community argue that their place of home has become primarily a place for tourist consumption, with attendant losses of familiarity, amenity and valued features. These people call for a larger degree of input into place making in Queenstown for the permanent resident community. This is strongly resisted by some in the business community who feel that local residents do not have the necessary skills and knowledge. In addition, 'the community's' ability to determine place meanings in Queenstown is influenced by the large number of tourism stakeholders, as well as by the very diversity and transience of the community in question. Queenstown has a high percentage of transient workers and significant levels of in- and outmigration. There are clashes between the values of long term residents and those of relative...
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8 The New Zealand Tourism Awards are tourism industry awards, given out annually for excellence in a number of categories (e.g. best accommodation establishment, best attraction, best regional development effort).
newcomers, as well as between those who have moved to Queenstown to retire and those who have moved there for professional or commercial reasons. There are also strong interests in Queenstown’s development by Southland and Otago New Zealanders who own baches (holiday homes) in the resort, which they would like to maintain in typical New Zealand style, but which are on prime development land (Figure 1.7). Added to this is a level of outside control of promoted place identity, with RTOs and industry organisation (e.g. the International Tour Operators’ Council ITOC) playing a significant role in the determination of Queenstown place identity. Spatial identity in Queenstown, then, is contested, and tourism and related residential subdivision development are issues of concern to sectors of the Queenstown community.

In light of these problems, two questions arise: First, how is it possible for a tourism place such as Queenstown to maintain local uniqueness in the face of global pressures and accompanied by countless other places attempting to do the same? Second, and within the parameters of the first question (that is, assuming that remaining an internationally successful tourism destination is a goal), what ‘space’ is there in place promotional practice for the ability of communities, of people in regions/localities, to 'make' their own places?

Figure 1.7: Baches

1.2 The Local and the Global

The literature shows that such concerns over the meanings of places are exacerbated when certain meanings of place become excluded through the practices of public-private place promotion partnerships that are based on speculative place construction in the interests of attracting tourism. As outlined above, in Queenstown, such practices, managed by DQ, the RTO, in partnership with local tourism operators, have led to the
construction of adventure tourism meanings. These meanings inevitably displace other versions of local place identity, and this has important implications for the nature of place governance. As Harvey (1996a, 298) writes: "The upshot [of globalisation and associated competition between places] has been to render the coercive power of competition between places for capitalist development more rather than less emphatic and so provide less leeway for projects of place construction that lie outside of capitalist norms" (see also Harvey 1989b).

The exclusion of such alternative projects of place construction, or the determination of place identity by a local growth coalition (Logan and Molotch 1987; Molotch 1976), with all its attendant implications of speculative place construction diverting concern and resources away from other, broader urban governance issues (Harvey 1989b), has become increasingly problematic. At the level of place construction, there are concerns about the threat of homogenisation of destinations which then become unattractive to tourists. In Queenstown, such homogenisation is exemplified in the presence of global fast food chains (Figure 1.8) but also by the 'disneyfication' of local architectural styles (Figure 1.9).

**Figure 1.8: Fast Food Globalisation**

All manner of marketing strategies attempt to get away from this by emphasising the need to brand a globally recognisable, yet locally unique, destination. Difference and uniqueness have become increasingly important in a political and economic context of increasing internationalisation of capital, globalisation and urban and rural restructuring and in the face of competition from other places. There is a greater need to emphasise the specificity of places in an attempt to differentiate regions and nations in search for competitive advantage.
A number of authors argue that globalisation and associated time-space compression have been instrumental in shaping this need for an increasing emphasis on place (Agnew 1989; Daniels 1992; Featherstone 1990; Harvey 1989a; 1993; 1996a; Massey 1993a; 1993b; 1995; Massey and Jess 1995; Rose 1995; Urry 1990). Harvey (1996a, 297-298), for example, argues that the maintenance of stable and secure meanings of places has become more important to residents as a result of changing relative locations of places within the global economy. A perceived threat of placelessness (Relph 1976), in the form of the loss of local specificity and increasing homogenisation, is thought to lead to a lack of meaning and authenticity at the level of place. Indeed the literature often argues that place promotional imagery is strikingly similar everywhere (e.g. Holcomb 1994; Pearce 1988) or that places are “created in the image of tourism” (Hughes 1992, 32), leading to a geography of imagination that selectively constructs landscapes, history and people but looks remarkably similar in many parts of the world.

The threat of such homogeneity is of particular concern to tourism policy makers and destination marketers, as tourism relies on differentiation of places by its very nature. A large body of literature is therefore concerned with analysing this practice of constructing identities for tourism places (Buck 1977; Crick 1989; Cloke and Perkins 1998a; 1998b; Dann 1996; Goss 1993; Hughes 1992; Selwyn 1996; Shields 1991). The lessons, from a destination marketing perspective, appear to be that, in order to combat homogenisation, tourism places need to differentiate themselves through promoting unique features and self-images that stand out in an increasingly competitive global tourism environment. As Urry (1990, 9) puts it:
Each centre of attraction involves complex processes of production in order that regular, meaningful and profitable tourist gazes can be generated and sustained. Such gazes cannot be left to chance. People have to learn how, when and where to 'gaze'. Clear markers have to be provided.

This is fraught with difficulty. First, it is difficult to find a 'niche' in an ever-increasing menu of tourism product on offer. What is unique, in a global tourism environment, is difficult to define in the context of fast-changing tourism demand characteristics. Second, there is growing concern about the increasing alienation of local people when their places of home become primarily places of tourism. The tourism literature recognises this, and there are calls for a more complete consideration of place in resource planning and for an inclusion of local residents' values in tourism place management (including place planning and promotion) (Brandenburg and Carroll 1995; Hall 1997; Massey 1993b; Meethan 1996; Milne, Grekin and Woodley 1998; Norton and Hannon 1997; Ringer 1998; Saarinen 1998).

At the level of governance, there is increasing evidence that the practices of urban entrepreneurialism through so-called public-private partnerships in place promotion have distributive consequences. Harvey (1989a, 12), for example, argues that there is evidence, for the United States at least, that such practices amount "to a subsidy for affluent consumers, corporations, and powerful command functions to stay in town at the expense of local collective consumption for the working class and poor".

The issues of local/global relationships and of tensions in place making, and concern with the ability of a local community to participate in place construction, lead to a more fundamental theoretical question, which lies at the heart of this thesis. That is, how best to conceptualise the relationship between structure and agency in contemporary tourism-based place making. How can agency assert its values in the face of powerful structural forces associated with tourism? How, for example, can the need for a globally recognisable yet locally unique place identity (as necessary in the international tourism marketing context) be reconciled with what local residents value about their places of home? In the next section, I turn from the Queenstown context to the contemporary theoretical landscape which informs our understanding.
1.3 Structure and Agency

Theoretical approaches appearing to be useful to questions of place making often centre on the concepts of structure and agency, and, in geography, on space and place. How can we maintain place and sense of place in the face of space/time relations? How can the local persist in the face of the global? And how can this be done without appearing to be reactionary, that is, how can we invoke what Doreen Massey (1993b, 66) calls a “progressive sense of place”.

The concepts of structure and agency, the former concerned with the basic organisational features of particular societies, and the latter with peoples’ capacities to act within this social context, have been at the centre of an important debate in social theory. This debate occurs across the whole field of the humanities and the social sciences (Chouinard 1997). Theorists either argue that social structure determines the actions and characteristics of individuals (structuralism or structural determinism), or, at the other end of the spectrum, perceive agency to be at the beginning of creation (voluntarism) (Abercrombie, Hill and Turner 1984).

The search for less rigid conceptions of structure and agency has encouraged the development of a middle position that conceptualises the structure-agency relationship in terms of a dialectical process “in which the meanings given by individuals to their world become institutionalized or turned into social structures, and the structures then become part of the meaning-systems employed by individuals (Abercrombie, Hill and Turner 1984, 17). The British sociologist Anthony Giddens (1984), in particular, has been identified with attempting to claim the ‘middle ground’ in the structure-agency debate. Giddens (1984, xxi) replaces the dualism between deterministic structure and voluntaristic agency so pervasive in social theory with his concept of duality. This duality, he argues, recognises that “structures enable behaviour, but [also that] behaviour can potentially influence and reconstitute structure” (Cloke, Philo and Sadler 1991, 98). While critics point out that Giddens’ notions of agency and structure may be too limited (see, for example, Thrift 1996, 54-5; Gregory 1989), structuration theory has attracted considerably attention across the social sciences.
Geography has been no exception to this. Indeed, structuration theory has received substantial attention in human geography, which has also long been concerned with structure and agency, albeit referenced in terms of the concepts of space and place. Human agency is a pivotal concept to humanistic geography, where place and sense of place, two of its key concepts, are centrally concerned with a voluntaristic view of the capacity of human agency and with the social construction of place, space and landscape. Structuralist approaches in geography, by contrast, have been expressed in terms of the deterministic influence of space and spatial structures. Such approaches set themselves apart from humanistic approaches by arguing - in various ways - that geographical explanation cannot be confined to subjectivist searches for meaning, but, rather, must look at underlying structural processes which generate conditions for human agency.

The search for a middle ground has led to a number of theoretical attempts to transcend dualistic understandings of the space/place relationship (e.g. Entrikin 1991; Giddens 1984; Gregory and Urry 1985; Giddens 1990; Harvey 1993; Lefebvre 1991a; Massey 1994; 1995; Soja 1996; Tuan 1977). Entrikin's (1991) concept of the 'betweenness of place', and Massey's (1995) idea of a 'progressive sense of place', for example, are attempts to replace space/place dualisms with dialectical understandings of space vis-à-vis the social.

Giddens' structuration theory, in particular, with its emphasis on reflexivity, recursiveness and regionalisation (consisting of the twin dimensions of time-space distanciation and time-space routinisation) has influenced the debate about the roles of structure and agency in critical human geography. It contributes two main aspects to geography's own structure-agency debate: First, the possibility of a recursive, rather than linear, relationship between structure and agency enables the space/place relationship to be understood in a dialectical fashion, as evolving and changing. Second, the embeddedness of structure and agency in specific places (what Giddens refers to as 'presences' or 'absences') encourages a focus on the multiplicity of ways in which struggles over place and space become manifest at the level of the locally specific. Attention, therefore, is not only focused on the dialectical nature of the structure-agency relationship, but also on the different spatial levels at which this takes place.
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Having outlined key features of the structure-agency debate, I will now turn to two theories that have focused on the dialectical nature of the structure-agency relationship. These are Lefebvre’s (1974) *Production de l’espace* and Jürgen Habermas’ (1984; 1987) theory of communicative action. Both theories have contributed to the structure-agency debate, and an examination of their key features in a case study context forms the heart of my thesis.

1.3.1 Lefebvre: Abstract Space and Lived Space

As I will explain in more detail in Chapter Two, Lefebvre (1991a) explains the dialectic between structure and agency (or space and place) in terms of material practices, which are created in lived space. Lived space is the space of experience, of everyday life, and is contrasted with abstract space, the space of structure. Abstract space, to Lefebvre (1991a, 49), colonises the lived space of everyday life through multiple spatial practices of bureaucratisation and commodification and through what he calls “representations of space” (e.g. discourses of urban and regional planning). To Lefebvre (1991a), lived space can establish a counter-movement to this, resisting this colonisation through critical material practices (Johnston, Gregory, Pratt and Watts 2000). Lived space, therefore, has the potential to “act as a material productive force” (Harvey 1989a, 219). Material practices lead to the establishment of contradictions of space, which Lefebvre (1991a, 353) describes as the “dialectical link”. His theory of space, therefore, is focused on the production of space and conceptualises the structure-agency relationship as complex processes of spatial production.

1.3.2 Habermas: The System and the Lifeworld

Jürgen Habermas, by contrast, conceptualises the structure-agency relationship in terms of communicative reason “ingrained in the use of language oriented to reaching understanding” (Habermas 1987, 397). The imposition of structure on agency, or the

---

9 Translated into the 1991 English version *The Production of Space* by Donald Nicholson-Smith.
10 Lefebvre (1991a) introduces what he calls the “spatial triad”, instrumental in the production of space, and consisting of a dialectical relationship between spatial practices, representations of space, and lived spaces. Representations of space focus on the dominant structural space in society, and lived space on the experiential space of the lifeworld. Spatial practices refer to physical and material flows that give
"colonisation of the lifeworld" by the system, in Habermassian terms, “can be recognized and restructured through a process of critical reflection” (Johnston et al. 2000, 129). To Habermas (1987, 143), the medium of language is instrumental in this, as the lifeworld is linguistically constituted (Habermas 1987, 241). Rather than materiality, therefore, communicative action becomes the medium of the dialectic.

Critical theory has been applied in at least two spatial disciplines, design and planning. In design, particularly architecture, critical regionalism has picked up the critical model in attempting to construct an ideal model for the maintenance of place identity in the context of commodifying influences. In planning, communicative planning theory attempts to set forth a number of criteria that should shape a discourse free from domination. Both are spatial applications of critical theory, and, in the place making context of this thesis, are the theories with which Lefebvre’s (1991a) production of space will be compared.¹¹

1.3.3 Drawing Parallels

On the face of it, both Lefebvrian (1991a) production of space and spatial applications of critical theory appear to address the issues in place making that were identified at the beginning of this chapter. Both the colonisation of everyday life through abstract space (Lefebvre) and the colonisation of the lifeworld by the system (Habermas) attempt to explain similar processes. Lefebvre makes the dialectical link in terms of the production of space and material spatial practices. Habermas, by contrast, sees communicative rationality as the dialectical link, and both critical regionalism and communicative planning theory specify normative criteria for this dialectical link in terms of design and process. Both are concerned with the influence of structural systems on everyday life, and with the ability of agency to mediate this influence, thereby influencing structure, in a structurationist fashion.

¹¹ I use spatial applications of critical theory here, rather than critical theory itself, for two reasons. First, and as Dryzek (1995) has argued, there is a need for critical theory to become less alienated, to provide constructive critique and feasible, attainable alternatives. Second, the case study context is one of place making. I am concerned with the creation of and maintenance of place identity. This necessitates a focus on both context (design) and process (planning and community participation) - critical regionalism and communicative planning theory are well placed to contribute to this.
Both writers differ, however, in the extent to which they see remedies for this situation: Habermas sees a role for critical theory in indicating how the conditions for social integration through communicative action have been negatively affected by the colonisation of the lifeworld (Brand 1990). His theory and its spatial applications are therefore normative ones, aimed at emancipation and enlightenment. They counterpose ideals formulated in terms of communicative rationality, which extend into design criteria formulated in critical regionalism and process criteria central to communicative planning theory. The structure-agency dialectic, in this view, can be recognised and restructured through a process of critical reflection.

Lefebvre (1991a), by contrast, argues that abstract space has the power to impose itself on lived space through material spatial practices. Lived space, conversely, ought to be able to counter such impositions through material spatial practice of its own. The structure-agency dialectic in his theory, as I will explain in more detail in the next chapter, is conceptualised through a focus on the production of space.

1.4 Research Approach

This thesis is focused on an exploration and comparison of these two theories in the context of place making and the particular question regarding the creation and maintenance of unique place identity in the context of tourism and globalisation. My intention is to evaluate how both theories explain the dialectical nature of the structure-agency relationship, using the Queenstown and Glenorchy case studies as examples.

1.4.1 Research Objective

A central research objective guides my research:

To evaluate how different theories (Lefebvrian production of space and Habermassian critical theory in its spatial applications of critical regionalism and communicative planning theory) conceptualise the structure-agency relationship through two case studies of tourism place making in Queenstown and Glenorchy.
1.4.2 Research Strategy\(^{12}\)

As explained above, my research is concerned with an exploration and comparison of two different theoretical attempts to conceptualise the structure-agency relationship. To do this, I use two case studies of tourism place making in Queenstown and Glenorchy. A case study approach is the “preferred strategy when ‘how’ or ‘why’ (rather than ‘what’, ‘where’ or ‘how many’) questions are being posed, when the investigator has little control over events, and when the focus is on a contemporary phenomenon within some real-life context” (Yin 1994, 1). The place making context in Queenstown and Glenorchy requires such ‘how’ and ‘why’ questions and involves an examination of events over time, drawing on histories in place. A case study approach utilises these histories, but adds two further sources of evidence “not usually included in the historian’s repertoire: direct observation and systematic interviewing” (Yin 1994, 8).

Case studies are a particularly useful research approach in the context of research like mine that is primarily concerned with an examination of theories. This is because case studies allow a grounding of observations and concepts, and they benefit from the prior development of theoretical propositions (Yin 1994). Indeed, theory development is a crucial part of the design phase, regardless of whether the case study’s role is to develop or to test theory. In multiple case designs, research findings that emerge from this grounding are generalisable to theoretical propositions. This is called analytical generalisation,\(^{13}\) and the value of the case study as a research tool lies in the fact that it allows theoretical generalisation to emerge from an investigation of a social setting (Eyles 1988).

In the context of my research, two case studies are employed. Given the closely related nature of the two case studies, however, I do not claim to employ a multiple case research strategy, where replication establishes the right to generalise to theory. Theoretical generalisation, therefore, is not my intention. Instead, I employ a research

\(^{12}\) Full details of the research strategy, including detailed methods, are provided in Appendix One.

\(^{13}\) The idea of analytical generalisation builds on a previously developed theory, which is used as a template with which empirical results of a case study can be compared: “If two or more cases are shown to support the same theory, replication may be claimed” (Yin 1994, 31). By contrast to statistical generalisation (which is concerned with generalisation to a population), the case study research is concerned with generalising a particular set of results to some broader theory.
strategy that is appropriate for large, complicated case studies, where replication is not possible due to time and cost constraints. This is focused on achieving high levels of validity and reliability through several strategies: First, more than one case is investigated. A degree of external validity\(^{14}\) is therefore achieved in that the theoretical propositions at the heart of this thesis are tested in two case studies, albeit related ones. Second, construct validity is increased through reliance on multiple sources of evidence which encourage convergent lines of inquiry (for example, interview data confirms documentary evidence). Third, and most importantly, internal comparison is utilised. Rather than comparing case studies, different analytical cuts at the same case studies are taken, as illustrated in Figure 1.10.

**Figure 1.10: The Analytical Process**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theory 1</th>
<th>Theory 2</th>
<th>Theory 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
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<td><strong>Problem</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<td><strong>Case Analysis 1</strong></td>
<td><strong>Case Analysis 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>Case Analysis 3</strong></td>
</tr>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Conclusion</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An explanatory case study that employs this research strategy is that presented by Allison (1971) in *Essence of Decision: Explaining the Cuban Missile Crisis*. Allison (1971) uses a single case study (the confrontation between the United States and the Soviet Union over the placement of offensive missiles in Cuba) but posits three competing theories or models to explain the events that took place. He therefore takes three different “cuts” at his data, using different theoretical models. Castells (1983) uses a similar approach in *Grassroots and the City*. To Castells (1983, 339-340), the process begins with a research question followed by the construction of a provisional

\(^{14}\) As explained in the footnote immediately above, in case studies, external validity is concerned with analytical generalisation, rather than statistical generalisation.
theoretical framework which is utilised in empirical case study analysis. The outcome of such a process, more often than not, is the generation of further questions, which, to Castells (1983, 340) should lead to a different theoretical approach, followed by re-analysis in pursuit of, finally, some sort of integration of theory and analysis.

I developed such a model inductively, as my initial analysis opened up further lines of enquiry. Swaffield (1991, 15) describes this model of enquiry as iterative, where “both the theoretical framework and the empirical analysis evolve during the course of the study”. Such a model does not aim for analytical generalisation, or the building of theory from case study material, but it does allow theoretical conclusions to be drawn, if these conclusions are about the relationship between the different theoretical “cuts” at the data. The strength of this approach lies in the ability to investigate the critical relationship between theoretical perspectives, if these are “taken through” the same case studies. In the context of this thesis, it allows comparison of different theories’ comparative utility for explaining the problem of the case studies, as stated at the outset of this chapter.

1.5 Choice of Methods

In the context of a case study approach, I chose to adopt a qualitative research strategy, based on documentary sources and semi-structured interviews. My primary focus is on the nature of the place making context, particularly the ability of communities to retain locally determined values in the face of global pressures associated with tourism development. I therefore began my analysis with extensive documentary analysis of promotional material, of both a historical and a contemporary nature. This was followed by 109 semi-structured interviews. Following my initial case study analysis, I then broadened my research strategy to make extensive use of administrative documents and place promotional material at the regional and national level. Further details of my methods and sources are provided in Appendix One.

1.6 Thesis Organisation

In light of the particular analytical process outlined above, my thesis is organised in five broad sections: Section One is comprised of this introductory chapter and
Chapter Two, *The Structure-Agency Debate in Geography: Reconciling Space and Place*. This further examines the theoretical basis of the structure-agency debate, and introduces one attempt at reconciling structure and agency, that of Lefebvrian (1991a) production of space.

In Section Two, Chapters Three, *A Short History of Tourism Space*, Four, *The Spatial Practices of Land Use Planning*, and Five, *Lived Space: From Queenstown to Paradise*, contain the first analysis of case study data. Chapter Three examines the historical place-making context in Queenstown and Glenorchy. Chapter Four focuses on a contemporary conflict over spatial practices to do with tourism development exemplified by the *Queenstown Landscape Decision*. Chapter Five examines the nature of a community planning exercise in pursuit of community-controlled development in Glenorchy. Section Two concludes with an evaluation of Lefebvrian (1991a) production of space in the context of the case study analysis. This evaluation re-examines the questions posed in this chapter in light of the empirical findings.

In Section Three, Chapter Six, *Critical Theory and Critical Regionalism*, introduces the next theoretical attempt at conceptualising the structure-agency relationship, that of critical theory and particularly its spatial application in critical regionalism. Chapters Seven, *Iconic Queenstown*, and Eight, *Strategic and Institutional Context: Linking Destination Marketing and Destination Management*, contain the second analysis of case study data. Chapter Seven looks at the nature of place promotion in Queenstown, and Chapter Eight examines its strategic and institutional context. Section Three concludes with an evaluation of critical regionalism in view of the case study analysis and in the context of the questions posed at the outset.

In Section Four, Chapter Nine, *Communicative Planning*, introduces the last set of theoretical propositions with regard to the structure-agency relationship. Chapters Ten, *The Tourism Community*, and Eleven, *Transience and Attachments to Place*, examine the case study material in light of these propositions, and Section Four concludes with an evaluation thereof.

In Section Five, Chapter Twelve, I present the conclusions of my research. I summarise the outcomes of the three “cuts” at my data and discuss the potential for
integration between the different analyses in the case study. I also suggest some implications for theory development.

1.7 Conclusion

In this chapter, I introduced both the practical research question with which the case studies of tourism place making in Queenstown and Glenorchy are concerned, and the broader theoretical questions that underlie such practical questions. I outlined – in brief – both main theoretical directions that attempt to explain the structure-agency relationship, and I formulated a research question to guide analysis of case study material that will provide for the grounding and examination of those theories.

My research strategy, I suggested, is based on a case study approach, utilising qualitative methods. I present my findings in a narrative form, and this form closely follows the development of my thinking along the research path and the conclusions I have reached.
2 CHAPTER TWO: THE STRUCTURE-AGENCY DEBATE IN GEOGRAPHY: RECONCILING SPACE AND PLACE

2.0 Introduction

Attempts to explain the nature of the structure-agency relationship have taken a number of forms in the social sciences. In view of the case study of tourism place making used in this thesis, it is the geographical literature, in particular, that is relevant. In geography, structure-agency debates, especially those arising from humanistic geography and political economy, provide oppositional attempts to theorise this relationship between local uniqueness (and the role of human experience in its construction and maintenance) and global influences.

In this chapter, I review this debate, as it is relevant to the research objective of this thesis. The chapter has two main sections. I begin with a review of the concepts of space, place and sense of place, geography’s version of the structure-agency debate. Place and sense of place are pivotal concepts to humanistic geography, centrally concerned with a voluntaristic view of the capacity of human agency and with the social construction of place, space and landscape. Structuralist approaches in geography, by contrast, have been expressed in terms of the deterministic influence of space and spatial structures. Such approaches set themselves apart from humanistic approaches by arguing - in various ways - that geographical explanation cannot be confined to subjectivist searches for meaning, but, rather, must look at underlying structural processes which generate conditions for human agency.

In the second section of the chapter, I review attempts at reconciliations of the concepts of space and place, as they have emerged in the geographical literature, with particular reference to Lefebvre’s *The Production of Space*, which is of course the first of the theoretical attempts to explain the structure-agency relationship that are the focus of this thesis.
2.1 Structure and Agency in Geography

As I stated in Chapter 1, structure and agency are central concepts in the humanities and social sciences (Chouinard 1997). Geographers have, of course, also been grappling with these concepts, often referenced in terms of space and place. Johnston et al. (2000, 767-772) distinguish between three distinct geographical treatments of space. First, there is the Cartesian conceptualisation of space as absolute, or universal (e.g. Hartshorne 1939). Space, in this view, is geography's basic organising concept, providing the 'container' for objects and events, and possessing distinctive properties. Second, a relative view of space includes the notion of spatial relations between objects and events, and introduces the possibility of change to spatial structures. The spatial sciences era in geography drew on such a view of space, and, at its extremes, attempted to disclose an intrinsic spatial world order, amidst accusations of spatial fetishism and of neglect of the role of social practices in spatial relations. Third, a relational concept of space attempts to take account of social practices by conceptualising the social as spatial and the spatial as social, each requiring the other (Gregory and Urry 1985; Johnston et al. 2000).

2.1.1 Space and Place

The concept of place has also received considerable attention in geography, and it is not my intention to detail this debate here. Suffice to say that, contra space, place has often been conceptualised as the location of specificity, uniqueness and meaning, often neglecting broader political, cultural and economic influences. More recently, however, this focus has changed to one attempting to better contextualise the way in which place relates to space and vice versa.

Structural interpretations of the structure-agency (or space-place) relationship frequently rely on Marxian thought which emerged as a critique of the then established and prominent spatial science approach with its positivist assumptions. Marxism is often thought of as a variant of structuralism, concerned with infrastructural processes (e.g. economic processes) and their relation to the

---

15 Marxism is, of course, a varied and highly differentiated theoretical field. For a summary of its main traditions in geography see Johnston et al. (2000, 485-492) and Johnston (1997).
superstructure (Johnston 1997, 216-217). The major contribution to early Marxist perspectives on structure and agency was made by David Harvey (1973) in his *Social Justice and the City*, where he charts his own transition from liberalism to Marxism. Using Marxist analysis, Harvey (1973) makes the link between urban geography and the social and economic system and argues that urban geographies can be understood as resulting from class struggle. Many early Marxist perspectives were similarly occupied with class relations and power structures, sometimes bordering on structural determinism at the expense of human agency.

The 1980s saw the development of more sophisticated Marxist conceptions of the role of human agency in social change. These include efforts to “steer a ‘middle course’” between radical, descriptive humanism and structural determinism (Chouinard 1997, 4). Despite these efforts, however, dissatisfaction with Marxist theorisation of the structure-agency relationship emerged in the form of the humanistic critique of the idea of structural logic determining human action (Duncan and Ley 1982).

A central and active role for human agency is pivotal in the humanistic approach, as is a concern with particularity and specificity, often exemplified by close interest in discovering or re-discovering meaning embedded in places through ethnography or empirical studies derived from ethnomethodology or symbolic interactionism (Johnston *et al.* 2000).

Humanistic geography is generally credited with the establishment of a debate about the relationship between people and places that has become known in the literature as ‘sense of place’. Drawing from the philosophical traditions of existentialism and phenomenology, particularly the work of Heidegger, humanistic geographers (e.g. Buttimer 1976; Buttimer and Seamon 1980; Entrikin 1991; Relph 1976; Tuan 1976; 1977; 1990) seek to distance themselves from positivist geography, in particular from the complete neglect of people in the spatial sciences approach to human geography, and from the partial treatment of people in behavioural geography (Cloke, Philo and Sadler 1991, p.67). This is achieved by an emphasis on the close association between

---

16 This excludes more deterministic structuralism where it incorporates notions of a deep structure.
people and places expressed in such notions as dwelling (Heidegger 1967) and rootedness (Buttimer and Seamon 1980; Relph 1976). These notions are concerned with the basic human capacity to achieve spiritual unity with the material world. Subsequent interpretations of this in the context of sense of place and place construction have extended into “a whole genre of ecologically sensitive writing about particular places ... [where] the evocation of the particular qualities of place becomes a means to explore an alternative aesthetic to that offered through the restless spatial flows of commodities and money” (Harvey 1996a, 303).

Humanistic geography has, not surprisingly, been subjected to criticism for its neglect of context and structure. The concept of sense of place, for example, is criticised as a free-floating phenomenon, in no way influenced either by historically specific power relationships that enable some to impose upon others their view of the natural and acceptable, or by social and economic constraints on action and thereby thought (Pred 1983, 50, see also Ley 1981). As Harvey (1996a, 301) asks: “What might the conditions of 'dwelling' be in a highly industrialized, modernist, and capitalist world”? In the humanistic approach, “broader socio-ecological processes occurring at scales that cannot be directly experienced ... are ... outside of phenomenological reach” (Harvey 1996a, 303). As Johnston (1991, 139) puts it, drawing on the well-known Marxian one-liner: “People make their histories and geographies, but not in contexts of their own choosing”. One such context, the context of tourism place making, is the focus of the case study in this thesis.

2.1.2 Space, Place and Sense of Place in Tourism

In the tourism literature, concern with particularities of places has influenced many central concepts, as tourism, by its very nature, involves relationships between people and places. These relationships, many authors argue, are always in danger of being characterised by alienation, inauthenticity and placelessness because of the high propensity for structural influences related to the nature of tourism. Relph’s (1976, 93) thoughts on the matter are a good example of this type of thinking. He writes:

The landscapes of tourism are typified by ... 'other-directed architecture' - that is, architecture which is deliberately directed towards outsiders, spectators, passers-by, and above all consumers. The total effect of such architecture is the creation of other-directed places which suggest almost nothing of the people living and
working in them, but declare themselves unequivocally to be 'Vacationland' or 'Consumerland'.

The perspective espoused by Relph has been a common one in socio-geographical treatments of tourism. Analyses of authenticity and commodification (e.g. Boissevain 1996; Cohen 1988; 1989; 1995; Goodwin 1993; MacCannell 1973; Pearce and Moscardo 1986; Relph 1976, Wickens 1994), in particular, have emphasised the alienation incurred through place consumption practices associated with tourism. Concerns centre on the commodification of place through place marketing and image making. This is thought to lead to a loss of authentic identity and a resultant placelessness, a kind of ‘everywhere and anywhere’ place identity. To Relph (1976, 93), tourism homogenises places and thereby destroys the very landscapes that often initiated its practice through “disneyfication”, “museumisation” and “futurisation”. Tourism, Relph continues, involves an unauthentic attitude to place because “individual and authentic judgement about places is nearly always subsumed to expert or socially accepted opinion, or the acts and means of tourism become more important than the places visited” (Relph 1976, 83). This unauthentic attitude to place is then transmitted through the media. This, in turn, encourages placelessness. Combined with developments in transportation that free communities from geographical constraints, this can result in a “weakening of the identity of places to the point where they not only look alike but feel alike and offer the same bland possibilities for experience” (Relph 1976, 90), as well as “a reduced significance of place-based communities” (Relph 1976, 92). The supposed consequence of all this is that it is more difficult to maintain a degree of agency in the form of a deeply felt sense of place. To remedy this, Relph (1976) calls for an approach to place that takes into account the attachments that people have to places and that appreciates dwelling.

A similar call for more recognition of the genius loci17 is made by Norberg-Schulz (1996, 418) who advocates a treatment that “deals with places in terms of their importance to the people who use them” (Hough 1990, 178). A turn to the vernacular, to Hough (1990, 18), is a possible solution, as “the vernacular contains a greater sense of place than the veneers of wealth and power that have long been the subject of

17 Spirit of place.
history books and holiday tours". Calling for an “experiment in socially based
design”, Hough (1990, 178) argues that an emphasis on the vernacular can provide
“one mechanism for how communities, faced with the rapid and disruptive change
that tourism brings, can maintain their valued social structure and places while
enjoying its economic benefits”. Central to this is “change through community
action, where people who have made a place special continue to be instrumental in its
development rather than falling victim to change that only benefits others” (Hough
1990, 178).

Massey (1993b, 64) argues that such versions of place are in danger of appearing
reactionary. To her, the question is “how to hold on to that notion of spatial
difference, of uniqueness, even of rootedness ... without it being reactionary”. An
“introverted, inward-looking history based on delving into the past for internalized
origins”, Massey (1993b, 64) argues, is unprogressive and misleading. What is
needed, instead, is “a sense of place which is extra-verted, which includes a
consciousness of its links with the wider world, which integrates in a positive way the
global and the local” (Massey 1993b, 66). The structure-agency debate in recent
years has attempted to achieve just such a sense of place through a reconciliation of
space and place.

In the remainder of this chapter, I consider some of these efforts. In particular, I
review Lefebvre’s (1991a) attempt to conceptualise the structure-agency relationship
in terms of a spatial triad in order to evaluate its potential usefulness for analysing the
dynamics of the tourism-place relationship in the case studies of Queenstown and
Glenorchy.

2.3 Reconciling Space and Place

A recent, broad trend in geography has called into question the ways in which space
has been conceptualised. Such questions have focused on three sets of existing
dualisms, those of time and space, of absolute space and relative space, and of
material and imagined space. The first, the dualism of space and time, which
historically privileged time over space, has recently been rewritten in terms of space-
time (e.g. Massey 1993a; 1995). This acknowledges the concurrent and interactive
production of space and time. The second, the dualism of absolute space and relative space, is based on contrasting spatial stability (absolute space) with spatial fluidity (relative space). This has been transcended by attempts to think of space in more relational, or even "happenstance" or accidental terms (Massey 1999). The third, the dualism between material and imagined space, has been abandoned by some geographers in favour of real space (Rose 1996), simultaneously real and imagined, concrete and symbolic (Johnston et al. 2000, 771-772). Attempts to overcome a further dualism, that between space and place, have focused on the dialectical nature of the space-place relationship and have led to many more theoretical attempts to transcend dualistic understandings of the space-place relationship (e.g. Entrikin 1991; Gregory and Urry 1985; Harvey 1989a; 1996; Giddens 1990; Lefebvre 1991a; Massey 1994; 1995; Soja 1996; Tuan 1977). As explained in Chapter One, both Entrikin’s (1991) concept of the “betweenness of place” and Massey’s (1995) idea of a “progressive sense of place” are such attempts to replace space-place dualisms with dialectical understandings of space vis-à-vis the social. Another attempt to reconcile universal and particular versions of place is put forward by Harvey (1996, 313) who, contrasting Heidegger and Marx, argues that neither Heidegger’s narrow experiential world nor Marxism’s lack of consideration of particularities of places are adequate to providing an understanding of place realities: “What goes on in a place”, Harvey (1996, 316) writes, “cannot be understood outside of the space relations which support that place any more than the space relations can be understood independently of what goes on in particular places”. Places, therefore, are both “material ecological artefacts and intricate networks of social relations” (Harvey 1996, 316).

2.3.1 The Production of Space

A theory that has received limited attention in the English-speaking world but that includes a powerful focus on the dialectical nature of the structure-agency relationship is Henri Lefebvre’s (1974) *Production de l’espace*, translated for the English-

---

18 Dialectics is based on the resolution of binary opposition and is closely associated with Hegelian and Marxian thought. It emphasises processes, flows and relations, makes the formation and duration of systems a problem for analysis, rather than the point of departure (thus introducing the possibility of change), and implicates space and time in the production of space and time (Johnston et al. 2000, 172). Lefebvre (1991a, 353) speaks of the “contradiction within a unity” as the dialectical link. His emphasis, following Hegel’s dialectical logic with its “synthesis of thought and being” is on “the resolution of contradictions through practice” (Allen and Pryke 1994, 454, footnote 3).
speaking world into *The Production of Space* in 1991. Lefebvre (1991a) was one of the first writers "theorizing difference and otherness in explicitly spatial terms" (Soja 1996, 34). A concern with complex processes of spatial production is a central component of this seminal work, which uses Karl Marx’s (1957) concept of commodity fetishism to develop a dialectical understanding of space. Central to Lefebvre’s (1991a, 26) search for a science of space is his proposition that social space is a social product, partly constituted by, and partly constitutive of, social and political structures:

The space thus produced also serves as a tool of thought and of action; ... in addition to being a means of production it is also a means of control, and hence of domination, of power; yet ... as such it escapes in part from those who would make use of it.

A focus on the production of space allows for a conceptualisation that regards space as emergent, rather than given or pre-existing. Lefebvre (1991a, 39) conceptualises the production of space as a continual dialectic of what he calls the triad of the perceived space of material spatial practice (e.g. land uses and built environments), conceived representations of space (e.g. architectural and planning discourses that facilitate communication about and understanding of perceived space), and lived representational spaces (the spaces of everyday life). He contrasts this with

---

19 The booksleeve to the English translation (1991a) of Lefebvre’s (1974) work *Production de l’espace* describes his work as spanning some sixty years and including “a diverse range of subjects, from dialectical materialism to architecture, urbanism and the experience of everyday life”. It is not my intention here to place *The Production of Space* into the context of Lefebvre’s philosophical development, but to utilise an understanding of Lefebvre’s spatial dialectics for the analysis of tourism space. It is necessary to acknowledge, though, that much of his work in *The Production of Space* is based on thought he develops in his earlier works (e.g. the notion of spatial practices is closely linked to his concern with everyday life, the body and routine, see Lefebvre’s (1991b) *Critique of Everyday Life*).

20 Practical alienation under capitalism (see Lefebvre 1991a, 83).

21 Lefebvre’s (1991) terminology is somewhat cumbersome in the English translation. He refers to the three parts of the triad with two sets of terminology: Perceived space is also called spatial practice, conceived space is referred to as representations of space, and lived space he also calls representational spaces (sometimes also called spaces of representation by other authors in an attempt to clarify these terms (see Soja 1996, 10), Gregory (1994, 403) and Johnston et al (2000, 646-647)). The issue is further complicated by the various ways that other authors, writing about Lefebvre’s ideas, have picked up the terms. Harvey (1989a), for example, refers to experienced (spatial practice), perceived (representations of space) and imagined space (lived space). Soja (1996) refers to Firstspace (spatial practice), Secondspace (representations of space) and Thirdspace (lived space). In an attempt to simplify the language, I use representations of space, spatial practices and lived space. Representations of space refer to imagined space at the level of a conceptual structure or framework. Spatial practices stand for real, material space and this implies becoming aware of something through
Cartesian-inspired concepts of social reality which draw on a dualistic view of polar opposites, therefore focusing on opposition and contrast (e.g. the global and the local, space and place, the universal and the particular, the structural and the experiential) and which have characterised many geographical treatments of space and place. Lefebvre (1991a) assumes a relational ontology instead and argues that his spatial triad is instrumental in the production of space.

A central argument in *The Production of Space* is that capitalism is characterised by particular representations of space and associated spatial practices, what Lefebvre (1991a, 49) calls “abstract space”. This is one of four main types of space that Lefebvre (1991a) describes. First, there is absolute space, which is natural space, untouched, original, until it becomes colonised and historical. Then there is abstract space, essentially the space of accumulation, which produces fetishism because of its separation of production and reproduction processes. It is described thus: “This space is a lethal one which destroys the historical conditions that gave rise to it, its own (internal) differences, and any such differences that show signs of developing, in order to impose an abstract homogeneity” (Lefebvre 1991a, 370). The third space in Lefebvre’s (1991a) distinction is contradictory space which exists because abstract space causes ruptures between the old and the new, causes the old to disintegrate and the new to take over in response to contradictions inherent in abstract space.

To illustrate Lefebvre’s (1991a) somewhat abstract terminology, Allen and Pryke (1994) give the example of cleaners in London’s financial space who manipulate the dominant coding of space (the abstract space of finance and global capitalism which seeks to dominate spatial meanings) through changing parts of that space into lived spaces (e.g. ‘decorating’ cleaning storage rooms into areas of personal expressions), thereby introducing a contradiction (albeit one largely invisible to the other users of such space, the financial market traders).22
Last, there is differential space, or “the consequent mosaic of different places” (Dear 1997, 51) which eventually arises out of such contradictions of space.

To Lefebvre (1991a), abstract space, the space of capitalism, colonises lived space through effecting particular spatial practices (e.g. particular land uses, built environments) and particular representations of spaces (e.g. particular spatial discourses expressed in planning, spatial hierarchies expressed in maps, or place promotional imagery). What this means in practice is that the real, material space (spatial practice in the form of particular land uses, zoning and the designation of private property in land) and the imagined space (representations of space in the form of spatial discourses inherent in architecture, planning, or place promotion) associated with capitalism influence the lived spaces of everyday life. Lived spaces can therefore become dominated through the imposition of physical barriers, through repression and exclusion and through appropriation of space at both the level of the material and the imaginary. For example, imagery might designate a place as a place for something (as in Queenstown the adventure tourism destination), while physical changes associated with this (i.e. adventure tourism attraction development) impose restrictions on the use of space through excluding other practices in these spaces. As Allen and Pryke (1994, 454) put it, “the very way in which spaces are imagined represents a means of living in those spaces”.

The production of space does not end there, of course. Lived space, conversely, also effects changes in both spatial practices and representations of space through challenging dominant spatialities. Lived space originates in history and is interpretive – interpretive of both representations of space and spatial practices. Through asserting the “private realm ... against the public one” (Lefebvre 1991a, 362), it should be able to contribute to the production of contradictory space, which, to Lefebvre (1991a, 353), is the “dialectical link”.23

23 How this might actually happen, in other words, how lived space practically reasserts itself, is one of the less developed parts of Lefebvre’s (1991a) theory. I will pick up on this in more detail in Sections Two and Five.
Thinking of space in this way has a number of implications: If space is conceptualised as a product, then every society produces its own space, within its own constraints and within its own historical context. Thus,

a social space cannot be adequately accounted for either by nature (climate, site) or by its previous history. Nor does the growth of the forces of production give rise in any direct causal fashion to a particular space or a particular time. Mediations, and mediators, have to be taken into consideration: the action of groups, factors within knowledge, within ideology, or within the domain of representation (Lefebvre 1991a, 77).

Further, the ability to reflect on - or know of - space as a product means that we are able to influence the process of production (Lefebvre 1991a, 36-37, emphasis in original):24 “The ‘object’ of interest”, therefore, “must be expected to shift from things in space to the actual production of space”.

Lefebvrian dialectics have influenced a number of authors who have been concerned with the centrality of space in social theory, among them (but not exclusive to) Gregory (1994), Harvey (1989a), Merrifield (1993), and Soja (1989; 1996).

To Merrifield (1993, 527), Lefebvrian dialectics enables geography to view space and place as “different aspects of a unity - that is, two facets of a dialectical process just as the wave and particle aspect of matter is assumed in quantum physics”.25

The production of space is thus the process as well as the outcome of the process (i.e. the produced social space); it is the totality of the ‘flow’ ‘thing’ qualities of capitalist material geographical landscape (Merrifield 1993, 521, emphasis in original).

Such a concept of space, to Merrifield (1993, 522), can overcome difficulties in reconciling lived experience in particular locations with universalising, globalising spatialities.

Edward Soja (1989; 1996), whose work has included numerous interpretations of Lefebvrian spatial dialectics, somewhat complicates the already complex terminology

---

24 See also Lefebvre (1968; 1973).
25 This refers to quantum theory’s understanding of the dual nature of matter and light which can simultaneously be understood as particle (thing) and as wave (process) (Kojeve 1980).
by calling for a trialectics of spatiality, which reformulates Lefebvre’s (1991a) triad as F

Firstspace, Secondspace and Thirdspace. Soja’s (1996, 60-61, emphasis in original) concepts of Thirdspace and “thirling” draw on Lefebvre’s (1991a) lived space and attempt – somewhat unsuccessfully - to clarify the dialectical link through describing a third possibility or ‘moment’ that partakes of the original pairing [of subject-object, local-global, or agency-structure] but is not just a simple combination or an ‘in between’ [à la Entrikin (1991)] position along some all-inclusive continuum .... It does not derive simply from an additive combination of its binary antecedents but rather from a disordering, deconstruction, and tentative reconstitution of their presumed totalization producing an open alternative that is both similar and strikingly different (Soja 1996, 60-61).

While Soja’s (1996) account of Lefebvrian dialectics tends to further complicate rather than explain an already complex theory, Harvey (1989a, 219-222), by contrast, captures some of the theory’s complexity in a grid of spatial practices which uses examples for Lefebvre’s (1991a) three dimensions of space across four types of spatial practice (Table 2.1). These types of spatial practice are:

- accessibility and distanciation, which refer to the role of distance in human affairs (e.g. its role as both barrier to and defence against social interaction);
- appropriation and use of space, which refer to the occupation of space by objects (houses, streets), activities (land uses), individuals, classes or other social groupings (including systematised and institutionalised appropriation);
- domination and control of space, which refer to the control of space through organisation and production by individuals or powerful groups; and
- production of space, which refers to the production of new systems of land use, transport, communications and territorial organisation along with new modes of representation (e.g. Geographic Information Systems).

Interpreted thus, the dialectical interplay between representations of space, spatial practices and lived space across the four categories, ranging from distanciation over appropriation and domination to production of space (all of which overlap), serves as a framework with which to interpret social relations of class, gender, community and race. This is necessary, Harvey (1989a, 222-223) argues, because the grid can tell us nothing important by itself. To suppose so would be to accept the idea that there is some universal spatial language independent of social practices.

The meaning of the expression ‘spatial practices’ in Harvey’s (1989a) sense is not the same as that of Lefebvre’s (1991a) spatial practices. As explained in Footnote 21 above, Harvey uses experienced, perceived and imagined space rather than Lefebvre’s (1991a) original terminology. Spatial practices, therefore, has a more literal meaning, rather than one related to Lefebvre’s (1991a) triad.
Spatial practices derive their efficacy in social life only through the structure of social relations within which they come into play.

Table 2.1: A Grid of Spatial Practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived Space (Spatial Practices)</th>
<th>Accessibility and distanciation</th>
<th>Appropriation and use of space</th>
<th>Domination and control of space</th>
<th>Production of space</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>flows of goods, money, people, labour power, information, etc.; transport and communications systems; market and urban hierarchies; agglomeration</td>
<td>land uses and built environments; social spaces and other 'turf' designations; social networks of communication and mutual aid</td>
<td>private property in land; state and administrative divisions of space; exclusive communities and neighbourhoods; exclusionary zoning and other forms of social control (policing and surveillance)</td>
<td>production of physical infrastructures (transport and communications; built environments; land clearance, etc.); territorial organization of social infrastructures (formal and informal)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Conceived Space (Representations of Space) | social, psychological and physical measure of distance; map-making; theories of the 'friction of distance' | personal space; mental maps of occupied space; spatial hierarchies; symbolic representation of spaces; spatial 'discourses' familiarity; hearth and home; open places; places of popular spectacle (streets, squares, markets); iconography and graffiti; advertising | forbidden spaces; 'territorial imperatives'; community; regional culture; nationalism; geopolitics; hierarchies | new systems of mapping, visual representation; new artistic and architectural 'discourses'; semiotics |

| Lived Space | attraction/repulsion; distance/desire; access/denial; transcendence 'medium is the message' | unfamiliarity; spaces of fear; property and possession; monumentality and constructed spaces of ritual; symbolic barriers and symbolic capital; construction of 'tradition; spaces of repression | utopian plans; imaginary landscapes; science fiction ontologies and space; artists' sketches; mythologies of space and place' poetics of space; spaces of desire |

Source: Adapted from Harvey (1989a, 220-221).

Under capitalism, Harvey (1989a, 223) continues, such spatial practices “become imbued with class meanings” (e.g. private ownership of the means of production). These class meanings are inscribed in space, and thus spatial practices are never neutral, always express class or social content and are often the focus of social struggle (Harvey 1989a).
A few authors have attempted to operationalise Lefebvrian dialectics in empirical research (Allen and Pryke 1994; Cartier 1997; Chivallon 2001; Fyfe 1996; Goss 1993; Huxley 1997; Kirsch 1995; Liggett 1995; Shields 1991; 1999; Soja 1996 and Zukin 1991). Shields’ (1991) book *Places on the Margin* introduces the concept of social spatialisation into the place-making debate. Shields shows how imaginary geographies created through tourism advertising have identifiable impacts on “social discourses on space which (1) underpin the rhetoric of ideologues and politicians and (2) pervade and subvert even the rationalistic discourse of planning and regional development policy” (Shields 1991, 6). The labelling of places as *places for something* thus finds its way into the wider discourses of local and regional development. In Lefebvrian (1991a) terms, certain representations of space encourage or discourage spatial practices, thereby rendering places appropriate for certain types of activities at the cost of others. As Shields (1991, 64-65, emphasis in original) puts it:

The administrative, guiding nature of spatialised discourse about the world is key to the transformation of purely discursive (i.e. ideational, symbolic, and linguistic) 'imaginary geographies' into everyday actions, gestures, crowd practice, regional identities, the 'imaginary community' ... of the territorial nation-state, and geopolitics. Thus, an overarching order of space, or social spatialisation, is reproduced in concrete forms as a practice upon the world.

This process is recursive as “it restates as well as reproduces 'discourses of space' which constitute it” (Shields 1991, 64-65).

Allen and Pryke (1994) use Lefebvre’s (1991a) notion of abstract space and apply it to the space of finance in London. They show how “a particular dominant coding of space has been achieved through the routine spatial practices and global networks of those who work in London’s financial markets” (Allan and Pryke 1994, 453). Different service communities of the financial sector, in particular those who clean it, cater for it and secure it, disappear within these spaces. Allen and Pryke (1994, 453) therefore show how “the modes of power and the different sets of relationships through which a dominant financial space is secured” influence the degree to which these contract workers who clean, cater for and secure the finance space in question are able to “subvert or contradict the dominant coding of finance”.
Kirsch (1995, 549) analyses the role of technology in the transformation of space and argues that the "accumulation of technical means in society has been reflected in the production of space through the increasing domination of conceived space over lived space". The role of technology in modes of production has increased, leaving a larger role for globalising technologies in the production of space.

Huxley (1997, 16-17) draws on Lefebvre and Focault to examine land use planning discourses in the UK, Australia and New Zealand and argues that Lefebvrian abstract space is a central concept in critiques of the role of planning and land use regulation: "The creation of abstract space – through maps and grids; through privileging the optic experience of writing and the gaze; and through the imposition of masculinist power – has as its aim the creation of homogeneity". Huxley (1997, 8-9) identifies the New Zealand Resource Management Act (RMA) as a progressive planning instrument that has "moved the furthest away from traditional planning regulations", although she points out that this is more so "legislatively", rather than "in practice". Huxley fails, however, to use Lefebvrian (1991a) analysis to further investigate the reasons for this and to investigate the links of ‘legislation’ with representations of space and ‘practice’ with lived space.

Cartier (1997) and Chivallon (2001) are concerned with the building of identity and nationscape. Cartier (1997, 569) reviews Lefebvrian (1991a) dialectics and, with Merrifield (1993, 524), argues that Lefebvre (1991a) is "tantalisingly vague on the precise fashion in which the conceived-lived-perceived triad interrelate". Cartier (1997) goes on to favour a social constructionist approach to the examination of the formation of place-based identity related to a Chinese burial ground in Malaysia. The utility of Lefebvrian theorisation, she argues, lies in its ability to work out "the empirical manifestations of complex cultural, economic, and political spatialities, in the creation of place and the inscription of meaning in the human landscape" (Cartier 1997, 580). Chivallon (2001) examines religion as a space for the expression of Caribbean identity in the UK and argues that the idea of space is necessary in the formulation of identities and that it plays a role in the relationship between power and resistances. The religious experience of the Caribbean diaspora, she argues, is characterised by a dialect between "physical forms aimed at the codification of racial categories within the British urban spaces and, on the other hand, representations or
counterrepresentations that form (through the imaginary) another space” (Chivallon 2001, 478).

Fyfe (1996, 387), lastly, uses Lefebvrian dialectics to examine the postwar modernisation of Glasgow through two postwar master plans and through the work of Glasgow poets which "vividly illustrates the effects of the colonisation of concrete space by the abstract spaces of the master plans". Lefebvrian theory, he argues, benefits from employment in concrete situations. Liggett (1995, 255) also points this out:

Lefebvre's categories are the most powerful when they are used as tools of analysis, not applied as mutually exclusive categories to be sought out and observed .... The three categories are a beginning from which to analyze space as an activity and to ask questions about the dialectical relations in terms of which space is formulated and functions.

2.4 Conclusion

As I stated in Chapter 1, it is my objective in this thesis to explore theoretical attempts to transcend the structure-agency (or space-place) dualism so pervasive in social theory. These attempts are focused on the dialectical nature of the structure-agency relationship. In this chapter, I traced the literature relevant to such an endeavour by reviewing both the debate surrounding the structure-agency relationship in geography, and theoretical attempts at reconciliations of space and place, structure and agency. It is clear that the central place given to human agency and the lifeworld associated with humanistic approaches to geography stands in contrast to emphases on production, accumulation and distribution of wealth at the level of the political and economic structure associated with structuralist approaches. What emerges is strong evidence that neither treatment, in isolation, does an understanding of either concept full justice. What is needed, instead, is a theoretical exploration of the concepts of space and place that connects both agency and structure, and there have been many attempts in the geographical literature to reconcile space and place.

Lefebvre’s (1991a) *The Production of Space* is one such attempt. Lefebvre's (1991a) theory, I argue, should enable analysis to transcend a focus on rootedness, dwelling and things in space to an understanding of space as productive process. It should
permit a focus on spatial contradictions as the expression of conflict between “socio-political interests and forces”, as “it is only in space that such conflicts come effectively into play, and in doing they become contradictions of space” (Lefebvre 1991a, 365, emphasis in original). In the following three chapters, I explore the utility of Lefebvre’s (1991a) theory in the context of the particular problems evidenced in the case study of tourism place making in Queenstown and Glenorchy.
SECTION ONE: CONCLUSION

Section One has provided the context for this thesis. In Chapter One, I introduced the broad research context, outlined the research questions and explained my methods. In Chapter Two, I reviewed the literature relevant to the structure-agency debate in geography. I introduced in detail one particular attempt at reconciling space and place, that of Lefebvrian (1991a) *Production of Space*, in preparation for Section Two, in which I examine this particular theory’s utility for conceptualising the structure-agency relationship in the case study context of tourism place making in Queenstown and Glenorchy.
3 CHAPTER THREE: A SHORT HISTORY OF TOURISM SPACE

3.0 Introduction

Alpine Splendour and High Style

For more than 200 years, people have followed their dreams to the Southern Lakes region. The first to arrive were seeking their fortune - gold from the rivers and merino wool from the mountain pastures. Today, people come to be invigorated, excited and renewed - take to the water for cruising, rafting or jet boating, to the air for parapenting, bungy jumping or flightseeing, or keep feet on terra firma for walking, wine tasting or golfing. The grandeur of the scenery is complemented by an excellent selection of boutique hotels, country lodges, five-star resorts, and imaginative restaurants (Tourism New Zealand (TNZ) 2002b).27

The website for Tourism New Zealand, the organisation charged with the promotion of New Zealand as an international tourism destination, describes the Southern Lakes region’s history (of which Queenstown and Glenorchy are part) as one of transition from early goldrush days over agriculture to a more “exciting” present characterised by tourism. The region, in today’s tourism marketing terms, is characterised by hosting tourism activities and “delivering high excitement”. As part of this,

the awesome environment is used to great effect. Lakes Wakatipu and Te Anau are picturesque venues for kayaking, jet boating and sailing. The rivers deliver high excitement in the form of white water rafting, river surfing, canyoning and bungy jumping, while the historical goldmining townships of Central Otago lure you into horse riding, exploring the golden hills by mountain bike or taking a 4WD (four-wheel drive) safari (TNZ 2002b, my emphasis).

As explained in the previous chapter, one of Lefebvre’s (1991a) central arguments is that social space is emergent and intimately connected with social arrangements

27 Direct quotes without page numbers refer to websites and are referenced in the main reference list.
related to modes of production. Capitalism, he argues, not only colonises everyday life, but also its location – social space.

Current tourism representations, as the quote directly above shows, conceptualise Queenstown and Glenorchy places as “delivering high excitement” for tourists in the Southern Lakes region. The spatial practices associated with this include adventure tourism activities such as jet boating, white water rafting, bungy jumping and many others. Tourism space, therefore, produces the places of the Wakatipu Basin in a particular way. Lefebvre (1991a) suggests that his conceptual triad of representations of space, spatial practices and lived space provides a useful tool with which to map this production of space and with it the dialectical struggle inscribed in the history of space. In historical perspective, tourism has always been an important focus in the region, but the spatiality of this focus differs in the settlements of Glenorchy and Queenstown.

In this chapter, I begin an exploration of Lefebvre’s (1991a) focus on space as productive process through a case study of the histories of space in Queenstown and Glenorchy in the Queenstown Lakes District in the South Island of New Zealand. I begin to ground Lefebvre’s (1991a) theoretical attempt to conceptualise the structure-agency relationship and by doing so, I place the current case study in its historical context through a brief outline of the histories of tourism in both Queenstown and Glenorchy.

3.1 The Last Frontier

Each epoch produces its owns space (Lefebvre 1991a, 31).

In many ways, Glenorchy and the Head of the Lake have had a very similar history, you know, mining, gold, farming, tourism. In many other ways, though, Glenorchy has always remained much less developed, much more of a frontier between nature and culture: the nature of the national parks and the culture of tourism and development that is Queenstown. To me, this town is still a frontier town, it’s what Queenstown used to be in many respects, but it has retained that last frontier quality (Glenorchy resident).28

28 Quotations from my respondents are identified as belonging to broad groups (e.g. residents, tourism operators), in order to maintain anonymity. In most instances, respondents are identified as residents.
Space, for Lefebvre (1991a), is actively produced through social relations on a day to day basis. This production involves an organising process and relations of power that have found expression in past and present spatial practices of landscape management and technology (e.g. transport routes, urban systems, physical infrastructure). Such material spatial practices are, of course, closely linked to the representations of space that govern them (e.g. urban plans, maps, architectural discourse) and to the materiality and imagination of lived space (e.g. the informal paths and networks of space that come into being through use in everyday life, but also the mythologies and poetry of space). In Glenorchy, the first of my two case studies of tourism place making in the Queenstown Lakes District, lived space is characterised by notions of space as frontier. This, I will show in later chapters, finds its way into symbolisms of space and materiality in space. The focus of this chapter is on investigating if and how this notion of space as frontier is based on histories of space and of the historical production of space.

Situated at the northern end of Lake Wakatipu (the “Head of the Lake”), Glenorchy, with a permanent population of 402 residents (Statistics New Zealand (SNZ) 2001) is bounded to the west by the Humboldt and to the east by the Richardson Ranges and sits in a river valley at the foot of Mount Earnslaw, where the glacier-fed Dart and Rees rivers meet Lake Wakatipu (Figures 3.1 and 3.2). The village’s only access road is a 45 km scenic road which connects the Head of the Lake with Queenstown, the neighbouring (and much larger) tourism resort.

Glenorchy, as a neighbouring town and the gateway to Mt. Aspiring National Park and a number of important New Zealand walking tracks (e.g. the Rees, Dart, Routeburn and Greenstone tracks), receives a small proportion of the more than 1 million international and domestic visitors who visit the Queenstown Lakes District annually. Many of its residents harbour concerns that current and potential rapid (e.g. Queenstown resident, Glenorchy resident), even though they may be both residents and tourism operators. This is because, given the size of the settlements (particularly Glenorchy), to be any more specific would reveal identities of individual respondents. In some cases, and where this does not affect anonymity, I have identified respondents as belonging to the business community or as operating a tourism business, because this identification helps put their statements into context.

29 No specific tourist arrival data is available for Glenorchy.
change may irreversibly alter the essence of Glenorchy (Blakely Wallace Associates (BWA) 2001).

**Figure 3.1: The Head of the Lake**  
(New Zealand)

![Image of the Head of the Lake](image)

**Figure 3.2: Map of the Queenstown Lakes District**  
(McLeod and Ross 1999, 8)

![Map of the Queenstown Lakes District](image)

To many of its residents, the Glenorchy and wider Head of the Lake area represent a kind of last frontier between culture and nature and between the developed nature of the Queenstown settlement and the wilderness of the National Park: “Land in front of you, development behind you”, as one of Glenorchy’s residents expresses this. The township is described by many of its residents as a last frontier township, a type of place of which there are not many left in the developed world. Lived space,
in Glenorchy, is characterised by expressions\(^\text{30}\) of a particular way of life, associated with a sense of adventure, of being able to confidently deal with nature’s challenges and overriding forces (as evidenced frequently by flooding which often causes the only road to Glenorchy to be cut off), of living close to and with nature and wilderness. It is also associated with more freedom to do one’s own thing, with a love of the outdoors, with being dominated and humbled by the natural environment and with a pioneering spirit. Nature, a pioneering culture and freedom are strongly interlinked in lived spaces, and Glenorchy is conceptualised as an environmentally sound interface, unpolluted and unspoiled:

It’s a combination of very pristine scenery and, in some places, fairly untouched nature, with a pioneering culture, which means people who like to live in a remote place, and who also make the statement that they want to keep this area as representative of this pioneer experience, which means there is still a lot of space, there’s still not too many rules, so these are the two main values, still fairly pristine nature, sense of remoteness and the pioneering culture (Glenorchy resident).

This is clearly set apart from neighbouring Queenstown:

See the difference between Glenorchy people and Queenstown people is that Glenorchy people made a statement by deciding to live in Glenorchy, that was a statement they made. I want to be out of it all, away from it all, and I want to have my freedom, I want to keep my freedom intact, so it’s a different kind of mentality they have because people want to have less rules to comply with, they want to have more freedom for sure (Glenorchy resident).

Such lived space has recently come under threat by the changed nature of tourism development in Glenorchy. Tourism, of course, has always been an important part of Glenorchy. Recently, however, and particularly since the only access road to the Head of the Lake was tar-sealed in 1997, development has increased at a renewed pace. This clearly has implications for the lived space of residents. Notions of Lefebvre’s (1991a) representations of space impacting on lived space are clearly evident:

Up here it’s what Queenstown used to be in many respects - it’s just the quietness of the place and the solitude you could say, and the mystery of the place, the

\(^{30}\) These expressions take the form of descriptions of sense of place in conversations, statements and writings, but also in ways of life and settlement, including building design (reflecting, for example, the wish by some residents to use environmentally sustainable technologies and materials, or the continued opposition by some sections of the community to such ‘urban’ intrusions as concrete kerbs and channels).
uniqueness of it, the discovery and all those things. They've always been there, but they are now more controlled, more structured, they have been made more of now, whereas before they were always there, and you sort of came across them, and got a really good thrill out of them being there, it's like you are making your own discovery. Now it's laid out in front of you, here on the bus is everything you can do and see up the Dart Valley, for instance, or read this brochure, you know, set up the Internet, it's all there, you've read it before you've even been there. I don't know, discovery is really important, being able to discover things for yourself, coming across things that you like, the special places that should remain special. With too many people wanting to do the same thing, suddenly rules and protection have to come with that (Glenorchy resident).

These rules and protections are, of course, in Lefebvre's (1991a) terms, spatial practices emanating from a particular representation of space (a tourism code of conduct or way of organising tourism experience) tied to the abstract space of tourism. These clearly influence the lived space of residents, through imposing rules and/or through destroying the possibility of true discovery, by organising space into consumable experiences, anticipated and prescribed via brochures and advertising. Glenorchy people, as a product of their local history described below, confidently view themselves as a very rooted, unique and self-sufficient community. The potential make-over of Glenorchy space into one of tourism consumption with its attendant spatial practices in the form of rules and spatial designations has alarmed some locals. In order to trace the nature of these concerns, it is necessary to begin with the historical context in which lived spaces in Queenstown and Glenorchy have evolved.

3.2 A History of Social Space 1: Glenorchy in Historical Context

3.2.1 Maori History

The Upper Wakatipu area, of which Glenorchy and the Head of the Lake are part, has a strong Maori historical connection, as Waitaha, Ngati Mamoe and, later, Ngai Tahu iwi all had tribal association with the area. The lake and the area have significant

31 Maori are New Zealand's indigenous people.
32 Maori tribes.
status in tribal creation traditions. The key attractions for Maori in the Upper Wakatipu area were *pounamu* (greenstone or jade) and *mahinga kai* (gathering food resources). Greenstone was found beyond the Head of the Lake and was an important resource to Maori in the manufacture of tools, weapons and ornaments, and as a trading commodity. Indeed, greenstone was one of the most important industrial mediums available to the stone age culture of Maori at the time, and the transporting of greenstone over mountain routes (via the Routeburn Valley) back to the West Coast for manufacture or trade was a significant features (BWA 2001, 5). Both greenstone and the gathering of food by travelling groups led to the area’s seasonal settlement by coastal iwi. The pace of travelling and the need to gather food led to semi-permanent, seasonal campsites that were established at certain intervals. The Wakatipu area was thus part of a network of trails that linked Otago with the West Coast. Today, however, little evidence of the precise location of these settlements exists.

In its Maori history days, then, the area was used primarily for the gathering of resources, and the spatial practices associated with this carved transport routes to the West Coast into the Routeburn Valley. Early spatial practices, therefore, were closely related to trade in greenstone and seasonal food gathering. Maori lived spaces told stories of famous battles, love stories and wars and were influenced by the representations of space associated with Maori creation legends at the time. Tribal legends spoke of the land as embodying the legendary warriors of Maori history. Cree (1959), for example, accounts for five Maori legends describing the origin of Lake Wakatipu, one of which is described by the current day Ngai Tahu Maori Trust Board (1995):

Near Tahuna (Queenstown) there once lived a chief who had a very beautiful daughter called Manata. Many a young man wanted her for his wife, but the old chief was exceptionally particular about his choice of son-in-law. It came about

---

33 The most prominent account is that of a giant, Matau, whose heart lies beating at the bottom of Whakatipu-wai-maori (Lake Wakatipu), accounting for the rhythmic ‘breathing’ that can be observed in the lake today (BWA 2001).

34 Traces of Maori settlement have been found at the foot of the mouth of the Routeburn River (McFarlane 1983), and at the Dart Bridge site: “The site consists of oven pits, midden material and some greenstone, associated with natural stone paving once thought to have been cultural. It was a camp site for cooking cabbage tree roots to a fructose meal, suitable for travelling food. A few moa were killed in the vicinity and some river cobbles of greenstone were used” (Hamel 1993, A6(1)).

35 For example, the story of Ranginui, the sky, and Papatuanuku, the earth.

46
that a young warrior named Matakauri fell in love with Manata and she fell in love with him. The old chief was furious because he thought Matakauri was not worthy of his daughter, and kept his daughter under close observation. One day a terrible taniwha [giant] named Matau came and stole her away. The broken-hearted father then said that anyone who rescued his daughter could marry her. Even the strongest of the young warriors who had desired Manata quailed at the prospect of rescuing her from the terrible taniwha. But the love that Matakauri held for Manata was so great that nothing would stand in his way. He went out to search for the taniwha and discovered where the taniwha Matau lived. When an easterly wind blew, the monster always went into a deep sleep. Waiting for a day when the easterly blew, Matakauri went to where Matau lay fast asleep. He found that the giant had tied Manata to him with strong cords. Matakauri set to work with his mere [club] to free his lover, but he could not cut the cords. Manata then sobbed bitterly, and her tears fell on the bonds. So great was her love in the essence of her tears that they melted the cords away. Matakauri scooped up Manata in his arms and carried her joyfully away and as agreed, the old chief allowed them to become husband and wife.

But while Matau was still alive no young maiden was safe, so Matakauri decided to deal with him once and for all. On a day with the favourable east wind, he found Matau asleep as expected. Matakauri set fire to the huge amount of dried bracken that Matau was using as a bed. The giant was smothered in the flames, with the fat from his body making the flames even fiercer. The blaze became so fierce that it burned a hole into the ground more then 400 metres deep. The fire also melted the snow on the distant hills, streams poured forth and filled up the hollow. You see it today as Lake Whakatipu Waimaori – Lake Wakatipu (Ngai Tahu Maori Trust Board 1995, 16).

Such representations of space were embodied in lived spaces and observed in spatial practices through, for example, the designation of certain areas as tapu (sacred). The region is integrally connected to such creation beliefs and is part of a wider network of mythology (O'Regan, cited in Department of Conservation 1993, 18): “The spiritual importance then of that whole region … is based on reverence of the deeds, the mana [authority] of the tipuna [ancestors] who explored the area, and the connection of man to the elements (whakapapa)”. Lefebvre’s (1991a, 48) concept of “absolute space” probably best describes this spatial relationship as one of religious, spiritual and political character, “a product of the bonds of … soil and language” which “survived as the bedrock of historical space and the basis of representational [lived] spaces (religious, magical and political symbolism)”. To Lefebvre (1991a), less disconnection between lived spaces and representation of space existed in absolute space due to a close association of productive activity (labour) with the reproduction of social life. It is not my intention here to provide a detailed analysis of
pre-European Maori space in the Wakatipu Basin using Lefebvrian (1991a) dialectics. That is a task going far beyond the boundaries of this thesis.\textsuperscript{36} Instead, the historical focus of this chapter is intended to provide the context for much more detailed analysis of Lefebvrian (1991a) dialectics in a more contemporary context in Chapters Four and Five. Suffice to say at this point that, to Lefebvre (1991a), spatial relations such as the ones described above are characterised by less disconnection between representations of space and lived spaces. What followed, in the shape of European history, slowly led to the disappearance of absolute space.

3.2.2 European History

The forces of history smashed naturalness forever and upon its ruins established the space of accumulation .... It was during this time that productive activity (labour) became no longer one with the process of reproduction which perpetuated social life; but, in becoming independent of that process, labour fell prey to abstraction, whence abstract social labour – and abstract space (Lefebvre 1991a, 48-49, emphasis in original).

The European settlement of Glenorchy dates from the early 1860s, when William Gilbert Rees, the first settler in Queenstown, explored the northern arm of Lake Wakatipu. Two of his employees drove a flock of sheep up to the Head of the Lake from Queenstown, and a station was established in the vicinity of present day Glenorchy (McFarlane 1983).

The settlement's initial growth was driven by farming, but the township quickly turned into a gold mining settlement. Gold was discovered in the wider Central Otago region during the gold rush period 1861-1865 and was mined in many creeks in the District, including the Head of the Lake area. The first hotels built in Glenorchy in the early 1860s, then, catered for miners, and extractive industries in the form of mining, farming and sawmilling dominated the local economy for most of the 1860s (BWA 2001). The population explosion associated with gold finds dramatically

\textsuperscript{36} The transition from \textit{tangata whenua} [people of the land, or natives] settlement of New Zealand to European settlement would make an interesting case study analysis in terms of its attendant changes in the production of space, as the spatial practices associated with European settlement differed markedly from those of pre-European times. In the Wakatipu Basin, for example, very few reminders of pre-European production of space remain.
increased the need for timber, and a thriving timber industry was also established. The spatial practices associated with a production of space oriented towards gold-mining and a number of other extractive industries revolved around the establishment of a mining service town in Glenorchy, mainly focused on providing accommodation to workers in the mining and milling industries.

A particularly important development in the Glenorchy area is Scheelite mining. Scheelite, a tungsten ore found in quartz reefs, is used in the manufacture of special heat-resistant steel, and as early as the 1880s, was mined in the Glenorchy Mt Juda mine, and on mountains such as Mt McIntosh or Black Peak. Scheelite mining has had a significant influence on the development of the area, with the Head of the Lake known as the most important area for the production of scheelite in New Zealand (BWA 2001). Up until the 1960s, New Zealand produced just over 1000 tonnes of scheelite, and most of this came from Glenorchy. The Scheelite mining history is therefore a unique part of Glenorchy, and the spatial practices of open cast scheelite mining have left their marks on the surrounding hillside (BWA 2001).

Throughout this time, farming continued to be an important industry. Indeed, both sheep and cattle farming, particularly high country farming, are important to this day. In many ways, farming represents a relatively stable activity, distinct from the highs and lows associated with both mining (particularly goldmining) and later tourism. It contributed to spatial practices of more permanence than many of the temporary practices associated with mining, in the form of established and permanent houses and associated landscaping in the District:

The lack of permanence of the majority of the land uses e.g. mining is reflected in the style of the houses and establishment of permanent businesses. Pastoralism and farming have continued since first settlement and this is evident in the established homesteads and associated plantings of the runs and farms (BWA 2001, 6).37

---

37 In recent years, of course, many pastoral runs have been bought by non-farming interests, and the spatial practices associated with the resultant conversion of pastoral land to other uses, including subdivisions for rural lifestyle blocks, are the focus of Chapter Four.
3.2.2.1 Tourism

Tourism began to appear in Glenorchy in the 1860s. In keeping with developments in the wider region, goldmining at the Head of the Lake declined in the 1870s, and tourism development began to grow, particularly hotel accommodation in Kinloch (the Glacier Hotel) and Glenorchy (the Mount Earnslaw Hotel). What makes the Glenorchy settlement quite unique in terms of tourism is its isolation, because, until 1962, it could only be reached by steamer (McFarlane 1983), either for a day trip from Queenstown, or for further venturing out into the Rees and Dart Valleys, and the settlements of Kinloch and later Paradise.38 The early spatial practices of tourism revolved around Glenorchy’s location as a gateway to the Rees and Dart Valleys and as a day excursion from popular Queenstown. Because of the settlement’s inaccessibility, notions of frontier, isolation and self-sufficiency strongly developed, based both on the lived space of miners, settlers and farmers, and also on the early representations of space that developed around the nature of tourism in Glenorchy (as described below).

Accommodation, tourist guiding enterprises and excursion traffic grew during the 1880s. A summer tourist season began to emerge, and scenery was the main attraction:

I do not know that lake scenery can be finer than that of the upper ten miles of Wakatip, although doubtless it can be much prettier .... (The peaks) are sharp and broken, making the hill tops look like a vast saw with irregular gaps in it. Perhaps no shape of mountain top is more picturesque than this. The summits are nearly as high as those of Switzerland, that of Mount Earnslaw being over 10,000 feet above sea-level. The effect of the sun shining on the line of peaks, was equal to anything I had seen elsewhere. The whole district is, or rather will be in coming days, a country known for its magnificent scenery (Anthony Trollope, English author, cited in Ryan 1971, 38-39).

Hotel accommodation, in particular, grew with the rebuilding of the Mt Earnslaw Hotel and the building of two further accommodation establishments, the Alpine Club Hotel and the Glenorchy Hotel (McFarlane 1983). The Lake Wakatip Mail (cited in McFarlane 1983, 19) describes the dominance of accommodation establishments in

38 The Paradise settlement appears to have gained its name from the numbers of paradise ducks in the area. Historically, it used the biblical connection in its advertising: “Soon there was a River Jordan, Rock of Ages and Heaven’s Gate” (McFarlane 1983, 46).
Glenorchy in 1888: “Although not a 'city of palaces' Glenorchy is undoubtedly a township of palatial hotels; and I believe it is unique in consisting solely of hotels without a single private house”. Quite clearly, the spatial practices associated with mining had developed the settlement of Glenorchy into one with a dominant focus on accommodation and other servicing of the mining industry. With tourism as an emergent use of space, these accommodation establishments experienced decline, however, due to the particular spatial practices associated with the type of tourist who visited Glenorchy.

Early tourism in Glenorchy revolved around scenic appreciation and exploration of the surrounding environments, with a clear focus on day excursions from Queenstown, without an overnight stay for the majority of tourists. If there was an overnight stay, tourists tended to visit accommodation establishments beyond Glenorchy, in Paradise or Kinloch. The area's scenic appeal, combined with easy access to the backcountry and such attractions as Diamond Lake, made it appealing to both excursionists and long-term tourists who, “on disembarking from the steamer ... would make the 14 mile trip to Paradise by buggy or dray” (McFarlane 1983, 34).

The spatial practices of this type of tourism focused on day excursions and exploration of the surrounding environments rather than extended stay in Glenorchy itself. This meant a change of focus for Glenorchy from continued reliance on accommodation provision (be it to miners or tourists) to a less certain future for the settlement. The three Glenorchy hotels faced financial difficulties, particularly as the numbers of daytrippers, who of course did not utilise hotel accommodation, increased disproportionately. The Glenorchy Alpine Club Hotel eventually closed, and the remaining two hotel operations faced strong competition from Paradise (McFarlane 1983).

To Lefebvre (1991a, 46), the most important phases in histories of space and spatial relations are those associated with the passage from one mode of production to another. Analysing spatial relations at such points of juncture, Lefebvre (1991a, 47) argues, is particularly fruitful, as it will reveal the generation of a new space, “a space which is planned and organized subsequently”. Such transitions are fluid and extend over time, but their spatialities are clearly indicative of new productive processes in space. In Glenorchy, the change from goldmining settlement to reliance on a
combination of mining, farming and tourism represented such a juncture, albeit a gradual one.\textsuperscript{39}

\subsection*{3.2.2.2 Transport Geographies}

Although tourist numbers (both excursionists and long-term tourists) continued to grow during the early 1900s, hotel trade continued to decline, with Paradise now the favoured location. The settlement was often bypassed by tourists now, and this caused growing and enduring frustration for local tourism development.

The development of the railways and increasingly cheaper excursion fares was a very influential spatial practice, and contributed to the growth of tourism in Glenorchy. In 1902, the Government acquired the Lake Wakatipu Shipping Company and its three steamers, the \textit{Antrim}, \textit{Ben Lomond}, and \textit{Mountaineer} (McFarlane 1983, 51-52):

This action had important consequences for tourism at the head [of the Lake]. A 25 per cent reduction in all the steamer fares, in conjunction with the excursion rail fares already offered during the holiday periods, resulted in a large increase in the numbers of excursionists .... Benefits for the head were immediate.

The Department of Tourist and Health Resorts, established in 1902, was instrumental in track and walk development in the area at the Head of the Lake, in particular the extension of the Routeburn Track, and a track up the Greenstone Valley to Lake Te Anau. Tourist numbers increased significantly as a result of these developments (McFarlane 1982, 54). The gazetting of two national parks, Fjordland National Park and Mt Aspiring National Park, in 1952 and 1964 respectively, led to increased interest in mountaineering and tramping activities in the area. The spatial practices associated with tourism development in the wider Wakatipu Basin began to exert an influence through providing increasingly easy access to Glenorchy, albeit constrained through a continued focus on day excursions and an emphasis on Glenorchy's gateway function:

\textsuperscript{39} It must be stated here that Lefebvre's (1991a) notion of modes of production is rather larger than the change in mode of production described in the Glenorchy context. Changing from mining to tourism is not quite the same in terms of its impact on social relations as is transition from feudalism to merchant capitalism, for example. Some of the implications for spatial relations, however, are worth exploring even for less paradigmatic shifts in modes of production.
Although the area at the head of the lake became THE scenic attraction of the region, just as the scaling of Ben Lomond became another essential activity for all who visited the lake, Glenorchy (Rees’ northern station), and Kinloch with their hotels and other amenities remained second to Queenstown as far as being the centre where the visitor, on the whole, stayed and based their activities. The head of the lake became primarily a pleasant day-excursion for the majority of tourists, excepting those few who succumbed to the challenge of Mount Earnslaw and the other giants, or favoured long tramps [hikes] following the Dart and Rees Rivers (Ryan 1971, 39-40, emphasis in original).

To this day, Glenorchy remains a gateway destination, as it provides access to a number of New Zealand’s most scenic walking tracks.

Lake steamer services to Glenorchy ceased eventually, and a road was developed, first in the form of a gravel road, and then, in 1997, tar-sealed. Tourism continued to be a part, albeit it minor, of the Glenorchy economy. In recent years, however, particularly with the sealing of the main access road, this has changed significantly, due to continued strong growth in tourism in Queenstown and the wider area and attendant growth of tourism numbers to Glenorchy. Spatial practices associated with a new type of tourism have begun to emerge, and these, as outlined below and in Chapter Five, have caused considerable concern to the lived spaces of Glenorchy residents.

3.2.3 Interim Summary: Glenorchy

In summary, then, the Head of the Lake and Glenorchy settlement have been influenced by a number of spatial practices emanating from the representations of space associated with different extractive industries and a focus on day trip tourism as well as the settlement’s gateway function adjacent to two national parks. The mode of production associated with such extractive industries as mining and milling, for example, inscribed particular spatial practices on the landscape (e.g. in the form of scheelite mining scars left on the hills, old gold mining sites, or the dominance of accommodation establishments in early Glenorchy). Adjacency to two national parks and the lack of road access to the village meant that the spatial practices associated with tourism were distinct – small scale day excursions with an emphasis on scenic appreciation or participation in mountaineering and tramping.

Lived spaces have, of course, been influenced by the nature of the industries that shaped settlement, and by the persistent isolation of Glenorchy. For example, the
community’s lived spaces continue to express a sense of place characterised by self-reliance, self-sufficiency and proud pioneering culture, as explained by this inhabitant:

The pioneering culture is still very much alive in Glenorchy – people here are proudly self-sufficient. We are also independent and able to take, if you like, whatever the land throws at us – be it in the form of floods or when the road gets cut off. There were visitors in town when the road last got cut off, and they were upset about not being able to reach the outside world for several days. To me, it was a return to the familiar old days of no road access – no big deal. I welcomed it. (Glenorchy resident).

More recently, these lived space values have been attracting new settlers into the community. Blakely and Wallace (2001, 6) put it thus:

A small relatively self-reliant community challenged by climatic extremes has developed. People seeking a more low key lifestyle in an alpine environment away from the pressures generated by ‘progress’ have also been attracted to the area in more recent years.

Spatial practices characteristic of such lived spaces are emphases on self-reliance in many community activities, with high levels of involvement of the community in schooling and community activities. There is a culture of trust between neighbours, reflected, for example, in mostly unlocked buildings and in a perception of relative safety for children of the community.

**Figure 3.3: Horseriding as Part of Rural Glenorchy**

(BWA 2001)

Building designs reflect the need to adapt to a mountain environment with often challenging climatic extremes, but are also expressive of continuing rural values (e.g. strong opposition to concrete kerb and channelling and the provision of parking spaces on roads, support for the presence of
horses and horseriding as an integral part of Glenorchy - see Figure 3.3). Community attitudes towards the surrounding environment reflect a strong sense of place and connection, with exploration and discovery strong themes in outdoor recreation. People are skilled at adapting to the necessities of often long isolation (when the road is closed due to bad weather conditions, for example), or of fast changing weather conditions. Lived spaces, in summary, do exhibit spatial practices that influence the production of space, and Chapter Five will elaborate on this. Suffice to say here that the historical themes (both in the realms of lived space and of representations of space associated with extractive industries) of frontier, self-sufficiency and pioneering culture have found their way into the conceptual realm and the discourse of contemporary tourism development in Glenorchy.

3.3 Imaginary Tourism Geographies in Glenorchy

I have since seen some of the finest views in the world, scenes the beauty of which have been extolled by many writers, and have been immortalised by poet and painter, but none of these, in my opinion, can compare with that magnificent blending of water, trees and mountains on which we gazed that morning, and watched the sun as it lit up each gully, crag and glacier - Alfred H. Duncan (the first settler at the head of Lake Wakatipu) (Journey Into Paradise 1967).

Historically, Glenorchy representations for tourism purposes centred on its scenic values, its nearness to backcountry walks, and were often linked to the settlement of Paradise. Today’s Glenorchy tourism representations, similarly, centre on its smallness, uniqueness, and the close connection to the wilderness, with a play on words indicating its paradisal nature (referring to the settlement of Paradise). It is “the tiny township that holds the key to nature’s paradise” (Gateway to Paradise). Brochure and website material emphasise the Paradise connection, and also describe Glenorchy as a frontier:

Glenorchy: From Queenstown to Paradise - The frontier township that holds the key to nature's paradise (Glenorchy - From Queenstown to Paradise).

Glenorchy’s natural environment takes centre stage and the settlement is even described as ‘Paradise in the South Seas’, but connections to historical spatial practices are clearly important in today’s place promotion:

You too may wonder if earth has anything to show more fair. The sparkling waters stretch past dreamy islands to a backdrop of glaciers and sunlit crags. A thousand
years ago came the first moa hunters. They left tales of giants who carved out this landscape. Of the forces which joined the mystic greenstone, gold and scheelite. Canoes still paddle the lake, horsemen surrender their hearts on the upland trail. Ancient beech forest is home to bush canaries, fantails, parakeets and kaka - and three species of deer. In the lake teem trout and salmon. For over a century musters, miners and hunters have fought to create an endearing little settlement in the wilderness, tracks meander through the bush and over the alpine passes - here lies Paradise in the South Seas (NZ.Com 2001).

Glenorchy is also described as special, a secret destination, implying a lack of crowds and a promise of tranquillity. On offer is a paradise for outdoor enthusiasts:

Experience Glenorchy: People go to Glenorchy for a specific reason - to relax and enjoy absolute tranquility amidst magnificent scenery. Glenorchy, situated at the head of Lake Wakatipu, is a scenic 48km from Queenstown. This frontier township is the gateway to the many famous walking tracks of Mount Aspiring National Park, including the Routeburn, Caples, Greenstone, Rees Valley and Dart Valley. The Glenorchy area is an outdoor enthusiasts paradise and offers such activities as jetboating, fishing, hunting, horse trekking, canoeing and much much more (Glenorchy Information Centre 2001).

The notion of the frontier is used extensively in Glenorchy advertising. The township is portrayed both as the 'gateway to paradise' and as a frontier town:

Known as the 'Gateway to Paradise', Glenorchy is one of New Zealand's last frontier towns” (Blanket Bay 2001).

And:

Glenorchy, a 45 minute drive from Queenstown at the head of Lake Wakatipu, is the gateway to thousands of hectares of National Parks. Glacier fed rivers surrounded by valleys clothed in native forest, open up to the Routeburn, Rees/Dart and Greenstone/Caples tracks. The key to experiencing this mountain splendour is held by the local community. They enable visitors to access a full range of activities and adventures, or simply relax and enjoy (Glenorchy - From Queenstown to Paradise).

As can be seen, contemporary promotional tourism geographies have picked up a number of historical themes, exhibited in the continuing notion of the frontier, of paradisal nature and of gateway to the wilderness:

Join us for the adventure of a lifetime amidst the grandeur of Wilderness New Zealand. Gateway to New Zealand's great southern wilderness area is Glenorchy. Situated at the head of Lake Wakatipu, the South Island's second largest lake, our small settlement is only 40 minutes from Queenstown. Glenorchy residents are
committed to preserving this world heritage region for all to enjoy. Famous for its local flavour and rural comedy (Glenorchy.com 2001).

Activities in and around Glenorchy are also often branded as closer to nature and less commercialised, softer adventure than neighbouring Queenstown activities:

Funyaks Dart River: Exploring the Untouched - Our recipe for soft adventure *(Funyaks Dart River – Exploring the Untouched)*.

And:

Dart River Jet takes you over 30km into the upper reaches of the river, then Funyaks gives you the chance to become part of this pristine environment, floating silently, adrift with nature *(Gateway to Glenorchy)*.

**Figure 3.4: Funyaks Dart River - Exploring the Untouched** *(Fun Yaks Dart River - Exploring the Untouched)*

The spatial practices recommended in today’s tourism representations revolve around exploring wilderness, pristine environments, experiencing something that is special through its remoteness. Ordinary adventure tourism activities can thus become transformed through association with the nature of such space. For example, jetboating in Glenorchy is set apart from the more action-oriented Queenstown Shotover Jet variety:

Dart River Jetboat Safaris: It's more than a jetboat ride - it's a journey amidst wilderness so untouched it's a World Heritage Area. A rare journey amidst the towering mountains and ancient forests of Mount Aspiring National Park. Awe-inspiring and enriching, the challenging grandeur of this World Heritage Area will leave a lasting impression *(Dart River Jetboat Safaris)*.

While the settlement is set apart from Queenstown in terms of the different type of experience to be had there, nearness to Queenstown is nevertheless emphasised in much of the advertising material:

Jetboat on crystal clear water in a wild and scenic landscape, amidst the towering peaks, glaciers and ancient forests of Mt. Aspiring National Park. Upriver it's awe-inspiring and enriching; a journey to mesmerise the most seasoned traveller. Downriver, the pace quickens and it's jetboating fun from the Southern Alps to Lake Wakatipu. And best of all, this enchanted place is only 45 km by sealed highway from Queenstown *(Dart River Jetboat Safaris)*.
Best of all, in today's tourism representations, is the utility of the space of Glenorchy to offer pristine wilderness, untouched nature and unique natural experiences while being conveniently close to the more action-oriented, cosmopolitan Queenstown:

Glenorchy: Queenstown's Best Kept Secret: Glenorchy is situated at the head of Lake Wakatipu, a scenic 35-40 minute drive from Queenstown, the internationally famous premier New Zealand tourist destination. The road is now sealed the entire route. Access can also be gained by plane or helicopter. It is only 10 minutes away from the Caples and Greenstone tracks, which lead to the Routeburn Track at Lake McKellar (Glenroydon Lodge 2001).

This latter aspect, the ease of access to Queenstown, it appears, is also the point of contention for the lived spaces of many inhabitants. Better accessibility of Glenorchy through sealed road access from Queenstown has meant that notions of frontier living and associated community values are more difficult to sustain.

3.3.1 The Lost Frontier?
Characteristics of remoteness, inaccessibility, pioneer lifestyles and images of the frontier have increasingly come under threat since the major upgrade of the 1962 access road to Glenorchy, and particularly since the 1997 tar-sealing (Figure 3.5).

Figure 3.5: The Road to Glenorchy

Better road access to the Head of the Lake has meant larger visitor numbers and less control by the local community over developments at the Head of the Lake. Such issues have been exacerbated by fears in recent years that a proposed connection to the West Coast may be established through the Greenstone Valley, and that Glenorchy, therefore, may become just another New Zealand village en route to somewhere else. Ideas of last frontiers and rural character
and the historically isolated position of Glenorchy could disappear in such developments:

It's important to remember that Glenorchy and the Head of the Lake community has had a bigger past with tourism when there was a higher degree of isolation - no road etc. Used to be 3 big hotels and the various tours and the region was arguably more special then for visitors than it is now. The more the area develops the less special it is as an end of the road destination. The Greenstone road and haphazard subdivisions are the main threats (Paterson 2000, 22).

There is a recognition that it will be difficult to influence tourist flows and that a degree of accelerated development is inevitable. The sealing of the road in 1997 made control over the nature of tourism development much more difficult, and it is the particular type of tourism since then and its associated spatial practices that are of concern to some lived space values:

It's only in recent times that we've developed this sort of café, two hour quick fix tourism, really. People just come and have a quick look at the place. I mean they come up for a cup of coffee. They stay in Queenstown, the road is so accessible, so they come up and have a cup of coffee (Glenorchy resident).

And:

A lot more day people have come up [since the sealing of the road], a different sort of tourism, a different sort of person. A lot of older people taking day trips in their cars, but also a lot of younger, hoon type people (Glenorchy resident).

In fact, the sealing of the road was one of the catalysts for a community planning exercise which attempts to impose some direction on future development based on lived space values (and which is described in more detail in Chapter 5):

So when the road was sealed, everyone started worrying there and saying oh my God, you know, our little heaven is going to be swamped by big buses, and we're gonna see developments happening that we don't necessarily want. And there was quite a strong feeling on that, so eventually we initiated this workshop that you saw, where we tried to find a vision for Glenorchy before it's too late. And in a lot of ways it's too late on a lot of levels, but it's just something the community can do, and while you can't completely control development, you can still influence the way it's going to be developed (Glenorchy resident).

The sealing of the road, in essence, contributes to a new kind of space and new forms of spatial relations. It forces notions of frontier and isolation into a more direct
confrontation with representations of space framed by a tourism development discourse and by what is perceived to be the oppositional nature of Queenstown.

3.4 A History of Social Space 2: Queenstown in Historical Context

Queenstown, also on the shores of Lake Wakatipu in the Queenstown Lakes District, is one of New Zealand's tourism icons. Its European history is closely connected to tourism. Like Glenorchy, it was originally a mining town in the goldrushes of the 1860s, briefly became a farming centre, but now depends almost entirely on the visitor industry for its livelihood. The European history of Queenstown is closely tied to tourism, and Queenstown's economy has depended on tourism throughout most of the 20th century (Herda 1993). Tourism representations of space, therefore, and associated spatial practices, were much more central to Queenstown's development.

3.4.1 Maori History

As is the case with the Glenorchy history described above, the tangata whenua history of the Queenstown area begins with the Ngai Tahu and Ngati Mamoe people, both of who knew the area as part of a route to the West Coast in search for pounamu (greenstone), taramea (Wild Spaniard) and tikumu (Mountain Daisy) from as early as 1100 AD. From the early 1600s, Ngati Mamoe and Ngai Tahu took up residence in the Lake Wakatipu area, albeit on a seasonal basis for birding and eeling, to take back to their more permanent coastal settlements. The Ngai Tahu Maori Trust Board (1995, 8) describes the details of settlement:

At the foot of the lake near the site of present-day Kingston was the Takerahaka settlement approached from the south through Te Wa (Dome Pass). Our main population centre was in the Frankton-Queenstown area. There was a settlement and a pa near the junction of the Kimi-akau (Shotover) River and the Kawerau River .... Closer to Lake Whakatipu, a village called Te Kirikiri was established at Frankton but the main Ngati Mamoe centre was at Tahuna the site of present-day Queenstown and the spot on which William Rees later pitched his tent.

Both Queenstown and Glenorchy were sites for early Maori settlement, during what is known as the Ngati Mamoe era of the present-day Ngai Tahu iwi. A number of

40 Modern day controversy over whether or not Maori actually had settlement in the Wakatipu area centre on the seasonal nature of such settlements.
battles took place in the Wakatipu area in the early 1700s, which led to later peace marriages and alliances, forming present-day Ngai Tahu from Waitaha, Mamoe and Tahu peoples (Ngai Tahu Maori Trust Board 1995).

Early spatial practices, as in Glenorchy, were closely related to trade in greenstone and food gathering practices, guided by representations of space emergent from Maori creation legends in a space that Lefebvre (1991a) would have described as absolute or historical (without contradiction between representations of space and lived space). European arrival, once again, was implicated in its disappearance.

3.4.2 European History
The first European to visit the Lake Wakatipu area, Nathaniel Chalmers, was led there by tangata whenua in 1863 (Herda 1993; Miller 1949). Generally referred to as the first permanent European settlers in the Queenstown area are William Gilbert Rees and Nicholas von Tunzelmann, who arrived in the Wakatipu Basin in 1860 in search of suitable land for sheep farming. Sheep runs were established until, in the early 1860s, the discovery of gold in Central Otago and in the Wakatipu Basin led to a dramatic change in the settlement of the area. The Molyneux, Kawerau and Arrow rivers were prospected for gold, and in November 1862, the now famous Arthur’s Point claim was established by sheep shearers from William Rees’ station. Many other discoveries followed, and the Queenstown settlement quickly grew as a mining and agricultural centre, as the gold rush brought thousands of prospectors into the area (Brown 1997; de la Mare 1996; Duncan 1964; Knudson 1968; MacKenzie 1951; Miller 1966; Ryan 1971).

As the gold rush abated in the mid 1860s, the settlement changed, and considerable concern was expressed over its viable future by local inhabitants. The need for diversification was recognised as early as 1864, and farming settlement once again became a desirable goal, along with gold sluicing and quartz mining (Herda 1993). According to Ryan (1971, 22), “this transition period - from a total reliance on gold to the establishment of a small farming community ... began to see the possibilities of a health and, especially, a tourist resort”.
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For a long time, however, such visions of tourism in the Wakatipu basin were very much dependent on the availability of transport routes and hampered by what Ryan (1971, 26) calls “communication difficulties”. Initially, there was a route to Invercargill and the Southland ports via Lake Wakatipu, which was later followed by packhorse track access to Dunedin, hampered by weather and at times impassable (Ryan 1971, see also Meyer 1980; Miller 1970). Tourists began to become a feature of the summer months in Queenstown. It was the advent of the railways in the late 1870s, however, that changed Queenstown tourism substantially.

3.4.2.1 Transport Geographies

Figure 3.6: Early Railway Advertising
(Scenic Trip by Train & Railway Motor Queenstown New Zealand)

The building of the railways from Dunedin to Invercargill, and the later extension to Kingston, completed in 1878, established Queenstown as a summer resort. The Kingston extension connected with existing shipping services on the lake and therefore made tourist excursions to Queenstown much easier (Herda 1993; Ryan 1971). In 1878, the Wakatip Lake Steam Shipping Company was formed, and five boats soon operated with timetables and daily return trips to Kingston and Glenorchy. “But it was the government’s action in reducing fares on certain days that really opened up Queenstown, and was the means of establishing her as a summer tourism resort” (Ryan 1971, 45). The same spatial practices that led to the opening up of Glenorchy to more tourism had a similar effect on Queenstown. In Queenstown, however, tourism development took off on a far larger scale, due to its better connectedness and easier accessibility by a variety of modes of transport. The spatial practices associated with transport systems, therefore, had a significant influence on the development of Queenstown.
By the turn of the century, summer excursion trains were a regular feature on most weekends, and Queenstown began to develop attractions, where “specific areas were cultivated to the visitor’s taste” (Ryan 1971, 48):

The hills surrounding the town were a challenge for the more energetic, and by 1880 it was possible to obtain a five-horse coach ... for a run round the country via Arrowtown .... Yachts and pleasure boats could be hired, with the first motor- launch, capable to [sic] holding twenty-five to thirty people, being put in the lake by Mr. Searle, the proprietor of Eichardts, primarily for the use of those tourists staying in his hotel (Ryan 1971, 48).

This motor launch was the forerunner of later “frequent and cheap trips to such sights as the Kawarau Rapids, Bob's Cove, Half-way Bay, and Elfin Bay” (Ryan 1971, 49).

The first distinct spatial practices associated with tourism development in the Basin emerged:

Gone are the people who are well satisfied simply with the unique scenic beauty of the trip to the head of the lake, or a climb up to the summit of Ben Lomond. Now holiday-makers patronise 'drive-u-self' [sic] motor boats, jet down the local rivers, and ride a chairlift or gondola (Ryan 1971, xi).

Transport improvements were crucial to the continuing development of tourism in Queenstown. Better accessibility, combined with cheaper excursion fares, were responsible for the growth of tourism in Queenstown. “But the fact remained, prior to the late 1940s, that the tourist traffic to Queenstown lasted only a few months of the year” (Ryan 1971, 88). The 1920s, 30s and early 1940s were difficult times for Queenstown in terms of international tourists, due to wars and the Great Depression, and associated declining tourist numbers. The building of the main access road to Queenstown and its opening in 1936, however, made access much easier and therefore increased domestic tourism numbers (Herda 1993). It was another 30 years before the main access road to Glenorchy was developed and the spatial practices associated with this accessibility may explain the differences in pace of development.41

41 How lived spaces might have contributed to these spatial practices is less clear in the Queenstown case, and in Chapter Five, in particular, I will critique Lefebvre’s (1991a) production of space with reference to its conceptualisation of the influence of lived space.
Two further developments were significant: First, the initiative of the Mt Cook and Southern Lakes Tourist Company opened up the area to motor traffic and began to extend the summer season. Second, the development of Coronet Peak in the 1940s as a skifield introduced winter tourism and, over the next decades, slowly changed Queenstown into a year-round resort (Ryan 1971, 91). As a result, by the late 1950s, tourism began to become an established year-round activity in the township of Queenstown. The types of tourist arrivals were changing, and further emphasis on tourism-specific developments appeared:

A new degree of sophistication became [an] essential element in accordance with the nature of the tourist now arriving. No longer was Ben Lomond a 'lion' of the district or the simple beauty of the head of the lake such a drawcard. Instead the tourists looked ahead to the 1960s for such provisions as the 200,000 dollar chairlift and restaurant at Coronet peak, the 98,000 dollar artificial skating rink, and the 200,000 dollar Skyline Chalet extension and gondola. The town's attraction is no longer almost exclusively dependent on the magnificence of its scenery. Today this has been greatly supplemented, and in some cases outshone by added features (Ryan 1971, 122).

In the 1960s, the lengthening of the Queenstown airstrip accommodated larger passenger planes, bringing more tourists into the resort and leading to a number of attraction developments, including day trips to Cecil Peak, a high country station across Lake Wakatipu, the Shotover Jetboat runs, and the Skyline Gondola ride to the top of Bob's Peak overlooking Queenstown (Herda 1993; McLeod and Ross 1988). To this was added the Kingston Flyer in the 1970s, and it was during this decade that adventure tourism became a serious feature of the Queenstown tourism experience, with the establishment of white water rafting, fishing safaris and helicopter rides, and the further expansion of jetboating. In the 1980s, bungy jumping joined the adventure tourism repertoire (Herda 1993).42

The establishment of two further skifields, Cardrona, between Queenstown and Wanaka, in 1980, and the Remarkables Skifield after a lengthy battle in 1985 (see Hayward 1993), made the Queenstown winter season a profitable one. In the mid 1980s, finally, and increasingly catering for Japanese, American and Canadian

42 Brown (1997) gives detailed histories of the development of adventure activities such as jetboating, river rafting and bungy jumping in Queenstown.
tourists, Queenstown established 24 hour trading. The resort was - and is - very much focused on tourism as its main economic activity. Current estimates place 85-95% of its business activity in the tourism sector (Destination Queenstown (DQ) 2000/2001; New Zealand Tourism Board (NZTB) 1998).

The representations of space in Queenstown, therefore, while also linked to goldmining in its early days, have been influenced by the abstract space of tourism to a much larger extent at a much earlier point than is the case in Glenorchy. A large part of this is due to Queenstown’s lesser isolation and better connectedness to other parts of the country. The transport element of tourism spatial practices was clearly influential in establishing Queenstown as a tourism resort. As a result, the spatial practices of tourism have left their mark firmly on the resort, and lived spaces in Queenstown appear to have been influenced much more extensively by tourism space. The contemporary focus of imaginary geographies in Queenstown on adventure tourism, therefore, is less easy to link to lived spaces in Queenstown (as is the case for the frontier example in the Glenorchy case, which is strongly represented in contemporary tourism representations).

3.4.3 Imaginary Tourism Geographies in Queenstown: Adventure Tourism

As I will show in much more detail in later chapters, adventure tourism is a dominant feature of the Queenstown tourism repertoire, and devising unique adventure experiences in scenic settings has become increasingly important. In its early tourism days, however, and as was the case for the rest of the District, Queenstown was known for its scenic grandeur, as brochure material of the time indicates:

Wakatipu, the largest of the Great Southern Lakes of the Dominion, is renowned for its amazing beauty and the magnificent grandeur of the gigantic mountain walls which confine its waters .... Sternness - ruggedness - grandeur and charm - these are the characteristics of Wakatipu. Where can one find the equal of the wild rugged grandeur of Skippers, the magnificence of the Crown Range or the soft sylvan charm of Paradise and the Head of the Lake” (Queenstown: The Centre of the Lake and Mountain Wonderland, ca. 1910).

In the 1920s, sport became an attraction: “Queenstown is the Home of Sport - Summer or Winter! Rod, Rifle, or Gun: Bowls, Rackets, or Golf Clubs: the visitor may bring the lot and find scope for them: in ideal surroundings” (Visit Queenstown,
New Zealand, The City of the Great Southern Lakes, ca. 1920). In the 1940s, lake trips, launch trips, air trips and bus trips, as well as walks were advertised in Welcome to Queenstown. Fun entered the picture in the 1950s, when a brochures espoused Fun in 4 Seasons Awaits you at Queenstown, although this fun was sedate by today's standards: “For the sportsman, there are tennis courts and bowling and croquet greens in the Domain and a golf course nearby”. The word adventure appeared in a 1965 brochure: “Holiday Adventure” (New Zealand's Queenstown 1965).

In the 1970s, Queenstown's tourism became more directly linked to adventure tourism activities and to activities in scenic settings. While rides on chairlifts and gondolas, by today's Queenstown standards, are relatively sedate activities, there was a recognition that the days of scenic appreciation as the major tourist attraction had been left behind. By the 1970s, therefore, adventure tourism activities were clearly part of the package in brochure material. A brochure entitled Sightseeing Queenstown mentions, among the more traditional launch trips and bus rides, hydrofoil, speedboat and jetboat trips on the Shotover River and through the Kawarau Gorge. Similarly, another brochure dated in the 1970s asks Queenstown - What can I do? (ca. 1970), and emphasises activities in scenic places (e.g. hydrofoil, Kon Tiki Raft, Shotover Jet, 'Lazy Bones' and 'Kawarau Jet' jetboating).

Emphasis in early tourist brochures was placed on the free availability of sports activities, without the need to pay fees, have restrictions imposed or acquire a license.43 A publication in the 1900s put it thus: “The Sportsman's Mecca’ aptly describes New Zealand as a land where all manner of sports may be undertaken under conditions as near the ideal as it is possible to find anywhere in the world” (The Sportsman's Mecca). And: “New Zealand, with its abundant lakes and rivers, its great mountain ranges and magnificent forested areas, is pre-eminently a land for sportsmen”. This emphasis was of course a conscious setting apart of New Zealand sporting practices from those in Britain, which were reserved for the elite.

---

43 This emphasis was of course a conscious setting apart of New Zealand sporting practices from those in Britain, which were reserved for the elite.
Cloke and Perkins (1998a) make clear links between the increasing commercialisation of outdoor recreation since the 1950s, and the growth of adventure tourism, including, since the 1980s, increased use of the conservation estate for adventure tourism activities. In 1971, the New Zealand Government Tourist Bureau (NZGTB) advertised New Zealand as “the most 'concentrated' wonderland of scenery and sport in the world”. In 1985, the New Zealand Tourist and Publicity Department went one step further:

New exciting things are happening in New Zealand's holiday world. Holiday adventures, experiences and attractions that take advantage of New Zealand’s unique, spectacular scenery. Nowhere else in the world could you find so many thrills within such a compact holiday land. Energetic things, gentle things, exciting things for those with a spirit of adventure .... The opportunities for adventure are endless. Experience the thrill of whitewater rafting on a scenic New Zealand river, or jet boating through the steep gorges of our back country. Go flight seeing over snow-clad mountains in ski planes, float planes or helicopters. Choose from innumerable launch trips .... When you come to New Zealand we know you'll get real adventure for your money.

Tourism promotional representations of space, therefore, increasingly emphasised the need for thrills, adventure and excitement, rather than just scenic appreciation. This was connected to tourism demand for certain types of experiences and influenced the spatial practices of tourism development, through adventure attraction development and a whole host of thrilling and exciting activities in scenic places.

Today, Queenstown is promoted as New Zealand's premier adventure tourism destination. Attractions such as A.J. Hackett bungy jumping (Figure 3.7), Shotover jetboating and whitewater rafting are iconic adventure activities, not just at the local level but in national promotion. Bungy jumping, for example, has come to stand for Queenstown tourism not just at the local level, but in the national imagination and in international tourism advertising. It - and associated adventure tourism activities such as jet boating and river rafting - provide the basis for Queenstown's ongoing reputation as an adventure tourism destination.44

44 Bungy jumping originated in a ritual for the 'land divers' of Pentecost Island on Vanuatu, and was picked up by members of the Oxford University’s Dangerous Sports Club who first jumped off a bridge, tied to a rubber band, in Bristol, England, on April Fools' Day 1979. This practice appealed to A.J. Hackett and Henry van Asch, two entrepreneurs who pioneered bungy jumping in Queenstown, based on A.J. Hackett’s first completed bungy jump off Auckland’s Greenhithe Bridge in 1986. It was Hackett’s 1987 plunge from the Eiffel Tower in Paris, however, that caught world-wide imagination. The Kawarau Bridge, 23 kilometres from Queenstown, became A.J. Hackett’s and Henry van Asch’s
Figure 3.7: A.J. Hackett Bungy Jumping
(A.J. Hackett Bungy Queenstown - The Bungy Originals)

Queenstown, then, has followed a different development path from Glenorchy, in many ways related to the spatial practices associated with transport and communications developments which connected the town to the rest of the country much earlier and much more extensively than was the case for Glenorchy. Tourism space, therefore, had much earlier and much more extensive influence on the settlement. Glenorchy, by contrast, managed to retain a level of isolation from the outside world, due to limited transport links. Lived spaces in Glenorchy, as a result, are much more distinct and separate from tourism. This appears to be mainly due to the settlement's continuing isolation and the lesser influence and dominance of tourism space. This, as I have shown above, has changed in recent years, and fears that such changes will irreversibly change the Glenorchy settlement are very real to the Glenorchy community.

3.5 Conclusion

Lefebvre (1991a) argues that the production of space is a continual dialectic between representations of space, spatial practices and lived spaces. This production is intimately bound up with history: “In the history of space as such ... the historical and diachronic realms and the generative past are forever leaving their inscriptions upon the writing-tablet, so to speak, of space” (Lefebvre 1991a, 110). The dual purpose of this chapter has been to begin an exploration of Lefebvre’s (1991a) focus on space as productive process, while introducing the reader to the historical context of the case.

best-known New Zealand base, and proved an immediate success in the Queenstown tourism repertoire (Brown 1997). Added later was a jump from the 71 metre high Skippers Canyon Bridge. Other companies became involved, such as, in 1994, Pipeline Bungy from the Skippers Canyon Suspension Bridge, with a 102 metre high jump, and helicopter jumps added later by van Asch. Today, bungy
studies central to my thesis. I intend to explore how Lefebvre's (1991a) theory attempts to reconcile the influences of space and place in a case study context.

Analysis of histories of space reveals that both Queenstown and Glenorchy space have experienced change relating to changing modes of production and attendant spatial practices. Tourism has been important for both settlements, albeit to a different extent. Despite similar beginnings, the two settlements have differed in the extent to which tourism has been inscribed in their geographies, both materially and in the imagination. In Glenorchy, the frontier town theme is related to the settlement's origins in mining and milling, but has survived as a strongly experienced lived space to this day because, until quite recently, the Head of the Lake was relatively inaccessible and therefore isolated. In addition, lived space, historically, has had to contend with much less strongly represented tourism space. This, I suspect, is one of the critical factors in the maintenance of Glenorchy lived space. It is not so much the success of lived space in asserting itself that is central to the spatiality of tourism in the Glenorchy case, but the lesser degree of influence that tourism space has had.

In Queenstown, by contrast, where tourism has developed much more extensively, tourism space and spatial practices have become much more dominant. Evidence of historical lived space values is much less evident, because tourism space has become the lived space of much of the community earlier and to a larger degree. In terms of the utility of Lefebvre's (1991a) dialectics to conceptualising the space/place relationship, this chapter has shown that Lefebvre's (1991a) focus on space as productive process is indeed valuable in the case study contexts, at least in an analytical sense. Analysis of the spatial practices associated with the space of tourism has shown quite clearly the different degrees of influence tourism has had in the two settlements. Lefebvre's (1991a) production of space provides an explanation for this with its focus on the productive processes of spatial relationships (e.g. the different

jumping is perhaps Queenstown's most famous adventure tourism feature, and the resort strongly emphasises this and other adventure activities, particularly jet boating, in its promotions.

45 Although this is a factor, as I will show in Chapter 5.

46 It must be restated here that a historical examination of the production of space in the Wakatipu Basin is not a central objective of this thesis. An in-depth history of land use and development in the Basin might have identified much more strongly the lived space values and voices in historical context. For the purposes of this thesis, analysis of historical themes serves mainly as a context-setting exercise.
transport connections, associated different levels of attraction development, differing types of tourism).

A first criticism can be levelled at Lefebvre’s (1991a) theory, too, though. It is perhaps quite difficult, in historical perspective, to disentangle spatial practices associated with representations of space from those associated with lived spaces and vice versa. Two reasons for this are possible: First, lived space expressions are sometimes hard to identify at all and/or boundaries between lived spaces and representations of space are difficult to distinguish. Lefebvre (1991a) is vague on what counts as an expression of lived space and what does not, and this has been observed by other writers (e.g. Harvey 1996; Merrifield 1993). For example, is the Glenorchy frontier theme an expression of lived space? Or has it emerged from representations of space associated with the abstract space of extractive industries? Liggett (1995, 255) would argue that Lefebvre’s (1991a) categories are most powerful when they are not conceptualised as mutually exclusive because this, she argues, reduces the focus on interpretation of processes. After all, Lefebvre’s (1991a) focus is on the production of space, that is, his focus is one of productive spatial activity in particular dialectical relationships. It is these ongoing relationships that influence processes of space production. This line of argument appears to be a way out of the dilemma, but it is not clear what the analytical strength of Lefebvre’s (1991a) framework is if one cannot identify the three elements of his triad at least to some extent. If, as Soja (1996, 22, emphasis in original) argues, lived space must be guided “by some form of potentially emancipatory praxis, the translation of knowledge into action in a conscious – and consciously spatial – effort to improve the world in some significant way”, then the identification of that lived space and its spatial practices must surely be an important first step.

Second, a further possibility is that lived space does indeed not have the ability, under capitalism, to 'stand up' to representations of space. Representations of space, as Lefebvre (1991a) argues, are given primacy under capitalism, and lived spaces are crushed, “vanquished by what he calls an abstract conceived space which dances to the tune of the homogenizing forces of money, commodities, capital, and the phallus” (Merrifield 1993, 524). If, however, as Lefebvre (1991a, 167) insists, “reappropriation of the body, in association with the reappropriation of space … [is] a
non-negotiable part of ... [the] agenda”, then better guidance towards the concrete features of this reappropriation is necessary. How can lived spaces ‘stand up’ to representations of space? What are the concrete practices? As I will argue again in later chapters, Lefebvre (1991a) is essentially silent on this.

In historical perspective, then, the dialectical relations that formulate space are not easily described. As I will argue in the next chapter, contemporary representations of space that determine land use planning in the wider Wakatipu Basin are much more easily identified.
4 CHAPTER FOUR: THE SPATIAL PRACTICES OF LAND USE PLANNING - OUTSTANDING NATURAL LANDSCAPES IN THE WAKATIPU BASIN

4.0 Introduction

In this chapter, I apply Lefebvre's (1991a) conceptual triad to the analysis of contemporary space in the Queenstown Lakes District. A major resource management issue before the New Zealand Environment Court is used to illustrate and examine Lefebvre's (1991a) ideas. The chapter consists of three separate but interrelated parts. First, and to set the context, I outline the Queenstown Landscape Decision, a landmark case heard by the Court which dealt with the nature of the Queenstown Lakes District’s landscapes and the appropriateness of development in different areas. Second, I explore the representations of space that guide the environmental management framework in the context of which this decision took place. Key legislative provisions for land use (including tourism) planning are the RMA (1991) and the Local Government Act (LGA) 1974. These are framed by a particular ideology, or representation of space. In the third part, I detail the spatial practices through which such representations of space are secured.

4.1 The Queenstown Landscape Decision

As described in previous chapters, Lefebvre (1991a) conceptualises the production of space as a continual dialectic of representations of space (e.g. architectural and planning discourses), lived spaces (of everyday life) and material spatial practices (e.g. land uses and built environments). Social space under capitalism, to Lefebvre (1991a), is characterised by an abstract quality and is “an expression of certain social relations … produced and secured” (Allen and Pryke 1994, 459). These social relations include producers of space and those who use it. The producers, according to Lefebvre (1991a, 43), “have always acted in accordance with a representation [of space], while the “users passively experienced whatever was imposed on them inasmuch as it was more or less thoroughly inserted into, or justified by, their representational space [lived space]”. The matter for analysis, to Lefebvre (1991a, 44), is to determine “how such manipulation might occur”. He continues: “If
architects (and urban planners) do indeed have a representation of space, whence does it derive? Whose interests are served when it becomes ‘operative’?" (Lefebvre 1991a, 44). And how might users of space resist representations of space that may not be justified by their lived space? These are the questions guiding analysis in this chapter.

As outlined in Chapter One, there are a variety of concerns about the nature of tourism and residential development in the Wakatipu Basin. These concerns centre on the growing impact of tourism and associated residential subdivision development on the local land- and townscape. The Wakatipu Environmental Society (WES), in particular, has been vocal in its opposition to subdivision development in what have been called areas of “outstanding natural landscape” (ONL) (Environment Court (EC) 1999). Court decision C180/99, which came to be known as the Queenstown Landscape Decision, refers to a submission by the WES, which resulted from the notification of the Council's District Plan in 1995 (“the notified plan”) (QLDC 1995) and a revised version thereof in 1998 (“the revised plan”) (QLDC 1998). At issue is that part 4 of the revised plan, which refers to the nature of the landscapes of the district (whether or not they can be classified as ONLs) is much different from part 4 in the notified plan.

The notified plan (QLDC 1995) identified certain areas on planning maps as areas of landscape importance. In these areas, subdivision was to be a non-complying activity under the RMA (1991) (non-complying means a resource consent is required, which could have conditions attached to it). The revised plan (QLDC 1998) dropped all references to these areas of landscape importance, instead designating the land in question as part of a “rural general” zone, where less restrictions on types of allowable uses exist. The WES wanted the original designations reinstated. The QLDC, by contrast, argued that the necessary protection of the landscapes in question could be achieved under section 6 of the RMA which refers to matters of national importance and “the protection of outstanding natural features and landscapes from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development” (RMA 1991, s. 6).47 Rather than designating particular areas as landscapes of particular importance, the Council argued, the landscapes of the whole district should be considered as important as part

47 Refers to a section in an Environment Court decision.
of section 6. Any attempt to identify and map such areas was seen as an unnecessary layer of regulation.

In practice, this means that the vast majority of land in the Queenstown Lakes District outside that land held or managed under the Conservation Act 1987 is currently zoned "rural general" in the revised Plan, with subdivision into less than 20 ha lots designated as a non-complying activity, and residential use a discretionary activity. The latter fact is the point of contention. Discretionary use means that the consent authority (in this case the QLDC) retains authority to grant or to deny consents, or to impose conditions on use. The revised plan made no provision for degrees of protection, i.e. it "gives these landscapes no more value than any other rural areas in New Zealand, when in reality, these landscapes are of national and international importance" (EC 1999, s. 35) (Figure 4.1). At issue is whether rural residential activities are appropriate in parts of the rural general zone (and if so, where), since there is severe pressure to create the rights to permit such activities. Such appropriateness or inappropriateness, defined in the form of rules in the District Plan, designates and organises space and is therefore implicated in its production. It is guided by the representations of space associated with the land use planning framework.

Figure 4.1: The Rural Landscape

(Vineyards near Queenstown New Zealand)
4.2 Representations of Space: The Current Statutory Planning Framework

Land use planning is regulated by two principal acts, the RMA (1991) and the LGA (1974). The RMA governs the sustainable management of natural and physical resources, and the LGA provides the broad governance mandate for local governments, which are also the main implementation agencies of the RMA in relation to land use planning.

4.2.1 The Resource Management Act

As an outcome of a resource management law reform process (see Appendix Two for details on the historical context of the current planning framework), in 1991, New Zealand enacted the RMA. It replaced more than 50 environmental statutes with one single document. Its guiding principle is the notion of sustainable management of natural and physical resources:

1. The purpose of the Act is to promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources.
2. In this Act, 'sustainable management' means 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 wellbeing 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 (RMA 1991, s. 5).

The RMA is said to be one of the world’s first pieces of legislation that tries to enshrine the concept of sustainability in planning law (Page and Thorn 1998). The idea of sustainable development became widely publicised through a World Commission on Environment and Development (WCED) (1987) report entitled Our Common Future (thereafter referred to as the Brundtland Report)\(^{48}\). According to the WCED (1987, cited in Hall and Lew 1998, 3), sustainable development is “development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of

\(^{48}\) Named after Gro Harlem Brundtland, then Parliamentary leader of the Norwegian Labour Party, who was appointed as WCED chair (see Hall and Lew 1998).
future generations to meet their own needs”. The *Brundtland Report*’s fundamental message is that development and conservation are both necessary principles for human activity and should be planned for in an integrated manner, reflecting ecological and human processes and requirements (Butler 1998, 26). The emphasis on the integration of development and conservation is important in the context of this thesis, as it was this principle in particular that is also at the heart of the RMA.

In New Zealand, the RMA’s principal architect, Sir Geoffrey Palmer, was influenced by the Brundtland report, and “sustainable development left its mark on national environmental legislation in Aotearoa New Zealand” (Rixecker 1998, 134-135). The RMA, however, uses the concept of sustainable management, rather than sustainable development. This change of words, from *development* to *management*, is deliberate, because the term development incorporates much broader concepts such as intergenerational inequity, and poverty (Memon and Perkins 1993; Rixecker 1998). The use of *management*, instead, is seen to be in accord with the state’s supposedly neutral role in resource allocation decisions. An extract from the then Minister for the Environment, the Hon Simon Upton’s speech during the third reading of the RMA Bill to Parliament provides a good summary of the Government’s view of the RMA at the time:

> The Government has moved to underscore the shift in focus from planning for activities to regulating their effects .... We run a much more liberal market economy these days. Economic and social outcomes are in the hands of citizens to a much greater extent than they previously have been. The Government’s focus is now externalities – the effects of those activities on the receiving environment – and those effects have too often been ignored (Upton 1991, cited in Rixecker 1998, 126).

The RMA, by contrast to previous legislation (e.g. the *Town and Country Planning Act*) has a focus on effects-based management of environmental resources. It does not aim to control activities (as might have been achieved under previous legislation through zoning and the designation of particular activities appropriate only in particular spaces), but to control their effects. In practice, this means that any activity is allowed anywhere, as long as it has been established (through, for example, environmental impact assessments) that effects are consistent with sustainable management of resources and can be avoided, remedied or mitigated (Birdsong 1998).
An understanding of the Government’s role as restricted to the correction of market failure is part of this: “Environmental planning is seen as being essentially market led, where collective decisions are taken only to cope with consequences of private decisions” (Memon and Perkins 2000, 19). This is carried through in the effects-based nature of the RMA, where consent authorities are required to assess proposed activities in terms of the potential and actual impact their effects might have on others.

The day-to-day environmental administration under the RMA is the responsibility of regions and districts. In terms of the planning process, the RMA provides for a hierarchy of planning instruments at national, regional and local levels. Table 4.1 summarises these:

Table 4.1: The Resource Management Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consent Authority</th>
<th>Policy Statements and Plans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minister for the Environment</td>
<td>National policy statements (optional)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National environmental standards (optional)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Conservation</td>
<td>New Zealand coastal policy statement (mandatory)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resource consents (coastal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Regional Councils</td>
<td>Regional policy statements (mandatory)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regional coastal plans (mandatory)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regional plans (optional)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resource consents (land use, coastal, discharge, water)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74 Territorial Local Authorities (59 district and 15 city councils)49</td>
<td>District and city plans (mandatory)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resource consents (land use, subdivisions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment Court</td>
<td>Adjudicates appeals of resource consents, district plans, regional policy statements and plans</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A number of these planning instruments, among them district plans, are mandatory, whereas others are optional. District plans are prepared by district councils and are the planning instruments most widely used at the local level under the RMA. They contain rules that allow territorial authorities to regulate the use and subdivision of land through providing for permitted, regulated and prohibited uses of land (Birdsong 1998, 13)50 (Figure 4.2). Regional and local level planning instruments have to be

49 Including four territorial authorities (Gisborne, Nelson, Marlborough and Tasman District) that are unitary authorities, that is, they double as regional councils.
50 To some extent, therefore, local authorities still have a role in determining broad land uses. The extent to which land use can be determined, however, is much more focused on the effects of this land use, as assessed on a case by case basis within broad categories (described below).
consistent with those above them in the hierarchy. For example, district plans have to comply with any existing national or regional policy statements.

**Figure 4.2: Regulation of Land Use - Types of Resource Consents**

There are five different types of activities:
1. Permitted activity: allowed without any requirements for resource consent;
2. Controlled activity: applicant is entitled to resource consent, subject to council consideration of particular factors specified in the plan and possible imposition of conditions;
3. Discretionary activity: consent authority retains discretion to grant or deny, or to impose conditions (degree of discretion must be specified in the plan);
4. Non-complying activity: contravenes a rule in a plan but is not listed as ‘prohibited activity’, resource consent may be granted or denied; and

In summary, a particular representation of space characterises environmental planning legislation in New Zealand. This representation is based on the libertarian ideal of minimising planning control of any kind (Boston 1990) and confines the sustainable management of environmental resources to the management of externalities, in the form of the effects of development. As Memon and Perkins (2000, 19) put it, “environmental planning is seen as being essentially market led, where collective decisions are taken only to cope with consequences of private decisions”. In this scenario, public intervention is restricted primarily to the correction of market failure, as the Minister for the Environment’s above reference to a focus on externalities clearly indicates.

Lefebvre (1991a, 43, emphasis in original) argues that representations of space have a practical impact, they “intervene and modify spatial *textures* .... [and] therefore have a substantial role and a specific influence in the production of space”. This influence is highlighted in the spatial practices of the Queenstown Landscape Decision.

**4.3 Spatial Practices: The Queenstown Landscape Decision**

The Queenstown Lakes District contains what many consider to be ‘iconic’ landscapes – that is, visual landscapes of grandeur and beauty that are a resource not only for the tourism industry, Queenstown’s largest employer, but also for a growing number of residents who have moved to the district for lifestyle reasons (Figure 4.3). The District, traditionally mainly a pastoral farming area (particularly that area called
the ‘Wakatipu Basin’, stretching from Frankton to Arrowtown, but excluding Queenstown itself and Lake Wakatipu), along with many other districts in New Zealand, has undergone substantial change to its economic base. The visual landscape is the key to some of these changes. It has attracted visitors and new residents alike, and this has increased the demand for subdivision development. As the Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment (PCE) (2001, 26-27) put it in a recent report, financial returns from farming now cannot compete with returns from subdivision development, and “the visual landscape is the key to attracting this development but is also potentially under threat from it”. Many farmers have opted to subdivide farmland and sections of the community are very concerned that this trend results in damage to the visual landscapes of the District.

Figure 4.3: Outstanding Natural Landscapes
(Queenstown New Zealand)

As stated at the outset, the vast majority of land in the Queenstown Lakes District (outside that land held or managed under the Conservation Act 1987) is currently zoned “rural general” in the District Plan, with subdivision into less than 20 ha lots designated as a non-complying activity, and residential use a discretionary activity (Figure 4.4). The issue of concern in this zone is “whether rural residential activities … are appropriate in parts … and if so, where – since there is severe pressure to create the rights to permit such activities” (EC 2000a, s. 4). As the PCE (2001, 27) explains:

Since October 1998 QLDC has approved 799 new rural allotments, of which approximately 60 percent (480) are within the Wakatipu Basin. Not all of these new allotments have been created and it will be some time before they are built on … In addition, QLDC has zoned approximately 1260 hectares in the Wakatipu Basin for rural living purposes. These zonings provide for up to 1655 new lots as a controlled activity.
Rural residential development, then, has the potential to substantially change the nature of the landscape in question, if all of these rural allotments are created. As a Queenstown resident expressed it:

We have not yet seen the damage that was done to the [Wakatipu] Basin since 1998 — a whole lot of developments were approved, and most of those have yet to be developed. I think the people of the Basin would get a real shock if they knew just how many have already been approved (Wakatipu Basin resident).

Moreover,

it is possible that the existing situation will be exacerbated in the future by the tenure review of land held under the Land Act 1948, particularly in the wider Lake Wakatipu area .... Some land will go to freehold and .... will become subject to the same development pressures as elsewhere, thus removing a form of control currently sustaining the landscapes in these areas (PCE 2001, 27).

The danger is, therefore, that high levels of rural residential subdivision development will damage much of the appeal of the Wakatipu Basin landscapes. The spatial practices associated with the particular representation of space described above (land use management under the RMA in the Wakatipu Basin and as interpreted by the QLDC) do leave a vast proportion of the Basin landscapes designated as appropriate for rural residential development (including subdivision), subject to case by case analysis of effects. Sometimes, and as the respondents’ words indicate, this has privileged private land title over the public good aspects of maintaining overall landscape quality. The New Zealand Environment Court, interestingly, in the
Queenstown case, provided guidance away from this effects-based practice by recommending more stringent management rules and more emphasis on management under a plan that would identify certain areas as appropriate/inappropriate for certain developments. The Court’s representations of space, therefore, point to the need for different spatial practices in the Queenstown context: Much more stringent rules need to be attached to certain landscape areas, and these areas need to be identified on maps.

4.4 Adjudicating Sustainability: The New Zealand Environment Court

The Environment Court, as the primary adjudicator of legal issues that arise under the RMA, “serves as judge, jury, and executioner over most of the fundamental aspects of the RMA regime”. It is also “the most active central institution engaged in shaping the implementation of the RMA” (Birdsong 1998, 1). Except for national policy statements, the Court has the power to render judgement on any aspect or instrument in the planning and resource consent process (Birdsong 1998, 15).

Representations of space under the RMA, therefore, are very much influenced by this central institution, as case law generated by the Environment Court provides guidance to other resource management cases and issues. In the Queenstown case, the Court has been very influential in landscape management issues. In April 2002, for example, 45 appeals to resource consent decisions and/or district plan issues in the Wakatipu Basin were waiting to be heard in the Court (R. Kampman, personal communication, May 24, 2002),

52 which is underresourced and therefore has long waiting times to hear cases. To some developers, this process is a significant obstacle to investment in the Wakatipu Basin. To others, in particular members of concerned community groups, it is a much needed check on development pressures in the Basin.

---

51 Title taken from Birdsong (1998).
52 Personal communication is referenced under the surname in the main reference list.
4.4.1 The Queenstown Landscape Decision

The Queenstown Landscape Decision (EC 1999), a landmark Environment Court case, and related decisions since then (EC 2000a; 2000b; 2001) have argued that appropriate protection of the landscapes of the Wakatipu Basin could not be achieved without drawing at least some boundaries and mapping the landscapes in question. The Court decided that the QLDC, as part of its plan preparation, should have identified the outstanding natural landscapes of the district. Only after identification could the management of effects on these landscapes begin. The Court then set out to identify, via maps, the landscapes in question (points 105-108 in the decision EC 1999, 60-61).

Three basic types of landscapes in the greater Lake Wakatipu area were identified by the Court. These include:

- outstanding natural landscapes and features (district-wide (ONL) and in the Wakatipu Basin (ONLWB)), described in the decision as “romantic landscapes – the mountains and the lakes”;
- visual amenity landscapes (VAL), described as pastoral or Arcadian landscapes; and
- other landscapes (also called other rural landscapes) (ORL) (EC 1999, s. 93).

The Court called particular attention to the Wakatipu Basin:

The Wakatipu Basin is more difficult to manage sustainably. The outstanding natural landscapes and features of the basin differ from most of the other outstanding natural landscapes of the district in that they are more visible from more viewpoints by more people. The scale of the basin is also important .... People in the basin are never more than 2-3 kilometres from an outstanding natural feature or landscape. Consequently, we find that it is generally inappropriate to allow any development for residential, industrial or commercial activities on the outstanding natural landscapes or features (EC 1999, s. 136).

In essence, the Court ruled that the spirit of provision under section 6 of the plan, matters of national importance (which the QLDC had argued was sufficient to ensure protection of the District’s landscapes) was inadequate and needed to be followed in the Queenstown case through much more explicit provisions in the District Plan regarding the specific criteria for activities that may be allowed in outstanding natural

---

53 The previous Council administration tried to do this in 1995, although the methods employed to select suggested “Areas of Landscape Importance” (ALIs) are now generally regarded as inappropriate.
landscapes. In other words, the spatial practices associated with land use planning needed to be much more determinative, the Court argued. In the Wakatipu Basin case, this could be achieved through mapping the landscapes in question and developing rules for appropriate use. In terms of the concrete spatial practices of such a decision, the Court, for the Council, drew lines on topographic maps (see Appendix Seven), and these lines determine the reach of the categories described above.

A clear, strong and powerful representation of space was thus laid down by this Court, which became the primary decision-maker for achieving the purpose of the RMA. Spatial practices are the key to the production of space in the Wakatipu Basin, and these spatial practices, as laid down by the Court, are based on a different representation of space than that held by the Council and its planners. The Court pointed to the need for strategic planning of development, rather than case by case management of effects:

The ... argument that the capacity of the landscape to absorb development should be assessed on a case by case basis does not impress us. While there are dangers in managing subjective matters rather than letting the market determine how the landscape should be developed and altered, those factors are outweighed when the appropriate management is the status quo and there is statutory sanction for the protection of the outstanding natural landscape from inappropriate subdivision and development. Management under a plan may avoid inconsistent decisions, and cumulative deterioration of the sort that has already occurred (EC 1999, s. 137).

As a solution, the Court decided to add to the rules relating to the discretionary activity status of resource consent applications so as to make it clear that there is a presumption that resource consents will be difficult to obtain in the rural general zone because the activity being considered is more likely to be inappropriate than appropriate. According to this change, activities may be discretionary because in or on outstanding natural landscapes and features the relevant activities are inappropriate in almost all locations within the zone, particularly within the Wakatipu Basin or in the inner Upper Clutha area; or because in visual amenity landscapes the relevant activities are inappropriate in many locations; or because in other rural landscapes the relevant activities may be inappropriate because the amenities of neighbours will be significantly affected (EC, 2001, 26).

Without such an addition, the Court argued, it could not rule residential activity (and subdivision) to be discretionary as the other reasons for classifying discretionary activity in the revised plan were seen to be inappropriate. The Court then went on to
set out the assessment criteria in detail and therefore recommended spatial practices, in the form of more stringent rules attached to particular landscape designations, which exhibit a particular representation of space, distinct from that held by the QLDC.

In many ways, this representation of space imposed by an outsider has the opposite effect on the lived spaces of Wakatipu Basin residents from the representations of space associated with QLDC interpretation of the RMA processes. While there is support for this landscape designation from a large number of residents and particularly from the WES, the ruling impacts on the private land title of some residents. For example, some Basin residents, who had intended to subdivide for residential subdivision are now faced with the possibility of living in a designated 'outstanding natural landscape' area, and are therefore not able to subdivide land. The lived space associated with land as private property (and all that this entails in terms of development rights) is therefore impacted on by a representation of space that conceives of the Basin as a public good landscape. In summary, then, both QLDC's and the Court's representations of space have consequences for the lived spaces of Wakatipu Basin residents, albeit different ones. Quite clearly, Lefebvre's (1991a) dialectics of space are a useful analytical tool with which to map the spatial consequences of structural influences.

To Lefebvre (1991a), the reverse should also be true if a dialectical relationship exists. Lived space values ought to be able to assert themselves through spatial practice. The RMA does indeed provide for the integration of such lived space values into planning and resource management processes, through public participation.

4.4.2 Public Participation in Land Use Planning: Representing Lived Spaces?

There are three main mechanisms through which people can participate in resource management planning. The primary mechanism of public participation in land use planning at the TLA level is open standing, which means that any person can make a submission on policy statements in district plans. Plans are developed and then notified, public submissions are invited and heard, and a revised plan is then notified. Those who originally submitted on the notified plan are then able to submit again, and once this second round of submissions is worked through, the plan becomes operative.
In other words, through this particular public participation mechanism, lived space values in the Wakatipu Basin can assert themselves in the planning processes via submissions in the District Plan.

A further mechanism enabling public participation in district planning is through the consent notification processes. This has also proved difficult at times in the Wakatipu Basin.

4.4.2.1 The Politics of Consent Notification

One of the key principles of the RMA is that it should provide mechanisms for public participation, through submissions on resource consents that are publicly notified. There is a presumption in favour of public notification of applications for resource consent. Section 93 of the RMA provides for this: It presumes that all applications will be notified unless they fall within one of the exceptions in Section 94 (Ministry for the Environment (MfE) 1997).

Section 94 has the following exceptions:

1. Applications for controlled activities can be non-notified if:
   (a) written approval has been obtained from every person whom the consent authority believes may be adversely affected by the proposal (section 94 (1) (c)); or
   (b) the relevant plan expressly permits consideration without obtaining written approval (section 94 (1) (b)).
   Note: an application for a subdivision consent need not be notified if the activity is a controlled activity (section 94 (1) (c)).

2. Applications for discretionary activities, where the consent authority has restricted the exercise of its discretion, can be non-notified if the plan expressly permits consideration without the written approval of affected persons (section 94 (1A)).

3. Where an application relates to a discretionary or non-complying activity, notification is not necessary when:
   (a) the consent authority is satisfied that the adverse effect of the proposed activity on the environment will be minor, and
   (b) written approval has been obtained from adversely affected persons, unless the consent authority considers that unreasonable in the circumstances (section 94 (2)). (MfE 1997, 10-11, emphasis in original).

In determining whether an application should be notified or not, consent authorities have the discretion to decide who is and who is not adversely affected. This is based
on a judgement (by the consent authority) as to whether the effects of development will be minor and requires written approval (3(b) above) obtained from all those who the consent authority decides would be adversely affected by development (unless it considers it unreasonable to obtain the written approval of every person). Decisions about these notification/non-notification processes affect public participation: “If an application is not notified, groups or individuals who see themselves as acting 'in the public interest', but who are not directly affected by a proposal, are prevented from participating” (PCE 1996, 26). Non-notified consents do not give the public a right to participate in decision-making, because this should already have been addressed through the development of the District Plan (where the public has a right to submit on non-notification regimes). If a consent is not notified, objectors to proposals have no recourse to the Environment Court (Birdsong 1998, 44). Similarly, a decision by Council not to notify is not subject to appeal to the Court (Morgan 2000).

In practice, and at the national level, the use of Section 94 has led to over 90% of all applications being processed on a non-notified basis (Birdsong 1998; MfE 1997; Morgan 2000). The QLDC, by comparison, notified 9.6% of resource consent applications in 1996/97, 7.7% in 1997/98, only 2.8% in 1998/99 (when the new Council administration came in), and 8.6% in 1999/2000 (MfE 1999/2000, p 43). In 1998/99, this percentage was significantly lower than the national average, while in 1997/98 and in 1999/2000, the percentage was slightly higher than the national average (see Table 4.2).

Table 4.2: Percentage of Resource Consent Applications Notified by QLDC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Average % of resource consent applications notified by the QLDC</th>
<th>Average % of resource consent applications notified by all local authorities54</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1997/98</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998/99</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999/2000</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


As a result, sectors of the Queenstown community feel that they are not being given the chance to participate in the process of deciding on applications for resource

54 With the exception of the MacKenzie District Council for which data were not available for 1997/98.
consents, because a large number of resource consent applications are being granted on a non-notified basis (MfE 1997, 7).

Affected parties, according to the RMA, can be defined as every person who, “in the opinion of the consent authority, may be adversely affected by the granting of the resource consent unless, in the authority's opinion, it is unreasonable in the circumstances to require the obtaining of every such approval” (RMA 1991, s94(1)(c)(ii)), The QLDC’s interpretation of this definition was seen as too narrow in many instances by respondents in Queenstown, particularly when it comes to the visual impact of tourism development:

If you can get consent from all your adjoining owners, one thing they [the Council] don't take into consideration is the greater good or the greater effect it has on not just the adjoining owners but the community as a whole (Queenstown resident).

This is another example of the conflict between lived space values associated with private land ownership and associated development rights, and those lived space values to do with the broader landscape. The QLDC’s practice of resource consent notification restricts public participation to those lived spaces in physical proximity to proposed development (e.g. direct neighbours, which is not entirely inconsistent with practice at the national level). The consent authority, therefore, has the ability to determine what is and what is not a legitimate lived space. For example, by deciding that the right of a landowner to subdivision and development is more important than that of the broader public to landscape and amenity values, a consent authority finds that the lived space of individual landowners (and perhaps their immediate neighbours), in this case, has more validity than that of the broader public. The other side of the same coin, of course, is the view that residential development at the foot of mountain ranges (Figure 4.5), on ridges (Figure 4.6) and on the backdrop to

55 Notwithstanding the opportunities around participation in District Plan development.
56 The data appears to confirm that the 1998 QLDC administration indeed notified less resource consents than the national average, lending some credence to my interviewees’ perceptions.
57 Gleeson (2000, 116) shows how this provision under Section 94 can also support the economic interests of developers: “Section 94 ... has encouraged trading between developers and potentially affected communities .... This particular efficiency provision has the potential, in practice, to undermine the RMA’s much-vaunted ideal of enhanced public participation”. Indeed anecdotal evidence suggests that some developers are actively offering financial incentives in return for signed resource consent agreements by affected neighbours.
Queenstown itself, on Queenstown Hill (Figure 4.7), affects a large number of people, not just adjoining neighbours:

People building on ridges change the whole visual landscape. Queenstown hill is a bit of a blot on the landscape in terms of all the building going up there. Coming into Arrowtown, you've got the scar of all those buildings on ridges, that affects us all (Queenstown resident).

**Figure 4.5: Buy a "Slice" of the Remarkables**

*(Queenstown Arrowtown New Zealand Buyers Guide)*

The third and last mechanism for public participation which is essentially a mechanism of last resort through the Environment Court. The Court’s decision regarding the Wakatipu Basin landscapes and its preference for broader public landscape values at the cost of individual landowners’ lived spaces (although it is possible and likely that these sometimes overlap) ultimately has more enduring influence on the spatial practices in the Wakatipu Basin than any other lived space assertion.

**Figure 4.6: Apartments on Queenstown Hill**

How, then, in Lefebvre’s (1991a) terms, would lived spaces assert themselves in the Queenstown case in ways other than through becoming represented in a plan or through the last resort of Court processes? The

---

58 Here, questions of access to resources constrain the ability of all lived space values to assert themselves (e.g. costs associated with legal representation are a constraint, as is the threat of costs being awarded against parties).
District Plan is a representation of space through which spatial practices are enacted, and in order to influence these spatial practices, lived spaces must become represented in this plan. It is unclear what "emancipatory praxis" (Soja 1996, 22) might look like in the case study context.

Figure 4.7: Sections for Sale on Queenstown Hill

How can emancipatory praxis assert itself in built form and architectural design, in pathways and households, in neighbourhoods and regions without going through the avenues of the District Plan or the Environment Court? What are the concrete strategies with which such assertion might happen? In the Queenstown case, analysis suggests that the most likely pathway is one leading ultimately to representation in another part of the bureaucracy. A further complication in the public participation process is the multiplicity of lived space values.59

4.4.3 Multiple Lived Spaces

All of these difficulties are exacerbated in the Queenstown context because the resource in question, the landscapes of the Basin, are, as the Court determined, more difficult to manage sustainably. These landscapes are very visible from many viewpoints because, to repeat, "people in the basin are never more than 2-3 kilometres from an outstanding natural feature or landscape" (EC 1999, s. 36). There are many conflicting lived space claims on the meaning of these landscapes, then. Because the Wakatipu Basin is an area of outstanding natural landscapes, developments in this landscape tend to have a greater effect on a larger number of people than is allowed for in the resource consent process, as determined by the QLDC. In addition, some

59 Not all lived space values are equally able to assert themselves in a public forum, or through written submission.
lived spaces in the Basin are closely tied to livelihoods dependent on the business of tourism, which, of course, itself depends on the ongoing maintenance of the qualities of the landscape. Tourism developments such as a bungy balloon in Skippers’ Canyon, or a ski access road to the Remarkables Skifield or residential development at the foot of the Remarkable Mountains (Figure 4.4) threaten the sustainability of tourism in the Basin as well as having far-reaching impacts on locals’ sense of place:

You’re got access roads, for instance the Remarkables Road up to the skifield which is a reasonably jagged scar across the landscape that can be seen from afar (Queenstown resident).

And:

And then you’ve got Skippers, you’ve got this beautiful canyon, and they want this brightly coloured hot air bungy balloon with all this whooshing up and down, that’s definitely a change to the landscape that affects a large number of users (Queenstown resident).

A local farmer expressed the irreversible nature of such development:

People have got to be very secondary to the landscape here, the minute you get people dominating the landscape it’s stuff. The Head of the Lake [Glenorchy] is the landscape and you’ve got to be insignificant little blobs in it. The minute you change it by shoving a lot of people very visibly in it, we’ve lost it (Glenorchy resident).

The visibility of rural residential development, then, often affects a larger number of people than the resource consent process, and the consent authority’s interpretation of affected parties, allows for. Such developments then go ahead without any further and wider consultation about their impacts on the landscape as a whole. Beyond an immediate neighbourhood perspective, therefore, there are cumulative effects based on the added impact that one more rural development has on the broader vista (i.e. taking into account a ‘whole of valley’ perspective, for example).

To return to Lefebvre (1991a), a number of distinct types of lived space values exist: First, there are those related to individual landowners’ concerns about what happens to their own or neighbouring properties (including the potential for future subdivision and development). These have been influenced by the recent Environment Court Queenstown Landscape Decision with all its implications for subdivision and
development in designated areas of outstanding natural landscapes. Second, there are those associated with the lived spaces of residents who value the landscape qualities for lifestyle reasons. These Wakatipu Basin residents value the landscape as an intact whole. The spatial practices associated with consent notification and the representations of space guiding the Council’s interpretation of affected parties mean that the lived spaces of a large number of people in the Basin are impacted upon by visible subdivision development that, in some people’s views, breaks up the landscape into ever smaller parcels. Third, there are those lived spaces related to the landscape as a resource for economic wellbeing (including the large number of residents who work in the tourism industry and therefore probably also have an implicit interest in this latter lived space). Far-reaching visual impacts of developments are not only of concern to residents in terms of their lifestyle and visual appreciation, but in terms of the appeal of the Wakatipu Basin as a tourism destination:

These landscapes are what people come here for .... It is the outstanding natural landscapes of the Basin that are its tourism attraction. If you have rural residential development dotted all over the place, then the grandeur of those landscapes is diminished, and people will start to go elsewhere. There is already anecdotal evidence that some Germans, for example, prefer Wanaka to Queenstown because Wanaka is less developed around the lake edge, has more undisturbed vista. I don’t think the Wanaka landscapes are as grandiose as the Queenstown ones, but there you go, already tourists are turned off. It’s a case of biting the hand that feeds you (Queenstown tourism operator).

This directly affects people’s livelihoods and therefore their lived space values. On the one hand, tourism causes the developmental pressures in the Wakatipu Basin, which, on the other hand, “kills the goose that lays the golden eggs”, because these very development pressures have direct ramifications for the iconic significance of the landscapes of the District.

4.5 Interim Summary

In summary, the landscapes of the wider Wakatipu Basin are under severe pressure for subdivision and development, “magnified and intensified in Queenstown and the

---

60 It should be noted here that the 2001 Council administration’s efforts at strategic planning have alleviated such concerns to some extent, and that, although still operative, the revised plan is likely to have variations introduced following a strategic community planning workshop in July 2001.
Wakatipu Basin because of the attraction of the outstanding natural values of the area for tourists and lifestyle dwellers” (PCE 2001, 29). The spatial practices associated with the representation of space exemplified in planning practice under the RMA have produced a space of tension and conflict over what is essentially the nature of property rights.

The central tension in this case is one of conflict between the lived space associated with the rights of private landowners to use and develop land and wider publicly held lived space values as to the nature of the landscapes in question (complicated, of course, by the tourism value of these very landscapes). The PCE (2001) has identified this as a common environmental planning and management issues in peri-urban areas. 61 Land privately owned and valued as private property may, at the same time, be valued by a community as a visual landscape. With this is associated a belief that the public may have a legitimate interest in how private land is used, and that the costs of protection of the environment (as in protection from adverse effects of subdivision and development) should be internalised by the landowners. Landowners, by contrast, expect compensation for conserving public goods through foregoing development rights (PCE 2001). Lefebvre’s (1991a) lived space, therefore, is by no means a clear or uncontested category in a community such as Queenstown, with very divergent and strongly held views. The “right to difference” (Soja 1996, 35) implies a number of “differences”, voiced with different levels of urgency and wielded from different positions of power.

The divergence is essentially centred on whether a landscape is valued as a ‘working’ landscape or one more amenable to aesthetic appreciation. A working landscape is produced and developed in a particular way, through specific spatial practices influenced by a particular representation of space. In Queenstown, groups of residents would like to maintain the land in its working form, that is, as working farmland, its traditional use. Others, whose idea of a working landscape is more related to tourism use, would like to maintain the grandeur of the landscapes in the interests of conserving the Basin’s appeal to international tourism, its economic

---

61 Peri-urban areas are defined as those areas “that are in some form of transition from strictly rural to urban” (PCE 2001, v).
lifeblood. Yet others would like to see the Basin converted to a resource for lifestyle and recreational values, through locking up the existing landscapes and protecting their visual appeal.

The strength and direction of the representations of space associated with the QLDC’s interpretation of the RMA (e.g. effects-based management, as described above) and with the Court’s involvement in decisions about landscape management, has a large impact on these positions of difference, and each is ‘colonised’ by different representations of space. The QLDC’s interpretation of the RMA processes, to some, has colonised the lived space of residential communities concerned about the landscape qualities of the Wakatipu Basin. The Environment Court, by contrast, has done the opposite. It has impacted upon individual property rights in the interests of maintaining the broader lived space values associated with protection of the landscapes. The Court, according to the PCE (2001, 65), “has recently confirmed that the RMA may authorise the limitation of private property rights in the interests of public benefit provided certain preconditions exist”. In other words, the Court’s power of *de novo*62 decision-making gives it the right to make final decisions on any aspect of the planning process and resource consent system. It therefore becomes the primary decision-maker bearing full responsibility for achieving the purpose of the RMA (Birdsong 1998, 23). In the Queenstown case, this has meant that the Court’s particular representation of space is likely to shape spatial practices significantly. These will perhaps come to support one particular lived space more than another, and that is the lived space of those who value the nature of the landscape as an unbroken whole over the interests of individual landowners.

The nature of the development pressures under the current representation of space, however, make it more profitable for individual farmers to subdivide than to maintain

---

62 This enables the Court to review and decide an application, giving it the fundamental task of environmental management. The New Zealand Court of Appeal describes this power thus: “[Its] duty necessarily includes the duty to decide the application. Unlike more general jurisdiction appellate Courts, the Environment Court has no power to remit [a matter] to a council for the latter’s reconsideration and decision. For the Environment Court to do so would be contrary to its ‘duty’. So where under s 290(2) it cancels a decision, the application to the council to which that decision related ceases to have effect. It does not remain extant for fresh or further consideration by the council. And consistently with that role and responsibility any rehearing in the light of new evidence or a change in circumstances subsequent to its decision is by the Environment Court itself (s 294) (EC, cited in Birdsong 1998, 22-23).
their land in farming use. In addition, development to bring additional economic resources into the area (through the attraction of tourism, for example) further increases the values attached to land, thus perpetuating this particular spatial practice. The pressures associated with representations of space are manifold, therefore, and lived space perspectives are divided - making spatial practices contested. This, to Lefebvre (1991a), is typical of the production of space, and a focus on the way in which power is practised in such production is instrumental in understanding the dynamics of the space/place relationship. This is where the strength of Lefebvrian (1991a) dialectics lies.

What is needed, according to the PCE (2001, 65), is for the planning processes to "recognise the value of property rights and seek to integrate the rights of private landowners with the interests of the wider community". Overseas examples show that a variety of techniques (spatial practices) exist that aid such an integration. Transferable development rights or alternative forms of valuing farmland for rating purposes, for example, offer overseas farmers realistic alternatives to selling farmland for residential development through rating land "on its use value rather than its market value, thus removing an incentive to subdivide for residential development" (PCE 2001, 75). In other words, new spatial practices are needed. None of these methods are currently used in New Zealand, however.

The PCE (2001, 86) also points out that the LGA, the second key legislative act involved in the regulation of land use planning at the local level, offers a broader mandate to local government, including the use of non-statutory mechanisms (e.g. strategic plans) along with statutory mechanisms (e.g. annual plans) for planning. This can have a positive effect on planning outcomes. Case study findings of peri-urban area planning, for example, show that in "those areas where strategic planning has been used to try to develop a vision for the future seem to show more success in moving towards sustainable outcomes" (PCE 2001, 86). As I will explain in the remainder of this chapter, the LGA also exhibits a particular representation of space with regard to planning, which emerged from local government reforms in the late 1980s.
4.6 Local Government Reforms

Major changes were introduced to the LGA (1974), the second key legislative provision for land use management at district council level, in 1989, mirroring and extending many central government reforms into the local government sphere. These changes incorporated private sector management techniques into the public sector, bringing with them an increased managerialism. Particular emphasis was placed on separating local government’s governance and management functions, and service delivery from regulation and policy-making (Forgie, Cheyne and McDermott 1999).

Local government reform brought about wide-ranging amalgamations of local authorities: “Thirteen regions, seventy-four local districts, and seven special purpose boards were created to replace 625 existing units of local government” (Bührs and Bartlett 1993, 120). This amalgamation was to achieve economies of scale, and a guiding criterion for amalgamation was the concept of “communities of interest” (former cities, boroughs and county councils) (Wearne 1995, 15). A fundamental part of this reform were changes to local government business practice, including the need to produce annual corporate plans, in order to make local government more accountable to its communities (Wearne 1995).

Instrumental in these changes was the use of the principal/agency model, which seeks to separate policy from service delivery functions and elected representatives from managerial layers, and is a derivative of the 'Chicago School' of economics and law: “There was clearly an official concern that the impacts of traditional 'town and country planning' practice on the achievement of economic efficiency and on the 'competitive neutrality' of private markets were negative insofar as it [sic]was involved in the direction and control of development” (Wearne 1995, 12).

---

63 This refers to the 1989 reforms, where wide-ranging changes to the structure of local government were made. The LGA is currently under review again. Proposed changes include changes in participation mechanisms and in information provision, a clearer purpose for local government and broader empowerment with greater flexibility in undertaking activities. It is also proposed that councils produce long term plans that include an integrated approach to service delivery, revenue and financing decisions (Department of Internal Affairs (DIA) 2001, 3).

64 This has also been called 'agency theory', or the "principle where governments (local or central), as the principals, set broad public objectives and policies that the agents carry out" (Local Government New Zealand (LGNZ) 1998, 57).
A model of corporatisation, aimed at facilitating efficiency and removing barriers to economic development, was implemented at both central and local government levels (manifested in the form of State-Owned Enterprises (SOEs) at central government level and in Local Authority Trading Enterprises (LATEs) at the local level). The underlying assumption was that "there should not be direct political intervention in the management of corporatised agencies" (Weare 1995, 14). A new language, concerned with outcomes, outputs and performance efficiency, entered local authority policy delivery. In addition, and to ensure efficiency in service delivery, local authorities were encouraged to facilitate competitive tendering and the contracting out of services. In essence, the 4th Labour Government, responsible for these changes, "recast government structures by increasing corporatization, and later privatization, of much of the government sector, while devolving considerable responsibility to local authorities, albeit without fiscal support" (Rixecker 1998, 124).

The 1989 amendments to the LGA "brought a new managerialism to local government with its emphasis upon mission statements, strategic planning and financial accountability" (Perkins and Thorns 2000a, 336). Representations of space associated with this model are focused on efficiency and financial accountability. In addition to annual plans and annual reports, the two main statutory planning instruments, since 1996, and following changes to the financial management responsibilities introduced under the Local Government Amendment (No. 3) Act 1996, local authorities are also required to develop long-term financial and public works plans: "The outcome of this was that local authorities focused on the development of strategic [financial] plans as their core operating documents .... based on the application of a 'strict economic allocation model'": (Perkins and Thorns 2000b, 351). These changes require councils to analyse who pays and who benefits from services, and to develop ten-year financial strategies and capital works plans. These new requirements have significantly affected Council planning processes (see Table 4.3).

---

65 Many SOEs and LATEs were later privatised.
Table 4.3: Council Planning Processes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Plan</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual Plan (mandatory under Section 223D LGA)</td>
<td>• identifies intended significant policies and objectives for a financial year;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• gives a full financial budget and non-financial performance indicators on a yearly basis, along with a range of financial information required by the LGA and to do with the Long Term Financial Strategy (e.g. investment policy, borrowing management policy).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Report (mandatory under Section 223D LGA)</td>
<td>• reports back against the financial and non-financial performance of the Council, as indicated in the annual plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-Term Financial Strategy (mandatory under Section 122K LGA and to be prepared at least once every 3 years)</td>
<td>• covers a 10-year period;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• is primarily focused on financial matters (e.g. estimated expenses, cost of debt servicing, proposed sources of funds, and estimated cashflow projections).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


In essence, these changes require district councils to establish financial management policies, including policies on investment, on borrowing management, and on security for loans. Strengthening local accountability and fiscal responsibility were important principles, and long term financial strategies, in particular, were a feature of this change:

The 1996 amendments are highly prescriptive. They provide for public scrutiny and financial accountability through, for example, requiring local authorities to adopt the requirements of the *Financial Reporting Act 1993* and to comply with Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP). It is possible that these statutory requirements will constrain councils from responding to community aspirations (Forgie et al. 1999, 63).

In summary, these changes introduced as part of local government reform had significant implications for democratic politics: “The parallel shift towards greater use of market mechanisms to define and ration services traditionally accorded the status of public goods – through the introduction of user pays pricing, corporatisation, contracting out and the sale of traditional government services – has resulted in a redefinition of ‘citizen’ as ‘consumer’” (Forgie et al. 1999, 11). Furthermore, and

---

66 At least every three years, territorial local authorities must also prepare and adopt a funding policy as part of an annual plan (in other years the current funding policy must be included). This funding policy has three steps:
- allocate costs based on economic principles;
- consider any appropriate modifications based on lawful policies, fairness and equity; and
- select funding tools (LGNZ 1998, 76).

Long-term financial strategies must be aligned to this funding policy.
most important in this context: "The introduction of business management systems into government in the interests of efficiency and accountability has also resulted in more public interest decision-making taking place outside the political arena" (Forgie et al. 1999, 11). The ability of lived spaces to influence council planning processes, therefore, is constrained by the parameters outlined above.

The local government reform changes outlined above introduced more stringent requirements with regard to local government's financial responsibility, but made only passing reference to social and cultural responsibilities. How social and cultural plans and activities (and therefore lived space values) fit into such a planning programme is unclear. Current local authority statutory planning frameworks do not enable local councils to consider financial, social, cultural and environmental goals on equal footing, unless they are willing to utilise non-statutory planning mechanisms such as strategic plans. In essence, decisions can be made in terms of efficiency, but it is unclear how community concerns, such as better social environments and cultural concerns, including amenity and landscape values, can be addressed. In other words, it is unclear how lived space values can become incorporated, and, as under the RMA processes described above, even if they did, they would have to become represented in a plan. How this impacts on tourism planning and development in the Basin in the context of the broader RMA processes already explained, is explored in the remainder of the chapter.

4.7 Spatial Practices: Tourism Planning and Development in Queenstown

Since there is no requirement for the central government to prepare a plan for tourism in New Zealand, there is no mandatory strategic approach to tourism planning. As was described earlier in the chapter, the RMA is the main legislation applied to planning in relation to tourism (Page and Thorns 1998), as physical resources form an important basis of the tourism industry. Not surprisingly, since it is concerned with effects of activities rather than activities themselves, tourism as an activity is not addressed directly in Queenstown's District Plan. There is an opportunity for local authorities, however, to address planning for tourism (and for other activities) through its other planning instruments, both statutory (e.g. annual plans) and non-statutory
(e.g. strategic plans), under the LGA. The Queenstown experience with respect to these mechanisms is detailed below.

4.7.1 Statutory Mechanisms
In Queenstown, tourism as an activity is addressed in the Council’s annual plan under the rubric of *Civic Functions and Tourism Marketing*:

**TOURISM MARKETING**
As the way in which the District is promoted is considered to be one of the key ways to support economic development, the Council provides funds to support tourism promotion and economic development (QLDC 2000/2001).

The plan indicates that a tourism promotion rate is charged on all commercial and accommodation properties, and a proportion of the general rate take is also allocated to tourism marketing. No further aspect of tourism is addressed. In other words, tourism is represented as a destination marketing issue, in support of economic development. Strategic objectives for tourism are subsumed under the rubric of economic goals and include the following:

**ECONOMIC GOALS**

Tourism
The district will contain the premier year-round alpine resort destinations of the South Pacific.
Queenstown will be the hub of a regional tourism product.
Visitors will be from a very wide range of countries to avoid reliance on any one visitor market.
The overall visitor industry in Wanaka and the Wakatipu Basin will be profitable on a sustainable basis throughout the year.
Visitor activities and facilities will be sympathetic to the character of the district.
Local character and history throughout the district will be retained in order to protect the tourism product.
Retention of an airport in the Wakatipu Basin and in Wanaka.
The average length of stay per visitor will be over two days (QLDC 2000/2001).

Thus, strategic objectives for tourism include notions of sustainability and protection of local character, but to a very limited degree (i.e. sustainable profitability and the local character’s importance to the tourism product rather than to the community).
4.7.2 Non-statutory Mechanisms

Under the mandate given to local government, other, non-statutory planning mechanisms can be used. These include such instruments as strategic plans, the designation of special reservation, or the negotiation of conservation covenants. The PCE (2001, 69), in an investigation of four peri-urban areas (Waiheke, Pauatahanui, Wakatipu and Waitakere), determined that "where there has been some strategic planning (Waiheke and Pauatahanui) there are signs of greater success and less conflict and stress for the community. The converse applies in areas where there has been little or no strategic planning (Wakatipu and Waitakere)". In addition, "in areas where the outputs are poorer, there seems to be a tendency to utilise a regulatory approach rather than develop a varied package of mechanisms that includes statutory and non-statutory tools" (PCE 2001, 72-73).

In Queenstown, under the 1995 Council administration, an attempt at strategic planning was made. When the Council changed in 1998, however, this attempt was abandoned and no further strategic planning for tourism or any other activity was attempted. Governance is a critical factor in this. Between 1995 and 1998, the leadership in QLDC changed. As described above, the 1995 administration had a growth management focus, and the notified plan, as well as the attempt at strategic planning, reflected this focus. The 1998 administration, under Mayor Warren Cooper, by contrast, took their electoral mandate as an indication that the community wanted change and, as a consequence, the 1998 revised plan had a different, much less growth-management oriented focus.

4.8 Conclusion

In his conclusion to a report into environmental management and planning in peri-urban areas, the PCE (2001, 91) indicates that evidence from the investigation
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67 Other non-statutory mechanisms include information, education and advocacy, iwi management plans, purchasing of areas, designation of Maori reservations, development of conservation covenants or Queen Elizabeth II covenants, protected private land agreements, Nga Whenua Rahui kawanata (agreements between the Crown and Maori landowners providing for the management of the land), management agreements, heritage covenants, wildlife protection, walkways, and financial assistance to encourage private landowners to protect land for the public benefit (PCE 2001, 112-115).

68 Indeed the focus of the next chapter is one such approach to utilise both statutory and non-statutory planning mechanisms.
“suggests that the current system of environmental management and planning may not be capable of promoting the sustainable development of peri-urban areas”. This finding is borne out in this case study with respect to land use planning in the Queenstown Lakes District. In terms of environmental management, the RMA approaches land use planning on a case by case basis, is focused on effects, and gives little opportunity for growth management. This, in the Queenstown case, and through Council interpretation of the RMA guided by a particular representation of space, has led to spatial practices that have privileged private property rights over the public good associated with the sustainable management of – sometimes outstanding – natural landscapes. In addition, an emphasis on bio-physical environment issues through the RMA has relegated social and economic planning (in which landscape appreciation values might be included) to the margins of plans (Perkins and Thorns 2000):

Whilst the Resource Management Act enables councils to take into account the economic and social effects of resource management policies, there is a widely held view that the RMA has a biophysical bottom line and that physical and environmental issues are to be taken into account ahead of economic and social [issues]. Councils’ annual and strategic plans are, therefore, the main vehicles for them to implement any economic and social objectives (Wearne 1995, 23).

At this level, however, in an environment of increased managerialism, council planning procedures are focused on financial accountability and fiscal responsibility, allowing little room for strategic social and cultural considerations, unless there is the political will to utilise non-statutory planning mechanisms. In the Queenstown case, the 1998 Council administration abandoned previous attempts at utilising strategic planning, as it considered this an unnecessary layer of regulation. This has significance for tourism planning and development, as there is essentially little room for a strategic approach to tourism planning unless this is undertaken as part of Council planning processes. The spatial practices of land use planning, therefore, in the absence of strong tourism planning mechanisms at the level of the Council’s annual and strategic plans, “colonise” (Lefebvre 1991a) the spaces of everyday life, through imposing a particular regime of development management that has concrete - and everyday - consequences for people in the Wakatipu Basin.
The Environment Court involvement in Queenstown landscape management, by contrast, has privileged another set of lived space values over those of the private property rights of individual landowners and developers (including tourism developers). The Court argues for much more stringent rules and landscape designations, in order to protect the outstanding natural qualities of particular Wakatipu Basin landscapes. It recommends spatial practices that make it difficult to subdivide and develop in such landscapes. Land owners, as a result, are faced with a reduced set of choices, which, to some, means projected retirement provision through subdivision is no longer possible. This is, in essence, just another representation of space with spatial practices that impose on, or ‘colonise’ the everyday lived spaces of some residents.

Where does all this leave the lived spaces of everyday life and the assertion of lived space values in the production of space? While “the pre-existence of space conditions the subject’s presence, action and discourse, his [and her] competence and performance”, Lefebvre (1991a, 57) argues, it is also true that the subject’s “presence, action and discourse ... also negate it”. As I have already argued in this and the previous chapter, the ability of lived space to influence representations of space is less easily analysed in the current case study than might at first appear. First, lived space and associated spatial practices are often difficult to identify and categorise because it is unclear how they might do this. This, to some writers, should pose no problem for using Lefebvrian dialectics as an analytical tool as long as a focus on productive spatial processes and the mapping of power relationships in space remains. This, I argued, may be difficult to operationalise, if it is difficult to ascertain – at least to some degree – where lived spaces and representations of space begin and end. Second, the existence of multiple lived spaces (e.g. private landowners values versus the public’s landscape values and their ‘representation’ in QLDC planning processes or the Court’s case law) makes the mapping of power relationships complex.

Lefebvre’s (1991a) dialectics and a focus on the production of space enables analysis to identify and map the spatial practices emanating from representations of space. In other words, it allows analysis to identify and map the spatial consequences of structural influences, how they subvert lived space values and impact on place and agency. The strengths of the theory clearly lie in the ability to identify power
relationships inherent in these spatial practices. For example, it is quite obvious that
the Environment Court’s representations of space have a powerful influence over
lived space values, and even over the representations of space associated with QLDC
interpretation of RMA processes. Mapping the spatial practices in question, therefore,
gives a clear picture of the different positions of power from which different
representations of space operate, but also how they stand vis-à-vis lived space
influence. In the Queenstown case, it appears, lived spaces, if they are to be
influential at all, have to become represented in a plan. Even this, however, has
proved difficult for some, and not all lived space values are equally well resourced to
partake in such processes.

The focus on the dialectical nature of the space/place relationship also enables a
turning away from a concept of structure on representations of space on the one hand
and lived spaces on the other. For example, and as I have shown in this chapter, the
two sometimes overlap or merge. There are multiple representations of space which
stand for particular lived space values. In other words, these representations of space
already represent certain lived space values. The dialectical relationship between
these means that it is not always clear what each has contributed to spatial practices.

A further criticism can be levelled at Lefebvre’s (1991a) writings, though. There is a
lack of guidance as to how precisely lived space might assert itself. Lefebvre (1991a)
gives the examples of poetry and symbolisms, art, literary comment and fantasy as
ways to assert lived space values. He sees lived space embodied in slums and zones
of resistance. What might differentiate art produced by representations of space from
that associated with lived spaces is unclear, however. In other words, what Lefebvre
(1991a) and his followers fail to provide are the criteria by which to judge art (or
other spatial practice) in support of lived space values. For the current case study, it
seems that so far, lived space has had most success in influencing representations of
space through becoming represented itself. In the next chapter, which forms the last
chapter of my inspection of Lefebvrian (1991a) dialectics in terms of its utility as a
tool to analyse the space/place relationship, I investigate the case of Glenorchy, where
strategic planning has been utilised to develop a vision for the future of the town,
including its tourism future, and where lived spaces have become represented in a
community plan.
5 CHAPTER FIVE: LIVED SPACE - FROM QUEENSTOWN TO PARADISE

5.0 Introduction

We look at Queenstown and we say we know we don't want that (Glenorchy resident).

In the previous chapter, I have shown how particular representations of space associated with land use planning and resource management under the RMA (1991) have 'colonised' the lived spaces of the Wakatipu Basin in two distinct ways. Such land use planning, I argued, can lead to case by case management of environmental effects, leaving little scope for broader planning processes. These need to be dealt with at the more general level of the Council's annual plan, as required by the LGA (1974). The LGA, the second key legislative act involved in the regulation of land use planning at the local level, “offers a further and broader mandate to local government, which could be used to mandate activity beyond the RMA aimed at promoting the sustainable development of peri-urban areas” (PCE 2001, 69).

Research has shown that at this level, the additional use of non-statutory along with statutory mechanisms for planning has been found to have a positive effect on planning outcomes. Strategic planning, for example, not a mandatory requirement of the statutory planning process, can enable progress towards more stable consensus on what may and may not be acceptable developments, if used to define a vision for this (PCE 2001). In other words, it can be a tool for lived space negotiations with representations of space, if one accepts that this 'takes place' in the form of representation in a plan.

The Glenorchy community has been active in identifying community goals for development, a process initiated and facilitated at the community level. The result of this has been a strategic plan for Glenorchy community development. In this chapter, I investigate how such a process may contribute to the retention of values associated with lived spaces in the context of the wider processes detailed in previous chapters.
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5.1 The Glenorchy Community

As described in Chapter 3, the Glenorchy community, 45 km from Queenstown by way of scenic road, is a small settlement of 402 people. Situated at the northern end of Lake Wakatipu (the “Head of the Lake”), it is bounded to the west by the Humboldt and to the east by the Richardson Ranges and sits in a river valley at the foot of Mount Earnslaw, where the glacier-fed Dart and Rees Rivers meet Lake Wakatipu. It is surrounded by mountains and some of New Zealand’s most remarkable scenery (Figure 5.1, see also Figure 3.1).

Figure 5.1: From Queenstown to Paradise: Glenorchy

(Glenorchy & Dart River)

As I explained in Chapter 3, the Glenorchy economy is mainly centred on farming but has developed a number of niche tourism operations. In recent years, there has also been an increasing interest in rural residential subdivisions in the area, and, in common with Queenstown and the wider Queenstown Lakes District, there is significant controversy over the management of the outstanding natural landscapes in the area (e.g. where subdivisions might be allowed and how small the lot size should be).
In Glenorchy, representations of space associated with the wider district planning processes are countered by strongly articulated lived spaces. This has become evident in a recent process of community consultation through which a community plan was developed.

5.2 The Glenorchy Community Plan

As I argued in the previous chapter, the lack of use of non-statutory planning mechanisms, in the form of, for example, a strategic plan, was an important factor in the somewhat unsatisfactory planning outcomes with regard to land use (including tourism) management in Queenstown. A case of a community that has proactively joined together to develop a vision for their area is that of the Glenorchy Community Plan ("the Plan"). This Plan was the outcome of a comprehensive local planning exercise, initiated by concerned members of the local community, facilitated by Arrowtown landscape architects, and begun in February 2000 with a two day planning workshop, followed by a further planning workshop in November 2000 and leading ultimately to the development of concept proposals for town development. As described in Chapter Three, the process was initiated because it was felt that, without a development plan for the settlement, Glenorchy would have little influence over the spatial practices of tourism growth and development.

The Glenorchy Community Plan was developed to guide future direction at the Head of the Lake by providing a framework for decision making, planning and development based on the community’s vision. The intention was that this community plan should sit alongside the wider District Plan, that it may lead to variations of the District Plan, and that it should be given appropriate consideration in any decision making affecting the future of Glenorchy. The Plan was initiated to address the Glenorchy community’s strong belief that “Glenorchy and the Head of the Lake have a special identity and character that must be managed if it is going to endure” (BWA 2001, 1) and as a result of concerns:

- that current and potential rapid change may irreversibly alter the essence of what makes Glenorchy – Head of the Lake a special place;
- that Glenorchy – Head of the Lake’s position adjacent to a major tourist destination makes it more vulnerable;
- that the wishes of the local community were not being heard;
• that a community direction needed to be developed so that representatives could present with confidence the wishes and views of the community; and
• that there was a need for both management and development to be well planned, coordinated and focused (BWA 2001, 1).

There was clearly a concern for the lived space values of the community and the threat that tourism development poses to these. The process initiated to address these issues included two workshops during which the community had an opportunity to develop a vision for Glenorchy.

5.2.1 Workshop 1: Determining a Vision for Glenorchy
The first planning workshop was primarily concerned with determining a vision for Glenorchy's future development. It consisted of two planning days in February 2000, the first one focused on developing a vision, the second one on translating this vision into concrete planning issues. In Lefebvrian (1991a) terms, the workshop provided an opportunity to express the values associated with lived spaces and to translate those values into spatial practices that could then be counterposed to the representations of space attached to subdivision and tourism development (described in the previous chapter) that is an issue for the Glenorchy township, along with Queenstown, Wanaka and other areas of the District.

5.2.1.1 Planning Day 1: Imagining Lived Spaces
The aim for the initial workshop was to develop a vision for Glenorchy and the Head of the Lake. In Lefebvrian (1991a) terms, this aim was concerned with determining the values emanating from the lived spaces of everyday life. These values centre on the lived experience of residents and focus on the important attributes that are attached to this lived experience. Discussion questions posed at this initial workshop included:
• what do you see as important values about the area;
• what aspects of the community identity are important;
• how would you describe the spirit of Glenorchy;
• what are your natural and human-made assets;
• what do you see as appropriate or not appropriate industry/commercial ventures;
• what types of amenities and services do you need and/or are existing services adequate;
• how and where should new settlement be accommodated; and
• other themes (Adapted from Glenorchy Community 2000).
In addition, there was opportunity for the community to identify issues, opportunities, threats and barriers that need to be addressed to achieve the vision. Potential issues included land use/RMA issues, rural subdivisions, sewerage/waste disposal, and tourist operations/developments and their locations.

5.2.1.2 Planning Day 2: Spatial Practices

The second planning day looked more specifically at town planning issues and was aimed at refining the vision developed on the first day through an analysis of:

- important natural and human-made elements within the town;
- unique town character and atmosphere;
- what existing themes/apparances could be built on/reinforced;
- ideas for new themes;
- the town boundaries, entrances, density of housing, and new subdivisions;
- extent and location of industrial/commercial areas;
- the treatment of the town centre;
- public spaces and reserves and whether they are needed by the community, their shortcomings and preferred character;
- the significance, history, and presentation of the lake shore, links to town and the future of the wharf structure;
- where and how to retain history and whether or not this is important;
- appropriate building designs;
- appropriateness and locations of tourist operations; and
- town services, including storm water, sewerage, and flooding (Adapted from Glenorchy Community 2000).

The town planning exercise was followed by a survey sent to all Glenorchy ratepayers in May/June 2000. The survey aimed to provide opportunity for all residents and ratepayers to contribute their ideas on the future directions for Glenorchy and the Head of the Lake. In line with the conceptual issues discussed at the earlier planning workshop, the following key topics were addressed in the survey:

- identify the values the community hold in common;
- explore a range of issues related to the future direction of the township and district;
- identify any issues that may impact on the desired direction of the area;
- explore a range of issues specific to Glenorchy township and the lakefront;
- determine preferences for building regulations; and
- determine attitudes toward new developments and rural subdivision (Paterson 2000, 3).
The survey was sent out to all households and 138 were returned, achieving a 40% response rate. Following the workshop and the survey, the landscape architects involved in this town planning exercise (Blakely Wallace Associates of Arrowtown) prepared draft concept plans for the Glenorchy township. These were presented to the public for comment in September.

5.2.2 Workshop 2: The Rural Head of the Lake
In November 2000, a further one day workshop was held that attempted to look specifically at the rural Head of the Lake, incorporating areas wider than the Glenorchy township. Both visions and concrete spatial practices were again part of this. It was felt necessary to hold a further workshop since some of the rural area issues were distinct from Glenorchy township issues and had not been fully addressed in the earlier workshop. In the remainder of the chapter, I will describe the outcomes of both workshops and the survey, and in view of Lefebvre's (1991a) conceptualisation of the production of space. I begin with the Head of the Lake.

5.3 Imagining the Head of the Lake
The Plan identified the community vision for the future direction of the Head of the Lake environment as follows:

- the uniqueness of the area - the wilderness scenery and quality of the landscape - to be retained;
- the heritage and culture of the area to be retained and interpreted;
- any decision-making to be based upon maintaining or enhancing the unique and special character of the area;
- the peaceful and rural atmosphere of the town to be retained;
- Glenorchy - Head of the Lake - to be an end destination;
- the peaceful and rural atmosphere of the town to be retained; and
- the community to be involved in decision making regarding development of the area (BWA 2001, p 10).

The vision for the community was similar:

- the community wishes to retain the following values: being safe, caring, self reliant, working together, welcoming to visitors and having residents who respect the environment;
- a stable community that lives and works in the area; and
- a self supporting community with a diverse age structure (BWA 2001, 10).
It was important to workshop participants that these characteristics of the community be preserved, that community integrity be maintained, and that development be compatible. Lived spaces, as expressed in this visioning exercise, therefore revolve around the need to retain the uniqueness and heritage of the area and to ensure the community’s ongoing involvement in the key decisions about their township and surrounding areas. Ten outcomes needed to achieve this vision were identified, including necessary goals and actions, often in the form of spatial practices (Figure 5.2).

**Figure 5.2: Outcomes Needed to Achieve the Head of the Lake Vision**

1. Community responsibility and ownership for the future of the Glenorchy area
2. A safe community with services and facilities for all ages
3. Rural - wilderness environment and landscape to remain unspoiled
4. Glenorchy - Head of the Lake to be an end destination
5. Activities to be low impact and ‘fit’ and respect the environment
6. Widespread awareness of Glenorchy - Head of the Lake values, the vision and direction
7. There is an awareness of and respect for rural activities
8. Recreation opportunities and access to be retained
9. Heritage and culture of the Glenorchy - Head of the Lake area retained and protected
10. Control of weeds, pests and flooding (BWA 2001, 11).

**5.4 Spatial Practices for the Head of the Lake**

A number of key actions for the Head of the Lake were identified under the 10 outcomes identified in Figure 5.2. Many of these related to specific spatial practices needed to translate the visions and imagination of lived space into reality. Examples of these are detailed in Figure 5.3:

**Figure 5.3: Spatial Practices for the Head of the Lake**

- oppose all developments, businesses, tourists and other operations/schemes which will impact on the vision or values of Glenorchy - Head of the Lake and are not both low impact on, and sensitive to, the environment;
- retain the productive farm landscape and make rural subdivision and other rural developments inconspicuous in the visual landscape (through the development of criteria for assessment of rural subdivision and development applications, and through seeking the adoption by the QLDC of landscape analysis outcomes, criteria and guidelines);
- no satellite townships or large developments, no exotic timber plantations on the hills;
- encourage owner presence for any approved subdivision and discourage absentee ownership;
- promote the Head of the Lake as an end destination and a gateway to the wilderness;
• maintain low impact land uses compatible with vision and values (e.g. niche and ‘eco’ tourism activities, creative craft) – encourage this through the development of guidelines and a code of conduct with criteria for the assessment of business activities;
• the promotion of environmentally friendly farm practices;
• maintain farming as legitimate land use and develop a rural code of conduct that encourages visitors to respect farming;
• identify and map different zones in the interests of managing recreational conflict;
• identify and map heritage sites, secure public access to historic sites and develop heritage trails; and
• control broom, gorse and other weed spread which has the potential to change the landscape (Adapted from BWA 2001, 12-26).

Lived space values, therefore, were easily translated into spatial practices, albeit, once again, represented in a plan.

5.5 Imagining Glenorchy Town

For Glenorchy itself, lived space values and visions were similar to those for the Head of the Lake but included strong notions of ‘frontier lifestyles’:

• peaceful, low key rural character;
• dominance of surrounding landscape and the power of the mountains;
• ‘last frontier’ type character of the town;
• a walking, riding town; and
• an active/busy town (Adapted from BWA 2001, 38 and BWA 2000, 2-25).

5.6 Spatial Practices for Glenorchy Town

A number of key strategies for different areas in and around the township (e.g. Peninsula Recreation Reserve, Campbelltown, Lower Buckler Burn, Glenorchy Lagoon, approach to Glenorchy town and rural outskirts) were suggested, all in keeping with the wider vision identified above and all essentially spatial practices intended to achieve the vision identified above:

• wide streets with spacious verges;
• horses grazing and ridden within the town;
• low key type houses on large sections;
• mix of residential and vacant sections;
• grass verges and drainage swales;
• lack of kerb and channelling;
• proximity to the lake, riverbed and wetland and associated open space;
• views out to the mountains, lake, etc.;
• dominance of the surrounding mountains and rural landscape; and
• open space within the town (BWA 2001, 38).
The particular spatial practice depicted in Figure 5.4 is an important one in that it illustrates the link between materiality and imagination in the production of space. Using grass verges rather than kerb and channel is an important spatial practice for Glenorchy residents, as it emphasises the pioneering culture of the village, its rural character and undeveloped nature. The concrete intrusion of kerb and channel is seen to be entirely inconsistent with such values.

Other key spatial practice strategies for the town drawn from lived space values include the wish to mix commercial with residential property and to retain control over appearances: “Residential use within the commercial area gives a relaxed, rural feel to a town and is consistent with the community’s wish to keep the rural and ‘last frontier’ town atmosphere” (BWA 2001, 55). In the commercial areas, this should be achieved through the following spatial practices:

- buildings to be domestic in scale and rural in style and character;
- gable, hip or lean to roof style, roof pitch a minimum 25 degree;
- building materials to be predominantly timber, stone and corrugated iron;
- verandahs are appropriate;
- signage that reflects rural character – no neon signs;
- simple, non-fussy landscape treatment;
- lighting design that reflects rural character; and
- 5 metre boundary setback (Adapted from BWA 2001, 73).

In residential areas, spatial practices to achieve a “Glenorchy Style” include:

- large section sizes;
- wide grass verges;
- narrow sealed carriageway for roads;
- storm-water removal by grass, gravel or stone lined channel, no concrete kerb and channelling;
- planned open space/parkland within new residential area;
- street parking on grass or gravel shoulders;
• street lighting to reflect rural character; and
• use rural style fences and materials (Adapted from BWA 2001, 75).

Key ideas behind this include an attempt to avoid urbanisation and domestication of the landscape through inappropriate subdivision and development and the wish to retain the natural undeveloped character of the town and its backdrop (Figure 5.5). It is clearly the wish of the Glenorchy community to assert particular lived spaces through particular spatial practices.

Figure 5.5: Glenorchy
(BWA 2001)

5.6.1 Community Survey
The community survey that followed the workshops identified a number of additional community values, including a community that is associated with being safe, welcoming to visitors, with residents who respect the environment, are self-reliant, caring and work together (Paterson 2000, 6). It also clearly identified very strong support for community involvement in decision making - 88% of those surveyed indicated a strong feeling that the community needs to be involved in decision making regarding development in the town (Paterson 2000, 11).

With regard to the business environment, 77% of respondents felt that the area needed to attract businesses that have little impact on the environment. Sixty-nine per cent of respondents felt that the area is suited to small niche tourism operators, and 64% agreed that there should be a limit on business/concessions so that the environment does not become dominated with tourism operations (Paterson 2000, 12).
There is a recognition, however, that this may be difficult to achieve. Influencing tourist flows is difficult if not impossible, and using strategies such as high pricing has its own disadvantages. As one local respondent indicated:

Emphasis needs to be on quality tourism. Don’t overkill it with numbers, do less, and I mean that’s probably where Blanket Bay is successful, in that they are popping off one bedroom for 2000 a night and everybody is sweet. But then I struggle with the whole value system of that. And I don’t know that I want to see the community go down that path where one jetboat trip might have been worth 100, now it’s 200, because you’re really going to a much better place than you were for the 100, no one knows that you are going to exactly the same (Glenorchy resident).

And:

There’s a different set of moral values which say you don’t have to pay 2000 dollars to sit out there and watch the stars, do you, at night (Glenorchy resident).

The problem at the heart of this thesis, that of balancing the need for uniqueness with the pressures of globalisation expressed in tourism demand, is identified by locals:

Glenorchy could benefit from finding a balance within keeping its uniqueness and also maximising the tourist dollar. People are afraid of change and growth but if it’s put back into the community to help protect and enhance its character then more dollars could be seen as positive (Paterson 2000, 13).

This uniqueness, connected to ideas of last frontiers and rural character, is based on the historically isolated position of Glenorchy, and its value to tourism promotion: “The more the area develops, the less special it is as an end of the road destination. The Greenstone road\textsuperscript{70} and haphazard subdivisions are the main threats” (Paterson 2000, 22).

Lastly, the survey attempted to identify the value of the planning process to the community. There was a degree of confidence that lived space values could influence tourism space. Sixty-four per cent of respondents felt that they as a community could influence the future direction of the area, and 70% felt that the community could develop a shared vision for the area (Paterson 2000, 29).

\textsuperscript{70} This refers to a number of proposals by members of the local community to develop a road connecting Glenorchy to Milford Sound, a major tourism icon, via the Greenstone Valley, which is of course part of a protected national park. The proposal has been around for several decades and is
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5.7 Tourism Space

A number of lived space values specifically regarding tourism space were identified in the planning exercise. Tourism development, it was determined, should be designed to suit the community rather than the tourist markets. This includes an economic base not dominated by tourism, the community's ability to affect future change, and the maintenance of a balanced community (without a large proportion of seasonal or transient workers). It was important to participants that the Glenorchy community spirit be maintained:

Compared with a place like Queenstown, the main thing is that there is still a really good community spirit here. Even though everybody is diverse, they will come together, they can do that (Glenorchy resident).

Tourism, to some, represents a threat to these community values as the spatial practices associated with tourism force the introduction of more transient elements to a relatively stable community:

When the community focus was on farming or on mining, they are long term occupations [at least scheelite mining is, rather than goldmining], but tourism isn't necessarily, it invites more transient people, and perhaps less committed to a community and a sense of community, and that becomes a big issue. At the end of the day, you get a very wilted community (Glenorchy resident).

Glenorchy, then, is seen as in danger of becoming a 'dormitory town', where people live, but from which they commute daily to Queenstown, for work. This, in some people's view, will weaken the community:

I'd like to see people committed to Glenorchy, I'd like to see people living and working here, rather than just working here, or commuting to Queenstown and living here, you get a much stronger sense of ownership than just living here and working in Queenstown (Glenorchy resident).

And:

We don't want transient persons and the associated social problems - tourist type of activity will bring more transients (Glenorchy resident).

---

revived every now and then, most recently in the form of a proposed gondola through the treetops of the Greenstone Valley to Milford.

71 This is a reasonably likely development. Already, affordable Queenstown worker accommodation is a scarce commodity, due to strong demand for all forms of accommodation, the geography of the Basin and the limited potential for accommodation development. As a result, workers are already bussed in from Cromwell and Lumsden on a daily basis, another spatial practice associated with representations of tourism space.
These transients, and other newcomers including tourist operators and rural subdivision developers, were seen to bring with them a particular lived space, one that may threaten other lived spaces:

There is a new culture of persons - they are expecting to bring their culture from urban areas, expect to be surrounded by a comfort zone (Glenorchy resident).

Naturally, this sort of development does not sit well with people in the community who see the spirit of Glenorchy characterised to some extent by an absence of that comfort zone. As is the case in Queenstown, a degree of diversity of lived space values is evident; and this is likely to grow with increasing development-related migration to Glenorchy. In other words, lived space values, as in Queenstown, will become more divergent.

To some, however, subdivision development and new people moving into the town are not necessarily negative. They may contribute to the continuing viability of the Glenorchy community:

You have to make the community appealing to families, and that's what I think is more what we are trying to achieve. In many respects, those 50 acres for those 4 hectare blocks [a proposed and controversial subdivision] could be the best thing that ever happened to Glenorchy. Because if we get a bulk of people moving in, whether they are holidayers or residents, but if they are prepared to spend that much money to come and live in Glenorchy, they probably got some reasonably firm views on the environment they want (Glenorchy resident).

And:

Our school was saved, I would suggest, by tourism, because we were down to 9 children in our primary school, and we are now up to 42 again. We also run a high school run, which started off with 8 people, and now carries 26 people a day, on route to Queenstown. I mean these are all positive aspects, and they are all jobs that are derived from tourism. They are certainly not from farming, because farming has shrunk over the last decade or two. So yes, I mean even the DoC situation, which has been quite a big employer in Glenorchy, has been enhanced by the amount of people doing the tracks, which is tourism. It's kept the town alive (Glenorchy resident).

5.7.1 Controlling Development

This development, including tourism development, needs to be controlled:

Tourism has done a lot of good, many would say. But it's having a sense of control, and being acknowledged, I think, a public acknowledgment that tourism
isn't necessarily good for us all would make a big difference. Sure, it may be for the greater good, but I don't want it forced down my throat all the time that it's for my personal benefit, because it's not (Glenorchy resident).

The community had firm ideas with regard to the desired nature of tourism developments. Tourism developments should appreciate lived space values:

I don't want to see any large scale tourist development. Instead, I'd like tourist development which appreciates the values of the place. I mean a good one there is Fun Yaks [a local operator, see Figure 3.4 in Chapter Three], they still sound as if they are on their first trip down the river, which means enthusiasm for the place. I think a lot of the tourist operations, the level they are operating at, do have that. So at the moment those tourist activities that are here are quite positive (Glenorchy resident).

And:

What is working well is locally based tourist operations, which the community perceives as being part of here, and it's not an exploitation of someone coming and taking and going (Glenorchy resident).

Characteristics of acceptable tourism development include its small scale and benefits in terms of local employment:

What makes it [tourism development] acceptable is that it's small scale and it employs locals. Blanket Bay has been good in that respect, they've employed locals, where possible, they are reasonably good working conditions. I suspect smaller scale enterprises are better. That's to have a level of local ownership, or perhaps an owner who is resident locally and committed to the community, so that they do feed back to the community (Glenorchy resident).

Certain tourism developments would not be acceptable:

I wouldn't like to see a bloody great cable car shoved up there, or bungy jumping, or fly by wire, or something that's imposed on the landscape (Glenorchy resident).

Some existing ones are perceived to be blots on the landscape:

It [Blanket Bay, a recently built exclusive lodge] is a chunk of America shoved in New Zealand, it's not a New Zealand building at all, it's like a stone fortress down there. It is not at one with the landscape, it's inside/outside, that's very much a building on the landscape (Glenorchy resident).

The emphasis should be on "quality tourism not bulk, not quantity, but long term, low impact tourism" (Glenorchy resident). There is a wish by the community that the pace of change should be slow, that growth should be controlled, particularly with the threat of land prices going up, making land unaffordable for local families:
Growth in the town is important, but not at any cost and not because some large company pushes an idea through. Growth should be limited by the community not QLDC or other similar groups, otherwise Glenorchy will end up like Queenstown, overbuilt, overcrowded. We all want to make a living but not at any cost. It is important to keep the town quiet and laid back as that's what tourists like and come for. We must protect that at all costs (Paterson 2000, 13).

Types of tourism ventures that the community considers appropriate include those that:

- promote the wilderness, magnificent landscape and are small niche tourism activities based on the environment, e.g. nature-based tourism, eco-tourism;
- offer a quality experience rather than depend on vast numbers;
- are suited to FITs (Free Independent Travellers) rather than package tours;
- ‘fit’ with the character of Glenorchy – Head of the Lake;
- reflect the ethos of Glenorchy – Head of the Lake and are environmentally friendly;
- will have a low impact on the environment; and
- are craft-based, i.e. artists, sculpture, pottery (Adapted from BWA 2001, 22).

Wishlists with regard to the type of tourists locals would like to see were also common during the workshop:

A lot of people will say halt international tourists, we may be better to focus on the domestic market. As a community we may be better off with an environmentally greener, slower type of tourism (Glenorchy resident).

And:

We'd like FITs [free independent travellers], but the type who appreciates rather than the one who comes and doesn't know what to do, the uneducated visitor, ignorant of local rules and knowledge, such as the need to close gates, or the arrogance to think that they have a right to be there, on farmland (Glenorchy resident).72

Again, however, there is a recognition that with commercial development come major changes in terms of the types of tourism and the types of tourists attracted to Glenorchy:

The jetboats, what 6, 10 years ago, that was the first real commercial tourism focus, it was a definite change of focus. The people who came before that, who wanted to get out into the hills, they didn't have much money, but the tourists associated with this jetboating, that's a different story (Glenorchy resident).

72 Educating tourists about lived space values may be an important part in this.
The community envisages limits to tourism and business concessions in order to not dominate the environment through these activities. In order to address this, the plan suggests the development of guidelines and criteria for assessing tourism, business and recreation ventures (Figure 5.6), many of which translate into concrete spatial practices.

**Figure 5.6: Criteria for the Assessment of Tourist/Recreation Ventures in Glenorchy - Head of the Lake**

Appropriate tourism developments:

- focus on the experience of the environment i.e. nature-based or on creative craft-based tourism;
- have a low impact on the environment;
- offer enjoyment of (without impacting on or detracting from) the special character and qualities of Glenorchy and the Head of the Lake;
- depend on quality of experience rather than large numbers of tourists;
- target FITs rather than mass bus tourism;
- when viewed collectively with existing operations, ventures will not dominate the environment/experience of the environment or compromise the special character and qualities;
- operators are willing and able to develop a relationship with the community of Glenorchy, respect community values and work within community codes of practice;
- are long-term activities that fit the above criteria;
- tourist/business venture infrastructure needs to respond to the uniqueness of the Head of the Lake i.e. the types of operations used in other centres may not be appropriate in Glenorchy – Head of the Lake (Adapted from BWA 2001, 23).

**5.8 Conclusion**

In Glenorchy, we can see "counter-representations that form (through the imaginary) another space, another topology of social relationships, different from, though fundamentally linked to, that determined by physical space" (Chivallon 2001, 478). The Glenorchy community has been very proactive in imagining future lived spaces. Through a community planning process, options for development have been imagined and ‘concretised’ (or not, as it turns out, given the resistance to concrete kerbs and channels) in spatial practices for the future shape of Glenorchy. Lived spaces, therefore, have been ‘given space’ in the future development of Glenorchy. Since this research was undertaken, the Glenorchy community planning process has indeed achieved variations to the Queenstown Lakes District Plan in areas where its designations and/or rules differed from the preferred expressions of Glenorchy values.  

---

73 Many local Glenorchy residents feel that such a variation to the District Plan would not have been possible under the previous Council administration.
In the larger picture of tourism development in the Wakatipu Basin, such lived spaces, because they were developed as part of a consensual process, involving all interested members of the community, have the potential to effect what Lefebvre (1991a, 356-366) calls differential space. Such differential space arises from contradictions of space: “It is not, therefore, as though one had global (or conceived) space to one side and fragmented (or directly experienced) space to the other .... For space is whole and broken, global and fractured, at one and the same time. Just as it is at once conceived, perceived and directly lived”. The contradiction, to Lefebvre (1991a, 359-360), is one between “a consumption of space which produces surplus value and one which produces only enjoyment – and is therefore ‘unproductive’. It is a clash, in other words, between capitalist ‘utilizers’ and community ‘users’”. Differences arise out of such contradictions “on the margins of the homogenized realm ... in the form of resistances”. In the Glenorchy case, they have arisen out of a wish not to become “another Queenstown”, with all its attendant implications regarding the production and consumption of tourism space. Such resistances, as I have shown in Chapter 3, have a historical basis in the Glenorchy case, as the town, contra Queenstown, has only recently become easily accessible by road. Important to the assertion of those resistances in the face of tourism space is the community planning process and the action the community is able to take as an outcome of this process. The irony, of course, as explained above, is that lived space values can only be asserted through becoming represented in a plan. Only by ‘speaking the language’ of current representations of space can lived spaces achieve a degree of influence. As a result, it is likely to be more difficult to distinguish between spatial practices associated with lived spaces and those associated with representations of space if the former have to speak the language of the latter.

Broader district planning processes must also be able to accommodate such community plans, and local authorities must be supportive of such efforts. Glenorchy’s right to difference (from Queenstown) does not come easily, as the promotion of the qualities of lived space is set against the powerful forces of abstract space associated with tourism development:

The ‘right to difference’ is a formal designation for something that may be achieved through practical action, through effective struggle – namely, concrete
differences. The right to difference implies no entitlements that do not have to be bitterly fought for. This is a 'right' whose only justification lies in its content; it is thus diametrically opposed to the right of property, which is given validity by its local and legal form as the basic code of relationship under the capitalist mode of production (Lefebvre 1991a, 396-397).

It remains to be seen, therefore, whether the Glenorchy community planning process has the outcome that the community envisaged at the outset. Much of the potential success of this exercise will depend on the continuing openness of district planning processes to the values of lived space and on the ongoing ability of the community to resource a process whereby lived space values can be asserted. As Merrifield (1993, 527, emphasis in original) argues, place “has the resources and capacity to transform space, but it cannot to so from the vantage point of place alone: political practices must thus be organized around place in form yet extend in substance to embrace space”. Glenorchy, as it begins to consider implementation of its plan's strategies, actions and guidelines, will continue to struggle for the right to be different.
SECTION TWO: CONCLUSION

What, then, is the conclusion for this part of the thesis? As I stated in Chapter Two, Lefebvre’s (1991a) *The Production of Space* is one of two theories which I investigate in terms of their value to the conceptualisation of the structure-agency relationship. Lefebvre (1991a), 365) calls for a theory “which would transcend representational space [lived space] on the one hand and representations of space on the other, and which would be able properly to articulate contradictions”. Such a theory, I suggested in Chapter Two, should enable analysis to transcend a focus on rootedness, dwelling and things in space to an understanding of space as productive process. It should permit a focus on spatial contradictions as the expression of conflict between “socio-political interests and forces”, as “it is only in space that such conflicts come effectively into play, and in doing they become contradictions of space” (Lefebvre 1991a, 365, emphasis in original).

The particular problems evidenced in the case studies of tourism place making in Queenstown and Glenorchy, as I stated in Chapter One, are centred on the ability of tourism places to maintain local uniqueness in the face of global pressures. How, I asked, can tourism communities maintain local characteristics when the pressures of tourism and associated development erode difference and distinction through commodification? I stated in Chapter Two that Lefebvre’s (1991a) *The Production of Space*, through its concern with the productive processes inherent in space and its conceptualisation of the dialectical interplay of representations of space, spatial practices and lived space, is a potentially powerful tool for analysis of such problems. Because it focuses on space as productive process and suggests a role for emancipatory material spatial practices in the creation of differential space, it enables analysis that focuses on space as a means of control, domination and power. Such control, however, in part escapes from those who use it, and, to Lefebvre (1991a), lived space has the ability to constitute difference.

Following these lines of analysis, then, in Chapter 3, I described the histories of space that have influenced contemporary space in Queenstown and Glenorchy. Despite similar beginnings, both settlements have differed in the extent to which tourism has
been inscribed in their geographies, both materially and in the imagination. This is due in part, I argued, to the different histories of space involved, though it is sometimes unclear, in historical perspective, what distinguishes lived space expressions from those emergent from representations of space. In Chapter 4, I focused on the contemporary representations of space that have influenced tourism planning and development in the wider Wakatipu Basin. These representations of space, I argued, have, on the one hand, led to spatial practices that have privileged private property rights over the public good associated with the sustainable management of – sometimes outstanding – natural landscapes. They have employed what Lefebvre (1991a, 317) would call a classical rationality “responsible for fragmentation, break-up and separation under the umbrella of a bureaucratically decreed unity”. In the Queenstown case, this has been achieved through the designation of the rural general zone, with all its attendant implications in terms of the breaking up of the landscape into residential units. On the other hand, and more recently, through Environment Court decisions, other lived spaces have gained more prominence, through rulings that have privileged values associated with the unbrokenness of outstanding natural landscapes. This has meant that lived space values associated with private land ownership have lost out in these areas, because subdivision for residential development is no longer possible. Chapter Four’s contribution, in the context of an examination of the utility of Lefebvre’s (1991a) dialectics, is the identification of the multiplicity of lived spaces and representations of space and their spatiality in the context of broader power relationships. The chapter also shows how lived spaces, in order to assert themselves, have to become represented in a plan.

In Chapter 5, finally, I investigated the potential for difference created through the expression of lived space. In Glenorchy, I argued, difference has been created through a community planning exercise which asserted lived space values, both materially and in the imagination, in the form of a plan that will guide development and that can be used to counter unwelcome development associated with tourism in the wider Wakatipu Basin. The irony of this process, once again, is that lived space values, in order to assert themselves, have to become represented in a plan, have to speak the language of contemporary planning discourse. The right to difference (from Queenstown), I argued, does not come easily, as the promotion of the qualities of
lived space is set against the powerful forces of abstract space associated with tourism development. How and to what extent this process will be successful long term is something that has yet to be shown.

Lefebvrian dialectics aim to enable us to “transcend representational space [lived space] on the one hand and representations of space on the other and ... to properly articulate contradictions” (Lefebvre 1991a, 365). The theory’s strengths undoubtedly lie in its ability to incorporate systemic processes and power relationships into an understanding of space as productive process. By focusing on the productive process, Lefebvrian dialectics provides an examination of space that enables analysis to transcend the question of who has power to one focusing on the practices involved in achieving certain ends. This productive process, Lefebvre (1991a) argues, should also enable lived spaces, or the concrete spaces of everyday life, to establish a countermovement of resistance to the colonisation of everyday life through abstract space. This, to Lefebvre, can be achieved through critical practice that influences not only representations of space but also acts “as a material productive force with respect to spatial practices” (Harvey 1989a, 219).

Both case studies have shown that, for lived space to become a material productive force, it has to be represented, has to become part of a plan. In other words, it has to speak the language of contemporary representations of space. What both case studies have also shown is that Lefebvre’s (1991a) notion of lived space influencing representations of space is perhaps a simplistic notion in the face of a large number of widely differing lived spaces, with different access to power and resources. Their individual influence on representations of space will very much depend upon how they come together in a joint effort at influencing spatial practice (as they have done in Glenorchy). This brings me to the last, and most important, critique of Lefebvrian (1991a) dialectics.

What Lefebvre (1991a) is essentially silent about are the concrete processes by which critical practice may achieve influence. It is unclear in the current case study how critical practice might assert itself spatially. While Lefebvre (1991a, 404) calls for an analysis that “must imply and explain a genesis and constitute a critique of those institutions ... that have transformed the space under consideration”, this analysis
does not set forth the criteria with which to enact difference. One can easily describe and analyse what might be lived space values and characteristics (and I have done so in this and the previous two chapters); and it is possible - albeit more difficult - to identify and analyse some spatial practices emanating from these. It is unclear how, in the context of a large number of widely differing lived spaces in the Wakatipu Basin, and in the face of strong and influential representations of space, these lived spaces could actually become influential. How can lived spaces best counterbalance representations of space? The case studies examined up to this point appear to have shown that this is only possible through becoming represented in another part of the bureaucracy, in other words, through asserting lived space in the language of representations of space. How can lived space escape this drift into the represented spaces of formal community planning, which Lefebvre (1991a, 49) describes as “differences ... forced into the symbolic forms of an art that is itself abstract [as in abstract space]”. And should it escape this? Perhaps it is precisely through becoming able to articulate lived spaces in terms of representation of space that lived space will be successful at asserting its values (e.g. subversion from within). Or perhaps it is through the development of a set of criteria for its assertion. Lefebvre (1991a) is essentially silent on this. It is the task of Habermassian critical theory, the focus of the next section, to set forth such criteria.
6 CHAPTER SIX: CRITICAL THEORY AND CRITICAL REGIONALISM

6.0 Introduction

In the chapters to here, I have examined one attempt at explaining the structure-agency dialectic: That of Lefebvrian production of space. Chapter 2 set out Lefebvre's (1991a) theory, and in Chapters 3, 4 and 5, I showed by means of case studies how Lefebvrian dialectics can be used as an analytical tool to help explain the nature of the place making process in the Queenstown tourism context.

In this chapter, I examine the second theoretical attempt at explaining the structure-agency dialectic: that of critical theory and particularly its spatial applications in the form of critical regionalism (this chapter) and communicative planning theory (explained in Chapter Nine). The critical theory of Jürgen Habermas, in particular, superficially appears to have similarities to Lefebvrian dialectics. Both theories explain the structure-agency dialectic, one in terms of the imposition of abstract space on lived space, the other in terms of the colonisation of the lifeworld by the system. But here the similarities end. Habermassian critical theory is a normative theory, that is, it transcends analysis and, as I will explain below, attempts to present an 'ideal other' with which to critique current practice, in the interests of emancipation and enlightenment.

I examine the idea of critical regionalism, a spatial application of critical theory, as an ideal model for the design of place making in pursuit of critical enlightenment in the Habermassian sense. I begin by tracing the development of critical regionalist perspectives, and by placing these perspectives in their wider philosophical context. Following this, I briefly review critical design strategies, because they set out - as an ideal type - critical regionalist ways of thinking about place. I conclude by suggesting that critical regionalism can be used as a counterfactual ideal with which to critique the place making practice in the Queenstown case study, in pursuit of transcending
analysis to some sort of normative ideal, if not partial solution, to the challenges of understanding the structure-agency relationship in place making.

6.1 Critical Theory

Critical theory is primarily concerned with the connections between human agency and social structure under capitalism, "which can be recognized and restructured through a process of critical reflection" (Johnston et al. 2000, 129). Critical theory is counterposed to scientific theory along three important dimensions: First, scientific theories are aimed at instrumental use and the manipulation of the external world. Critical theories, by contrast, are aimed at emancipation and enlightenment through the revelation of hidden coercion, thus enabling subjects to determine their true interests. Second, scientific theories objectify, that is, they distinguish between the theory and the object or objects to which the theory refers (e.g. Newton's theory is not itself a particle in motion). Critical theories, by contrast, rely on reflection and self-reference and are therefore always part of the object-domain they describe and always partly about themselves. Third, scientific theories require empirical confirmation through observation and experiment, whereas critical theories have to go through a more complicated process of evaluation and the demonstration of reflective acceptability (Geuss 1981, 55-56). In short, "scientific theories are cognitively acceptable if they are empirically accurate and are confirmed by observation and experiment; critical theories are acceptable if they are empirically accurate and if their 'objects', the agents to whom they are addressed, would freely agree to them" (Geuss 1981, 79).

A critical ingredient of critical theory is its normative nature and the way it anticipates its own use: "A critical theory ... 'demands' that they [agents in the society] will adopt the critical theory, i.e. it asserts that these agents 'ought' to adopt and act on the critical theory where the 'ought' is the 'ought' of rationality" (Geuss 1981, 57). A critical theory, then, "does not merely give information about how it would be rational for agents to act if they had certain interests; it claims to inform them about what interests it is rational for them to have" (Geuss 1981, 58, emphasis in original). The

74 This does not mean that it predicts the adoption, it merely anticipates.
The critical theory of the 'Frankfurt School', associated with interwar German philosophers such as Horkheimer, Adorno, Marcuse, and later Jürgen Habermas, has two main different views about reflection and epistemic principles. Adorno, most often associated with the first view, utilises a contextualist or historicist approach,
where agents’ “epistemic principles and their standards of reflective acceptability just vary historically ... are just part of our tradition” (Geuss 1981, 63). Critical theories in this vein can never lay claim to any absolute or transcendental status, “they are effective and ‘true’ only relative to this particular historical situation and are bound to be superseded” (Geuss 1981, 63). The second view is most often associated with the critical theory of Jürgen Habermas, particularly his later work.

Although Habermas was writing in the Frankfurt School tradition which originated in the interwar period, his approach to critical theory is seen as a distinctive school of thought, through, in particular, his theory of communicative action. Habermas rejects the contextualist view described above in favour of a “transcendental argument” (Geuss 1981, 65) based on the transcendence of systems of distorted communication which entails engagement in critical reflection and criticism (Held 1980). The argument goes something like this:

To be a human agent ... is to participate at least potentially in a speech community, and to be something we can recognize as a human agent means to participate at least potentially in our speech community. But no agent can be even potentially a member of a speech community who cannot recognize the difference between true and false statements in some general way or who doesn’t in some way know what it means for a statement to be true. But what it means for a statement to be true is that it would be the one on which all agents would agree if they were to discuss all of human experience in absolutely free and uncoerced circumstances for an indefinite period of time. So anyone we recognize as a human agent will thereby stand committed to agreeing with us on what to count as conditions of “free and uncoerced discussion,” and hence must in some way share our views on what are conditions of freedom and what conditions of coercion (Geuss 1981, 65, emphasis in original).

In this view, it is not only history or tradition which can determine epistemic principles for a set of agents, but, instead, there is some consensus theory of truth that rests in communicative action. Communicative action (also called symbolic interaction), as opposed to instrumental (or purposive-rational) action, is exemplified in Habermas’ “ideal speech” situation (see Chapter Nine). The possibility of argumentation in consensual action is at the heart of this situation: Human beings are said to anticipate free communication aimed at mutual understanding, compelled only

The name is somewhat of a misnomer, however, since much of the work was undertaken in the interwar years in exile in the USA.
by the force of the better argument (Alway 1995). This, to Habermas, is central to resistance to the colonisation of the lifeworld by the system.

6.2 The Lifeworld, the System and the Dialectical Link

Both paradigms, life-world and system, are important. The problem is to demonstrate their interconnection (Habermas 1976, 4).

In common with Lefebvre (1991a), Habermas is concerned with the interconnection of the system and the lifeworld. Indeed, there are parallels between Habermas’ concept of the colonisation of the lifeworld and Lefebvre’s (1991a) idea of the superimposition of abstract space over the lived space of everyday life. As explained in Chapter 2, a central concept of Lefebvre’s (1991a) *The Production of Space* is the idea that, under capitalism, abstract space colonises the lived space of everyday life through effecting particular land uses or built environments and particular spatial discourses expressed in planning, maps and spatial imagery. To Habermas, by way of comparison, the colonisation of the lifeworld is achieved through the penetration of economic and political systems into its symbolic reproduction, based on rationalisation (Alway 1995, 114). Both theories use similar terminology to conceptualise the structure-agency relationship, and both conceive of their interrelationship as a dialectical process.

That is where the similarities end, however. Lefebvre (1991a) makes the dialectical link in terms of the production of space, both materially and in the imagination. Habermas, by contrast, focuses on communicative rationality as the dialectical link. Moreover, as Gregory (1997, 205) writes:

Habermas sees this process [of the colonisation of the lifeworld by the system] as a deformation of the project of modernity, which his own work is intended to reclaim, and his argumentation sketches and reconstructive histories are designed to expose the inner logics and circuit diagrams of a transcendent process of rationalization. In contrast, Lefebvre strongly implies that the triumph of functionalist reason is inscribed within the very heart of capitalist modernity.
Habermas stresses the importance of a social learning process “in morality and forms of social integration” (Outhwaite 1996, 14) based on communicative relationships. In Habermas’s (1996, 227, original emphasis) own words:

Whereas Marx localized the learning processes important for evolution in the dimension of objectivating thought - of technical and organization knowledge, of instrumental and strategic action, in short, of productive forces - there are good reasons meanwhile for assuming that learning processes also take place in the dimension of moral insight, practical knowledge, communicative action, and the consensual regulation of action conflicts - learning processes that are deposited in more mature forms of social integration, in new productive relations, and that in turn first make possible the introduction of new productive forces. The rationality structures that find expression in world-views, moral representations, and identity formations, that become practically effective in social movements and are finally embodied in institutional systems, thereby gain a strategically important position from a theoretical point of view.

A major concern of Habermas has been the intrusion of instrumental reason into many areas of social life. This, to him, has led to a tendency to define practical problems as technical issues (Held 1980). In his The Theory of Communicative Action (1987, 327),\(^{77}\) Habermas argues that “the lifeworld is assimilated to juridified\(^{78}\), formally organized domains of action and simultaneously cut off from the influx of an intact cultural tradition” through systems processes of bureaucratisation and juridification. These lead to a “one-sided rationalization of everyday communication” which, in turn, leads to the “dying out of vital traditions” (Habermas 1987, 327). The colonisation of the lifeworld occurs because

the modern subsystems of economy and state which reproduce themselves materially, interfere in the process of the symbolic reproduction of daily life. This means that the processes of mediation between system and lifeworld are perceived under imperatives of money and power in functional terms exclusive of communicative interaction. Hence, exclusive of means of communicative interaction, the symbolic reproduction of the lifeworld occurs in functional terms under the rubrics of money and power (Rasmussen 1990, 47).

These subsystems “become more and more complex as a consequence of capitalist growth, and penetrate ever deeper into the symbolic reproduction of the lifeworld” (Habermas 1987, 367).

---

\(^{77}\) *Theory des kommunikativen Handelns* (1981, two volumes).

\(^{78}\) Juridification (*Verrechtlichung*) refers to the increase in legal regulations in the welfare state and the effects this has on the subjects of this regulation (White 1995, 112).
The lifeworld thus becomes colonised “when traditional forms of life are so far dismantled that the structural components of the lifeworld (culture, society, and personality) have been differentiated to a great extent” (Habermas 1996a, 296).

Money and power penetrate into lifeworld areas which require symbolic reproduction and thus remain dependent on communicative action. Everyday practice is then rationalised in such a one-sided fashion that a specialist-utilitarian style of life is established, in which consumerism and the individualism of property, achievement motivation and competition are predominant, and moral-practical elements have been forced out (Brand 1990, 60).

This rationalisation of the lifeworld (through the differentiation of culture, society, and personality) leads to the uncoupling of the lifeworld and the system which Ingram (1987, 127) describes thus:

Once positions of power are detached from the kinship system and annexed to political office ... legislative, judicial, and executive functions become organized formally. The state now requires ideological justification for a monopoly of power, the legitimate exercise of which is increasingly detached from the natural prestige of birth and is enhanced by distribution of political and economic privileges to loyal office-holders. The uncoupling of lifeworld and system is complete under a regime of formal law.

It is Habermas’ desire to re-couple “the economic-administrative system with the democratic ethos of the lifeworld” (Ingram 1987, 116). The way to do this, to Habermas, is “the anticipation of an ideal form of discourse which can be used as a normative standard for a critique of distorted communication” (Held 1980, 256).

The critical ingredient in Habermas’ critical theory, therefore, is expressed by him in the form of rules for an ideal speech context, set up as an ideal other, a counterfactual ideal, with which to critique the processes of this dialectic (e.g. the conditions of discourse). As spheres of action and “institutional systems become uncoupled from world views ... the continued vitality of traditions comes to depend increasingly on the willingness of individuals to criticize and innovate” (Alway 1995, 114). Indeed,

---

79 Again, there are similarities here between Habermas’ concept of the uncoupling of the lifeworld and the system and Lefebvre’s (1991a) ideas regarding the transition from absolute to abstract space, which leads to the separation of production from reproduction.
the potential for agency and social change, for Habermas, relies on language use aimed at communicative, self-reflective and cooperative understanding. This is a "process (goal) of unconstrained discursive will formation" (Alway 1995, 127), that is, Habermas' critical theory does not aim for revolutionary transformation of society. Instead,

the practical intent of the theory of communicative action is ... the creation and protection of spaces within which a radical concept of democracy, as a process of shared learning carried out in and through communicative action, might flourish (Alway 1995, 127).

6.3 Spatial Applications of Critical Theory

Critical theory, according to Dryzek (1990, 30-32) is concerned less with disclosure of what is right than with exposure of what is wrong. He distinguishes between three variants: First, there is what he calls pure critique, the ideal speech situation, where, through a process of critical argument, people meet and talk under conditions of free and open discourse. The ideal speech requires that "discourse proceeds among actors with equivalent degrees of communicative competence, ... free from domination, self-deception, and strategic interaction .... Hence any consensus attained in this situation ... has a rational quality" (Dryzek 1990, 36). It is an ideal, and "like any utopia, ... its primary value is critical" (Dryzek 1990, 37).

The ideal speech situation is a critical 'other' set up to criticise present approaches, a "counterfactual ideal" (Dryzek 1990, 34), to be counterpoised to actual situations for the purposes of anticipation (of the ideal). It is an 'ideal type' in the Weberian sense, a mental construct that attempts to isolate the theoretically most salient features of the subject under investigation, employed as a yardstick with which to analyse empirical reality (Saunders 1986; Johnston et al. 2000). White (1995, 104) argues that such a counterfactual ideal is, in fact, best thought of as "simply providing procedural criteria concerning how disputes might be resolved or the conditions under which consensus might be achieved rather than any theory of human needs or principles for individual conduct and social arrangements". The second kind of critical theory is more indirect,

80 Dryzek (1995, 109) describes this critique as pure "inasmuch as it criticizes real-world practices to the extent they fall short of the ideal".
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and "uses the precepts of communicative rationality (or some other ideal) to construct a counterfactual but contextually specific discourse, which can then be deployed in the criticism of reality" (Dryzek 1990, 31). The difference between this and the first kind of critical theory is the latter's sensitivity to context.

To Dryzek (1990, 31), a third approach is needed, because the first two, he argues, are ineffectual: "The theorists have criticized the world, but the point is to change it .... Critique that intimates no feasible or attainable alternative fails in its practical task". Dryzek (1990, 32) suggests constructive critique, that is, "critical theory [that] becomes progressively less alienated and more able to relate to the concerns of ordinary political agents". It is thus an addition to, rather than a departure from, traditional critical theory. Such critique is concerned more with effecting change: "Constructive critique goes further in intimating institutional and structural alternatives to some problematic status quo" (Dryzek 1995, 109).

Critical regionalism and communicative planning theory, both spatial applications of critical theory, are two such attempts to operationalise critique in a practical sense. I selected these two spatial applications of critical theory (rather than Habermas' critical theory itself) for this reason, and because they can be employed in a spatial context, to analyse a spatial problem (i.e. the space/place relationship). The first, critical regionalism, is the focus of the remainder of this chapter. The second, communicative planning theory, operationalises critical theory in the planning realm and is the focus of Chapter Nine.

6.4 Critical Regionalism

Critical regionalism, according to Nesbitt (1996, 483), "means to challenge both the world as it is and underlying world views". The term was coined by Alexander Tzonis and Liane Lefaivre (1981; 1987; 1996) and is most commonly used in

---

81 There is always a danger, Dryzek (1995, 110) admits, that critique becomes a purely academic project, and that critical theory's potential engagement with social science applications (e.g. policy analysis) are doomed: "State administrators are probably not going to be too keen on a style of analysis that thoroughly questions their own authority and competence, and this perhaps explains why critical policy analysis is mostly a project of academics, rather than policy analysts actually working in public bureaucracies".

82 Drawing on work by Lewis Mumford.
architecture, where its most well known protagonist, Kenneth Frampton (1983a; 1983b; 1988; 1996a; 1996b), uses it to “self-consciously ... deconstruct universal modernisms in terms of values and images which are locally cultivated” (Frampton 1983b, 148).

Critical regionalism is critical in two senses: First, it aims to resist “the appropriation of a way of life and a bond of human relations by alien economic and power interests” (Tzonis and Lefaivre 1981, cited in Colquhoun 1997, 18). Second, it aims to create “resistance against the merely nostalgic return of the past by removing regional elements from their natural contexts so as to defamiliarize” (Colquhoun 1997, 18). Critical regionalism, therefore, conceptualises the structure-agency relationship in a spatial context in a dialectical manner, aimed at emancipation and enlightenment. It is “self-examining, self-questioning, self-evaluating, ... confrontational with regard to the world ... [but also] itself” (Tzonis and Lefaivre 1996, 488). This is expressed as follows in an architectural design sense:

An essential characteristic of critical regionalist buildings is that they are critical in two senses then. In addition to providing contrasting images to the anomic, atopic, misanthropic ways of a large number of current mainstream projects constructed worldwide, they raise questions in the mind of the viewer about the legitimacy of the very regionalist tradition to which they belong (Tzonis and Lefaivre 1996, 488).

Critical regionalism, therefore, contains the typical components of a critical theory.

Its nature is normative, and it anticipates its own use. It is aimed at emancipation and

---

83 Geuss (1981, 76, emphasis in original) describes the three main constituent parts of a typical critical theory:

a) A part which shows that a transition from the present state of society (the ‘initial state’ of the process of emancipation) to some proposed final state is ‘objectively’ or ‘theoretically’ possible, i.e. which shows:
   (1) that the proposed final state is inherently possible i.e. that given the present level of development of the forces of production it is possible for society to function and reproduce itself in this proposed state;
   (2) that it is possible to transform the present state into the proposed final state (by means of specified institutional or other changes).

b) A part which shows that the transition from the present state to the proposed final state is ‘practically necessary’, i.e. that
   (1) the present state is one of reflectively unacceptable frustration, bondage, and illusion, i.e. (a) the present social arrangements cause pain, suffering, and frustration; (b) the agents in the society only accept the present arrangements and the suffering they entail because they hold a particular world-picture; (c) that world-picture is not reflectively acceptable to the agents, i.e. it is one they acquired only because they were in conditions of coercion;
enlightenment through the revelation of hidden coercion (through raising questions about the legitimacy of the regionalism in question), to enable subjects to determine their true interests (e.g. what might be truly critical regionalism).

Critical regionalism resists the shaping of places through commodity flows by “invoking ... vernacular traditions and icons of place” (Harvey 1996, 306). The impact of universalisms can be mediated “with elements derived indirectly from the peculiarities of a particular place” (Frampton 1983a, 21). In a design context, for example, critical regionalism might employ techniques such as juxtaposition, decontextualisation and repetition to draw attention to what might otherwise be habitually observed objects. To Bowring and Swaffield (1999, 4), Frampton’s use of the term “indirectly” (as in elements derived indirectly from places) is key to an understanding of the critical dimension, as “it signals the need for an abstraction and transformation of elements of regional identity, rather than their naïve and romantic reproduction”. While Frampton (1996b, 471) has been critical of casting communities as victims of capitalism, he makes a point of rejecting reactionary versions of place:

The term 'Critical Regionalism' is not intended to denote the vernacular as this was once spontaneously produced by the combined interaction of climate, culture, myth and craft, but .... as something which has ... to be self-consciously cultivated.

This self-conscious cultivation of the 'gap' between the universal and the particular in a dialectical manner is where the strength of this approach lies. Critical regionalism asserts regions as analytical and critical of the universalising forces of capitalism through "self-consciously promot[ing] characteristics that they themselves wish to see promoted” (Kirby 1997, 50). This is most clearly put by Weston (1991, 31):

Critical regionalism seeks to moderate the standardisation encouraged by modern technology without discard ing its liberating potential. It is critical of our mass culture and seeks to foster a mosaic of regional sub-cultures. It promotes place and occasion rather than abstractions of space and time, and seeks an architecture

---

(2) the proposed final state will be one which will lack the illusion and unnecessary coercion and frustration of the present state; the proposed final state will be one in which it will be easier for the agents to realize their true interests.

c) A part which asserts that the transition from the present state to the proposed final state can come about only if the agents adopt the critical theory as their 'self-consciousness' and act on it.
which is responsive to local geography and climate and which emphasises the
tectonic over the scenographic.

As an architectural design tool, critical regionalism critiques the shortfalls of other
forms of regionalism (see Appendix Five) and presents an ideal other. Using critical
theoretical elements, it therefore challenges "not only the established actual world as
confrontational works do, but the very legitimacy of the possible world views which
interpret it in the mind ... [to] 'dissolve the objective illusion' in architecture" (Tzonis
and Lefaivre 1996, 488). This is achieved through the technique of defamiliarisation,
or strangemaking, which aims "to make people aware of the condition of their lives
by making a world in which familiar things are reset in a slightly different order"
(Tzonis and Lefaivre 1987, 277).

6.4.1 Defamiliarisation as a Critical Design Strategy
The two fundamental principles of critical regionalism, according to Samuels (2000,
90) are "an acceptance of external (universal) influences in the articulation of regional
character" and the "use of defamiliarity rather than familiarity to express regional
character":

The 'familiar' approach uses the romanticism of historic styles to introduce a
recognisable feeling to the building, whereas the 'critical' or 'defamiliar' approach
uses elements related to the place in an unfamiliar, strange way (Samuels 2000,
31).

Critical regionalist notions of defamiliarisation are not new. Aristotle is credited with
using the notion of strange (in the context of idiom) to indicate "removing from [the]
ordinary" (Tzonis and Lefaivre 1987, 277). Defamiliarisation has also been used in
literary theory and draws on, for instance, both Tolstoy's notion of ostraneniye
(strangemaking or estrangement), the "pricking [of] the conscience" (Tzonis and
Lefaivre 1987, 277), and Brecht's use of the Verfremdungseffekt (strangemaking or
estrangement) in his epic theatre. Russian literary theoretician Victor Shklovsky
argues that the role of a literary text is to transform ordinary language into poetic
form, through what he calls "roughened form" (Shklovsky, cited in Tzonis and
Lefaivre 1987, 276), such as used by Tolstoy in his poetry:
Poetry has a much more complex social function [than mechanistic concepts of the relation between the formal and the social needs of a work of art], one that acknowledges the presence of conflict in society, the need for social criticism, and the social engagement of poetry as a critical activity (Tzonis and Lefaivre 1987, 277).

The passage used to illustrate this is the following one from Tolstoy's diaries (Shklovsky 1965, cited in Tzonis and Lefaivre 1987, 277):

I was cleaning a room and, meandering about, approached the divan and couldn't remember whether or not I had dusted it. Since these movements are habitual and unconscious, I could not remember and felt that it was impossible to remember .... If some conscious person had been watching, then the fact could be established. If, however, no one was looking, or looking unconsciously, if the whole complex lives of many people go on unconsciously, then such lives are as if they had never been.

This passage is indicative of what is at the heart of the idea of defamiliarisation: To make the familiar unfamiliar through showing things in a slightly different light, so that its perception does not become habitual and unreflective.

**Figure 6.1: Arrowtown Library**
(McLeod and Ross 1999, 46)

The objective of this defamiliarisation is to prick the conscience in order to avoid "the sentimental or backwards-looking approach of the previous 'romantic' regionalism". (Samuels 2000, 31; see also Appendix Five). The library building in Arrowtown in the Queenstown Lakes District is a good example of the defamiliarisation technique. Design elements drawn from the typical colonial era New Zealand villa design are defamiliarised through the unusual use of skylights in the building, which call attention to the building.
Figure 6.1). In Frampton’s sense, they make the familiar unfamiliar, thereby drawing attention to it.

Such defamiliarisation is achieved through a number of techniques, depending on the discipline. Bowring and Swaffield (1999, 5-7), for example, suggest a number of defamiliarisation strategies used in a landscape architecture context, including scale manipulation, repetition, extraction, exhibition, and narrative. Bowring (2000) categorises defamiliarisation techniques into two distinct groups, juxtaposition and transformation. Such notions are also familiar from tourism advertising, which has similarly used defamiliarisation techniques such as trick effects, poses and objects to signify particular meanings (Uzzell 1984). It is this latter context that matters for the case study in this thesis. Critical regionalism, as a spatial application of critical theory, can be applied to the design aspect of the tourism place making context, in order to explore the potential for the formation of critical versions of place identity. It appears to go one stage beyond Lefebvre’s (1991a) suggestion for critical spatial practices originating from lived space by suggesting actual criteria for such a critical dimension.

In summary, then, critical regionalist design strategies are a “contemporary response to place, learning from the past and relating to what has gone before, but not attempting to romantically reproduce it” (Samuels 2000, 32). With this, critical regionalism “tries to forge … identity … in opposition to … the alien occupation army of technocracy and bureaucracy imposing the illegitimate rule of anomie” (Tzonis and Lefaivre 1996, 489).

6.4.2 Related Concepts

Beyond architecture, writers such as Dirlik (1993), Wilson (1993; 2000) and Wilson and Dirlik (1995) have utilised critical regionalist thought. Wilson (2000), for example, in Reimagining the American Pacific, examines emergent localisms in the context of Hawaiian tourism identity. To Wilson (2000, 154), critical regionalism “would resist, through local styles and tones, the threat of technocratic modernization and Western ‘reason’ to folk cultures and indigenous traditions or regional locales”. This is not to be a “neoromantic retreat … into boyhood sentiment or those hazy Southern charms of pastoral submission”, however, but the development of “counterlanguages and counterforms to the ‘logic’ of high-tech and capital-intensive
life forms ... self-consciously inflected as regional style without succumbing to
decoration, fraud, or decadence” (Wilson 2000, 154).

In anthropology, Stanley (1998), argues that the understanding of the concept of
kastom84 has changed from one relatively essentialist and static to a view that kastom
“represents people’s notions of what was valuable or important about the past which
can be imported, altered or created for use in the present” (Stanley 1998, 97),
implying critical reflection. In an attempt to rescue endangered cultural practices,
“salvage ethnography” (Clifford and Marcus 1986, 113) sees critical tradition as “a
selective representation of the past, fashioned in the present, responsive to
contemporary priorities and agendas, and politically instrumental” (Linnekin 1992,
251).

The place-making debate in geography also relies on notions of critical place identity.
Massey (1995), Cloke and Perkins (1998a; 1998b) and Schöllmann, Perkins and
Moore (2000), for example, argue that places (and the people who live in them and
thereby shape them) are not simply exposed to universalising forces with a resultant
loss of local identity and meaning. They are actively involved in critical evaluation of
globalising influences and in shaping responses to this. While the term 'critical
regionalism' is not actually used, it is implicit in a view of places not as accurate
reflections of structure but as objects unto themselves, critical reactions to structure.
This intention to “mediate the impact of universal civilization with elements derived
indirectly from the peculiarities of a particular place” (Frampton 1983a, p.21) is a
fundamental strategy of critical regionalism.

6.5 Conclusion

Critical theory, concerned not just with explanation but also with anticipatory politics,
“involves both an explanatory-diagnostic and an anticipatory-utopian moment”
(Benhabibi 1986, cited in Gregory 1993, 88). It is distinct from Lefebvre’s (1991a)
The Production of Space, therefore, through its normative dimension. It poses an
ideal other with which to critique everyday life. Particularly pertinent is what Dryzek

84 A pidgin English version of custom, used, for example, in Vanuatu.
(1990, 32) calls constructive critique, that is, "critical theory [that] becomes progressively less alienated and more able to relate to the concerns of ordinary political agents". In theory, critical regionalism as a spatial application of critical theory explored in this chapter ought to allow progress towards an understanding of the salient criteria of critical versions of constructed place identity and spatial practice. In the context of the case study in this thesis, it ought to allow us to transcend a Lefebvrian-based analysis to arrive at some sort of normative dimension for critical spatial practice.

Lefebvrian (1991a) production of space, as I have argued in Section One of this thesis, gives us an analytical tool with which to map the spatiality of the production of tourism space. It allows us to describe the interactions of lived space values with representations of space through a focus on the spatial practices associated with both. It calls attention to the need to insert a critical dimension into spatial practices drawn from lived space values, in order to defend these values against the forces of dominant and powerful representations of space. What the theory is silent about, I argued, is any normative notion with regard to that critical dimension. What does such a critical spatial practice look like? How is it inscribed in space? Critical regionalism, as an ideal type constructive critique in Dryzek's (1990) sense, may offer a step towards understanding what critical spatial practice might look like in the context of tourism place making in the Queenstown Lakes District.
7 CHAPTER SEVEN: ICONIC QUEENSTOWN

7.0 Introduction

In the previous chapter, I introduced critical regionalism as a spatial application of critical theory. Critical regionalism conceptualises place as progressive, emancipated, and critical of universalising forces associated with globalisms. It emphasises the importance of mediating the impact of globalising forces on places through critical resistance. In architecture, this may take the form of using a combination of normative technique and what Frampton (1983a, 26) calls idiosyncratic form in a project, in an effort to “inscribe architecture with the character of a region and hence to express the place in which the work is situated”. Emphasis is placed on acknowledging regional history and tradition, albeit without falling into the traps of sentimental (and uncritical) revival of the past (avoiding what Massey (1993b) may have called a reactionary sense of place).

This chapter begins the first of two attempts at applying critical regionalism, as an ideal model, to the place-making context in tourism. As I argued in the previous chapter, because it is a critical theory and therefore has a normative dimension, critical regionalism should allow for a step beyond Lefebvrian analysis of the structure-agency dialectic exemplified in the current case study of tourism place making in Queenstown. Critical theories are concerned with anticipatory politics as well as explanation. Critical regionalism, therefore, not only conceptualises the structure-agency relationship in a place-making context, but offers criteria that can guide lifeworlds towards emancipation.

Queenstown as a tourism resort is represented as a certain kind of place, in the wider context of the promotion of New Zealand as an international tourism destination. I investigate the scales and content of this representation, and then in Chapter Eight, I analyse the institutional context within which this representation is situated in light of the potential applicability of the critical model to place promotional and representational purposes. Several dimensions – and some resultant tensions - in the
development of critical versions of constructed place identity can be identified and are outlined in this chapter and the next. The first, and most prominent, tension centres on the "adventure tourism capital of the world" label that is sometimes attached to Queenstown’s promotional image.

7.1 The “Adventure Tourism Capital of the World”

A degree of controversy over one particular label attached to the Queenstown tourism experience emerged in the local Queenstown newspaper Mountain Scene in February 2000. At the centre of this was the QLDC’s decision to adopt the “Queenstown-Adventure Capital of the World” slogan as a letterhead label. This sat uncomfortably with a number of industry commentators who felt that this use of the adventure logo was too one-sided and potentially off-putting to other market segments: “Our competitive advantage is we can deliver to all visitors - there is certainly a market coming to Queenstown not looking for adventure” (Quickfall, cited in Thomas and Chandler 2000, 1, emphasis in original).

A balanced promotional picture was called for, instead: “Certain markets are attracted by serene beauty. Are we going to alienate those people by virtue of trying to adopt a brand they may not be comfortable with?” (Matthews, cited in Thomas and Chandler 2000, 2). Rather than relying on one particular label, Queenstown should be “a region that caters for all tastes of an alpine recreational environment - passive sightseeing through to high adventure” (Smolenski, cited in Thomas and Chandler 2000, 2).

Attempts to cater for all tastes, of course, have been part of Queenstown’s tourism promotion throughout its history as a tourism resort. The adventure tourism aspect, however, has historically been an important part of Queenstown’s tourism product, building on the town’s goldrush history and the pioneering spirit of its founders.

85 I use the term “critical versions of constructed place identity” (or variations of this, e.g. critical dimensions of constructed local identity) in preference to Frampton’s (1983a; 1983b) use of the term critical regionalism, for two main reasons. First, the focus of analysis is critical place identity at different levels, including the locale, the region, and the nation. Second, and more importantly, critical regionalism, of course, is precisely a reaction against the sort of image making that is prominent in tourism place promotion. I cannot therefore argue for a critical regionalism in tourism promotion. I do, however, argue for a critical dimension to be introduced to constructed place identity.
As outlined in Chapter 3, in its early tourism days, Queenstown could rely on its scenic grandeur but, as tourism developed, adventure tourism and adventure attractions and activities development became more prominent. Today, adventure tourism is a dominant component of Queenstown’s tourism portfolio (Figure 7.1).

**Figure 7.1: Adventure Tourism in Queenstown**
*Do it all Queenstown Combos*

At the level of the local residential community, a significant degree of displeasure over the portrayal of Queenstown as an adventure tourism resort is evident. People feel that the prominence of the adventure tourism label has a number of significant impacts. First, it attracts a certain type of tourist to the town: “The emphasis on adventure has meant that you get more and more people who are looking for that sort of fast, thrill-seeking activity, not necessarily to actually do it, but often just spectators” (Queenstown resident).

Second, this has the potential to alienate the types of visitors that some feel are balancing an existing overemphasis on adventure activities. Adventure tourism, members of the local community feel, has more of an impact than other types of tourism: “We are at risk of turning it into just that, an adventure place, a place where you go and do your bungy jumps, your jetboats, your rafting, and you can kind of trash the place in the process, without much appreciation” (Queenstown resident).

Third, a proliferation of adventure tourism activities in scenic places is seen to impact on the value of those places. Referring to the installation of a bungy balloon into historic Skippers Canyon (Figure 7.2), a Queenstown resident put it thus: “Someone jumping out of a balloon at 200 metres and screaming their head off when they jump, who needs it. This is an old historic area that people go in with the expectation of going into a rural historic area, not a circus”.
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DQ, the RTO charged with the marketing of Queenstown, recognises the need to balance the promotional picture. Its business plan for the year 2000 points out the need to transcend reliance on single sector brands such as the adventure capital brand: Destination Queenstown is constitutionally bound to generically market Queenstown The Destination. It must be impartial and represent the interests of the entire industry - big and small operator, alike. This is very relevant to branding issues as it means Destination Queenstown must not limit its marketing to any singular sector. For example, The Adventure Capital of the World may well be a true, fashionable and even effective brand but the reality is, even in its widest sense, this description leaves out a great many other values that are integral to the Queenstown experience (DQ 2000/2001, 15, emphasis in original).

Furthermore, visitor activity data at the national level shows quite clearly that adventure tourism activities such as bungy jumping and jetboating are engaged in by a relatively small minority of tourists. Bungy jumping, for example, in the year ended June 2001, attracted 100,555 visitors, just over 6% of the total visitors. Jetboating, which is offered in many more places, attracted 11.25% of total visitors (Tourism New Zealand (TNZ) 2002a). Both activities, of course, attract spectator activity, and many more visitors simply watch.

Adventure tourism, despite all this, forms a strong part of Queenstown tourism. At the level of appearances, at least, one could be forgiven for thinking that it is even a dominant part of Queenstown’s tourism product. Clearly, there is a significant level of controversy over this, both at the level of the local residential community, and

---

86 The most popular activities were eating out/restaurants, general sightseeing, shopping, and walking in cities.
among industry operators. This chapter investigates the potential for the development of critical versions of place identity in the place promotional context.

7.2 The Dilemma of Place Promotion: How to Preserve Critical Versions of Place Identity

Place promotional imagery can play an important part in shaping place identity. Just as individual identities can be constructed in social contexts, "so too are cultural and national identities constructed from the representations which certain people both inside and outside our culture produce for us" (O'Connor 1993, 68). Representations for the purposes of tourism place promotion can be especially powerful because the application of modern marketing techniques to tourism destination promotion is designed to attract people to particular places for special times of the year characterised by an emphasis on leisure, relaxation and fun, therefore portraying often powerfully positive imagery.

In the tourism context, destinations attempt to differentiate themselves through promoting unique features and self-images in an increasingly competitive global tourism environment. As Urry (1990, 9) puts it:

Each centre of attraction involves complex processes of production in order that regular, meaningful and profitable tourist gazes can be generated and sustained. Such gazes cannot be left to chance. People have to learn how, when and where to 'gaze'. Clear markers have to be provided.

This direction of the tourist gaze through promotion can involve significant reshaping of places, both at the level of representation or image-making, but also through accompanying physical changes to fit a particular image that often reflects a highly selective reality (Holcomb 1994). The place promotional literature often argues that such imagery is strikingly similar everywhere (e.g. Holcomb 1994; Pearce 1988) or that places are "created in the image of tourism" (Hughes 1992, 32), leading to a geography of imagination that selectively constructs landscapes, history and people.

This geography of imagination, however, increasingly has to create highly recognisable and distinctive place imagery that sets one destination apart from another in a competitive global environment. As Urry (1990, 39) puts it: "Every potential
object of the tourist gaze now has to compete internationally, and this has led to substantial changes in just what is extraordinary and what is internationally ordinary”.

In the domain of tourism advertising and place promotion, therefore, the concept of image has become important, and attempts to discover the relationship between destination image promotion and traveller satisfaction or actual travel behaviour are frequent in the literature (see, for example, Ahmed 1991; Chon 1990; 1992; Echtner and Ritchie 1991; Crompton 1978; Gartner 1986; Goodrich 1978; Haati 1986; Hunt 1975; Jenkins 1999; MacKay and Fesenmaier 1997; Manfredo, Bright and Haas 1992; Phelps 1986; Pizam 1978; Schroeder 1996; Seaton 1996; Walmsley and Young 1998).

Such a line of argument poses a first problem for the potential of critical versions of place identity in tourism representation. The main intended recipients of tourism imagery are tourists. Tourism representations, therefore, will try to sell tourists 'images of themselves', often based on their own culture-specific meanings. For example, destinational marketing is usually customised to different market segments and therefore differs according to the perceived target market. Commercial imperatives associated with tourism may force the development of certain place meanings. The question that needs to be asked in this context is how is it possible to “hold on to that notion of spatial difference, of uniqueness, even of rootedness ... without it being reactionary” (Massey 1993b, 64)? In the context of such demands on tourism destinations, it has become increasingly important to develop and maintain critical versions of place identity.

Critical regionalism suggests a number of ideal parameters for the development of a critical version of place identity. In essence, critical regionalism argues against precisely the kind of place identity associated with place promotion and image making. In the context of tourism promotion, therefore, critical regionalism can be drawn on for the introduction of a critical dimension to place making, based on critical regionalist criteria (rather than expecting a truly critical – as in critical of the system – version of place identity). Critical regionalism, if applied to place promotion, can be thought of as an ideal model with which to criticise the content of the place promotional practices employed in the representation of local uniqueness. A critical regionalist frame applied to the place promotional domain in a tourism context would call for more critical representations that resist what Philo and Kearns (1993,
20-21) argue is a widespread emphasis on “the supposedly ‘unique’ qualities of supposedly ‘unique’ places using an actually quite universal vocabulary of ‘better, bigger, more beautiful, more bountiful’”. In addition to presenting a barrier to the very objective of attracting tourists, such emphasis on non-local place meanings may also sit uncomfortably with local understandings of place and may lead to active resistance to such meanings.

A critical approach to constructed place identity, as an ideal type, then, has to remove itself from such universalising tendencies, without regressing “into nostalgic historicism or the glibly decorative” (Frampton 1983a, 20). In other words, it must relate to, and indeed learn from, structural influences, but without being swallowed in the process. It must retain “in the evaluation of the past the critical perspectives afforded by modernity” (Dirlik, forthcoming, cited in Lyons 1997, 4). How – and if – this might be possible in the Queenstown case is the focus of the remainder of this chapter.

7.3 Nationalisms: Iconic Queenstown

Welcome to Queenstown

Blessed with some of the world’s most exquisite geography, Queenstown never fails to amaze travellers with its scope for excitement and fun (TNZ 2002e).

Queenstown is one of the icons of national New Zealand tourism promotion. As the 100% Pure New Zealand website, New Zealand’s official tourism website, proclaims: “Queenstown is the Southern Hemisphere’s premiere four season alpine and lake resort” (TNZ 2002e). The resort is firmly located on the itineraries of many international and domestic tourists.

7.3.1 Queenstown Visitor Trends

For the year ending June 2001, 572,814 international tourists visited the Queenstown Lakes District. International visitor guest nights as a percentage of total visitor guest nights generally exceed domestic guest nights, particularly in winter (Table 7.1).
Table 7.1: International Guest Nights as Percentage of Total Guest Nights

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Domestic Guest Nights</th>
<th>International Guest Nights</th>
<th>International Guest Nights as Percentage of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July 1996</td>
<td>57,050</td>
<td>83,600</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 1997</td>
<td>165,760</td>
<td>121,640</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 1997</td>
<td>54,900</td>
<td>79,390</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 1998</td>
<td>170,580</td>
<td>107,520</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 1998</td>
<td>66,380</td>
<td>79,200</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 1999</td>
<td>214,350</td>
<td>119,950</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 1999</td>
<td>82,580</td>
<td>94,260</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2000</td>
<td>191,760</td>
<td>128,850</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2000</td>
<td>18,180</td>
<td>127,500</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2001</td>
<td>207,790</td>
<td>176,240</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2001</td>
<td>82,110</td>
<td>159,660</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2001</td>
<td>56,130</td>
<td>139,520</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Statistics New Zealand (SNZ) 2001b

Guest nights and occupancy rates have steadily increased over the last few years (Tables 7.1, 7.2 and Figure 7.3). For example, occupancy rates rose from 29.4% in January 1998 to 35% in January 2001. Moreover, the rate of growth of the year on year percentage change of both guest nights and occupancy rates is increasing steadily (Table 7.2).

Figure 7.3: Total Guestnights Queenstown Area (1997-2001) (Wanaka 2020)\(^7\)

\(^7\) All bar charts and graphs with a CivicCorp emblem in this and other chapters were developed by CivicCorp, a Queenstown planning agency, and sourced from the Wanaka 2020 website (http://www.wanaka2020.co.nz).
Table 7.2: Destination Queenstown Guest Nights (Year Ended)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Ended</th>
<th>Occupancy Rate (%)</th>
<th>Change from Previous Year (%)</th>
<th>Guest Nights</th>
<th>Change from Previous Year (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 1998</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1,917,053</td>
<td>-3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 1998</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1,879,990</td>
<td>-5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 1999</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2,001,009</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 1999</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>2,105,192</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2000</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2,192,965</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2000</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2,344,042</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2001</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>2,548,281</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2001</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>2,675,290</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2001</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>2,719,987</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SNZ 2001b

International visitors arrive from a variety of originating countries, the most important of which are Australia, the USA, the UK, and Japan (Table 7.3 and Figure 7.4).

Table 7.3: International Visitors to Queenstown by Market (Year Ended June 2001)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country of Origin</th>
<th>International Visitors (Year Ended Jun-01)</th>
<th>% of Total International Visitors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>106,980</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>15,132</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>21,544</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>19,808</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>75,163</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>6,309</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>14,075</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nordic</td>
<td>12,577</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Central Europe</td>
<td>10,619</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Countries</td>
<td>39,635</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Nth Asia</td>
<td>4,813</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Sth East Asia</td>
<td>2,340</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>18,515</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>13,634</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>4,661</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>17,185</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>6,444</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>74,785</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>86,489</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>550,707</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: TNZ 2001a
Over the last decade, Queenstown has experienced rapid growth in tourism numbers, even when tourism has been in decline in the rest of the country (Table 7.4).

Table 7.4: International Visitor Growth for Queenstown (Year Ended December)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year ended December</th>
<th>Number of international visitors</th>
<th>% change</th>
<th>% change NZ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>433,100</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>480,999</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>538,973</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: D. Kennedy, personal communication, February 2000

International markets are changeable (Table 7.5), and visitor composition has changed since the early 1990s.
Table 7.5: Change in Proportional Share of International Visitor Markets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Market region</th>
<th>% of int. visitors 92/93</th>
<th>% of int. visitors 95/96</th>
<th>% of int. visitors 2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>21% (80,000)</td>
<td>20% (96,000)</td>
<td>20% (105,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North America</td>
<td>21% (77,000)</td>
<td>17% (82,000)</td>
<td>16% (85,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Europe</td>
<td>12% (45,000)</td>
<td>11% (52,000)</td>
<td>8% (40,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK/Nordic</td>
<td>11% (40,000)</td>
<td>11% (51,000)</td>
<td>15% (77,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>15% (57,000)</td>
<td>15% (71,000)</td>
<td>14% (72,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Asia</td>
<td>8% (28,500)</td>
<td>13% (61,000)</td>
<td>data not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East Asia</td>
<td>7% (28,000)</td>
<td>7% (32,000)</td>
<td>data not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5% (20,000)</td>
<td>6% (29,000)</td>
<td>data not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100% (375,500)</strong></td>
<td><strong>100% (474,000)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from NZTB 1998 and TNZ 2000a

7.3.2 Representing Queenstown

As a result of the relatively high international tourist numbers, and because of the nature of its standing as one of the icons of New Zealand tourism promotion, the township and the surrounding landscape of the Wakatipu Basin and the wider Queenstown Lakes District are often used as the showcase for New Zealand tourism in international advertising.

While the main message of TNZ’s current 100% Pure NZ campaign\(^\text{89}\) is one of wilderness, naturalness, purity, and environmental awareness (Figure 7.5), it is also strongly infused with notions of thrill zones (Figure 7.6).

**Figure 7.5: Wilderness - Idyllic, Isolated, Untouched**

Escape into the natural world. Rediscover your passion for life in this land of snow-capped peaks, golden beaches, jewel-like lakes and lush green forests. Breath-taking scenery. Experience true wilderness - from rugged hinterlands shrouded in stately native podocarps, giant ferns and trailing vines to 18,000 kilometres of beautiful coastline. This is nature as it was intended: pure, untouched, energising. Fly to the edges of steaming volcanoes, feel the primal legacy of giant kauri trees, walk on top of crystalline glaciers and venture into mystical and uninhabited fiords (TNZ 2001b).

**Figure 7.6: Thrillzone - Push Yourself to the Limit**

Feel the exhilaration. Venture into the New Zealand wilderness and discover the ultimate outdoor adventure playground. Adventures for all. Our natural environment is pure, fresh and invigorating - it’s the perfect place to have some fun. From alpine mountains to sandy beaches, we have a range of adventures to suit everyone. We might be renowned for bungy jumping and jet boating, but our local Kiwi adventurers can show you so much more. Take a step outside your comfort zone and test your individual sense of adventure. Push yourself. Imagine the rewards: enjoying spectacular

---

\(\text{88}\) This table is a combination of data from several sources, and percentage growth figures for some of the Asian markets could not be computed, as data categories were different.

\(\text{89}\) Analysis took place in July 2001 and relied mainly on brochure material and advertising websites. Websites may no longer carry these messages, as updates take place on a regular basis.
views from the summit of a hill, feeling both physically tired and emotionally inspired after hiking one of the great walks, sharing the thrill of doing something new and challenging (TNZ 2001c).

Queenstown adventure activities feature highly at the level of national advertising in this particular category. Under Thrill Zone, the national tourism advertising website emphasises Queenstown’s adventure tourism image (Figure 7.7):

**Figure 7.7: Main Attractions/Activities**

Shopping is Queenstown’s specialty, and souvenir shops here are as good as any you will find elsewhere. There are year-round action-packed thrills such as jetboating on the Kawarau or Shotover rivers, where these amazing New Zealand-invented craft execute seemingly impossible manoeuvres. Queenstown is also the world capital and home of bungy jumping (TNZ 2001d).

Under another rubric, Kiwi Culture, New Zealand’s culture is exemplified with bungy jumping and jet boating (Figure 7.8):

**Figure 7.8: Kiwi Culture at its Best?**

New Zealand is famous all over the world for things like bungy jumping, jet boating, kiwifruit and millions of sheep. Our national sport is the rough and tumble game of rugby; our national icon the Kiwi, a flightless nocturnal bird (TNZ 2001e).

Both bungy jumping and jet boating (particularly Shotover Jet), quintessential Queenstown adventure tourism activities, feature highly in national advertising. Neither are expressions of local culture, but, rather, expressions of tourism entrepreneurialism and attraction development.

National advertising, therefore, emphasises the adventure tourism aspect of Queenstown’s tourism product and thus promotes a Queenstown place identity that is not necessarily locally oriented. Instead, this representation of Queenstown is aimed at the level of New Zealand as a whole by being this country’s “premier visitor destination”. Adventure tourism experiences in Queenstown become icons for the wider New Zealand tourism experience, simply because they fit in with wider national advertising aims and the broader national tourism product.
In the national tourism product, Queenstown comes to stand for a place with year-round action, an adventure playground:

There are year-round action-packed thrills, such as jet boating, white water rafting and parapenting. Queenstown is also the world capital and home of bungy jumping. In winter, Queenstown turns into an alpine playground - skiers and snowboarders come from all over the world to join in the fun at the annual Winter Festival (TNZ 2002f).

Adventure activities feature prominently. On the “Don’t Miss” site, for example, the first activity highlighted is adventure (Figure 7.9):

Figure 7.9: A Shot of Adrenalin
Queenstown is adventure town. There are lots of different ways to get your thrills. Take a trip into Skippers Canyon to enjoy a mix of history and high adventure including bungy jumping, rafting, flying fox and jet boating. Go jet boating on the Shotover, Kawarau and Dart Rivers. Experience white-water rafting on the Shotover or Kawarau Rivers. Drift over Queenstown at dawn in a hot air balloon. Bungy Jump the Southern Hemisphere’s highest land based bungy jump - The Nevis Highwire Bungy. Ride the gondola 450 metre above Queenstown to Bob’s Peak to enjoy views of Lake Wakatipu and the surrounding mountains. Get down the fast way - take the luge (TNZ 2002c)

Under “Selected Highlights at a Glance”, adventure is linked with historical sites (Figure 7.10):

Figure 7.10: Skippers’ Canyon - The Road to High Adventure
From the 1860s until recently, Skippers Canyon was the very centre of gold mining activity in the Queenstown region - historical sites still exist today. Known in adventure circles as ‘Skippers Grand Canyon’ the area encompasses 20 acres and is home to the Pipeline Bungy, Skippers Flying Fox, Winky’s Museum, Skippers Canyon Jet and the Pipeline Walkway. You can also see a number of original gold mining workings that are progressively being restored. Hand carved out of solid rock, the Skippers Road is an adventure in itself … don’t look down! (TNZ 2002d).

On the face of it, such linking of adventure tourism activities with historical meanings of places could be seen as a critical version of constructed place identity in that meaningful local elements are taken out of context, defamiliarised, in adventure tourism activities. Cloke and Perkins (1998a, 1998b), for example, argue that place myths such as those associated with bungy jumping and jetboating in contemporary tourism representation have evolved both from past tourist activity and out of established outdoor practices in New Zealand. Many of the adventure activities

---

90 The site also highlights other activities such as golf, relaxation, the Queenstown wine trail, historic Arrowtown and winter skiing, but adventure activities take first place.
familiar from tourism advertising in New Zealand, for example, have been practised for decades by New Zealanders. Adventure tourism representations have used these traditional activities to imbue places with particular meanings.

Newcomers have successfully transformed the meaning of places not once connected with significant levels of domestic outdoor recreation but which they have been able to commodify for touristic purposes and which can now be counted as important adventure tourism sites (Cloke and Perkins 1998a, 213).

On one level, the adventure tourism image uses historical imagery, linked to an outdoor, pioneering culture and an unspoiled wilderness, and customises such nostalgia with imagery that appeals to targeted consumer markets. In other words, it would appear that, in a very limited sense, place promotion engages in critical reflection in Frampton’s sense. Certain nationalisms attempt to defamiliarise certain elements of cultural identity (the outdoor culture) by putting them into a new context (the adventure tourism culture).

Do such constructed versions of place identity have a critical component? Kirby (1997, 133) argues that these versions of place are carefully linked to the demands of international tourism markets: “New Zealand’s naturalness is now something that identifies the country in contrast with the rest of the world, but it is clear that this aspect of national identity is only as powerful as it is, because it is politically and commercially attractive”. Identity is established through interactions with the ‘outside’. The ‘outside’, in tourism, is of course the presence of the characteristics and demands of international generating markets, and - from a regional and local point of view - the nature of national tourism promotion. This introduces its own dynamics into the development and maintenance of critical versions of constructed place identity. For one, it becomes harder to distinguish between outside and inside, between nationally motivated version of place identity and those constructed locally, when it is partly the presence of the outside that shapes and constructs inside identity (i.e. the status of Queenstown as an icon of New Zealand’s tourism product). At the level of adventure tourism imagery, this means that, despite local attempts to get away from an overemphasis on adventure aspects of the Queenstown tourism product,

---

91 Cloke and Perkins (1998a; 1998b) do not suggest that New Zealanders regularly jump off bridges, but tramping, fishing, hunting and river rafting have been traditional New Zealand outdoor pursuits.
national level advertising and associated demand-shaping activities at different levels make this difficult. A further level of influence in this process is the recent establishment of macro-regional alliances in tourism marketing.

7.4 A Macro-Regionalism: "Regions Acting Together When Gains can be Made"\(^{92}\)

In recognition of their limited budgets, some RTOs have formed macro-regional alliances with neighbouring RTOs and with private tourism operators to gain critical mass in funding to allow increased international promotion. Examples of this include Centre Stage, created in 1998 as a joint venture between Totally Wellington, Tourism Nelson, Destination Marlborough, Tourism Wairarapa and TranzRail, a private sector rail services provider, Te Papa, the national museum in Wellington, and Air New Zealand. In addition, the largest five RTOs – Tourism Auckland, Totally Wellington, Christchurch and Canterbury Marketing, Tourism Rotorua and Destination Queenstown - have also developed an informal alliance to discuss issues relating to their activities and to represent their collective interests in the market place, to governments and the industry (Office of Tourism and Sport (OTSp) 1999, 18-19). Such macro-regional alliances have significant influence on the development of critical versions of constructed place identity.

The Southern Lakes region has also combined efforts in tourism marketing through the development of a joint tourism strategy. The Southern Lakes Tourism Strategy (the Strategy) focuses on sustainable tourism development in the Southern Lakes region to the year 2010. It has a clear macro-regional focus (incorporating not just Central Otago but parts of Southland) and advocates "a regional approach as the best way to improve industry performance, region-wide benefits and environmental quality and thus achieve sustainable development" (NZTB 1998, 4). The Strategy overtly aims to develop critical versions of place "based on the assumption that individual communities and 'sub-regions' retain their identity, continue to act independently otherwise, and [that] the considerable diversity that they contribute is fostered" (NZTB 1998, 4).

---

\(^{92}\) Objective of Southern Lakes Tourism Strategy (NZTB 1998, 4)
This is done, of course, with the clear aim of improving marketability: "Packaging together the strengths of individual destinations or 'sub-regions' will have a greater impact in the market place and enable the Southern Lakes to be strongly differentiated from competing regions" (NZTB 1998, 6). Diversity is a key message emphasised in promotional material about the Southern Lakes region, which incorporates "continental-style inland climates and landscapes, rugged mountain regions, renowned World Heritage areas and wild coastline".

Although the need for uniqueness is emphasised, there is also a desire to match sub-regional product development with particular markets or market segments, in order to better match customer needs and wants with product offerings. The Strategy does, however, acknowledge the importance of community benefits and recommends that each RTO work with the local community to determine the target market segments appropriate for their area (NZTB 1998, 11).

Regional positioning based on community preferences is seen to be important, and this, the Strategy suggests, could be achieved through either a Southern Lakes brand or a Southern Lakes tag-line, depending on the desired level of commitment by participants. The Strategy recommends:

- that a strategic marketing alliance be established to market the Southern Lakes and its 'sub-regions';
- that the strategic marketing alliance be comprised of representatives from the RTOs who are committed to building the alliance and would in turn represent the promotion groups and associations in their area;
- that the strategic marketing alliance, together with the relevant district councils, establish partnerships with the private sector and build understanding and strong working relationships with local communities; and
- that each promotion group or association differentiate their area from destinations within the region in a way that builds an attractive range of complementary brands across the region (NZTB 1998, 43-44).

At the level of the rhetoric employed in the document, then, the Strategy is sensitive to critical versions of constructed place identity: "It acknowledges the limitations of the region's resource base and the sensitivity of the environment. It focuses on identified regional strengths and promotes the development of identified

---

93 Diversity key to popularity, Queenstown and the Southern Lakes Region, Sunday Star Times Supplement, November 5, 2000, 3.
opportunities” (NZTB 1998, 52). It does this marketing, however, under the umbrella of the need for complementarity across the region and in the context of marketability. Individual versions of place identity, therefore, need to complement each other and the wider macro-regional brand. The following section outlines the Queenstown brand, which is one of the major components of the Southern Lakes macro-regional brand.

7.5 Queenstown - A Global Brand

DQ subscribes to the philosophy that it is important to establish a global brand for Queenstown:

Destination Queenstown has worked for 18 months to meet the challenge of establishing a globally recognisable brand for Queenstown. The goal was to create a brand to effectively represent the entire Queenstown tourism industry and its product. The necessity to generate a branding with recognized brand values was strengthened by research showing that Queenstown enjoys a good reputation as a destination, but its brand was ill-defined, confused and dissipated by mixed messages and perceptions (DQ 2000/2001, 14).

This global brand, DQ states in its 2000/2001 business plan, needs to incorporate community goals, albeit in the context of consistent branding, which would point to an understanding of the need for critical versions of place identity:

In the past, separate Queenstown organizations with disparate goals have made it difficult to keep community goals in focus and to establish and maintain consistent branding which would, in the long term, benefit everyone (DQ 2000/2001, 14).

Such branding is lined up with the TNZ strategy of global marketing, expressed through 100% Pure New Zealand. As the DQ business plan (DQ 2000/2001, 14, emphasis in original) expresses:

Tourism New Zealand promotes the concept to first market New Zealand, then the local area (Queenstown), and then the local operator. This basic theory of global marketing shows the most important message for Queenstown to communicate as an area, is the Queenstown name and the brand values attached to that name.

It is recognised, however, that such a generic brand poses difficulties in terms of aligning diverse messages:

Branding is a complex issue for Queenstown because of the diversity of the Queenstown product. The Queenstown brand needs to be able to encompass all the complexities and diversity of Queenstown as a destination. The Queenstown
brand and associated values need to represent not only our position as adventure capital but also our incredible scenery, sophisticated accommodation and services, fine wine as well as a full range of relaxation and holiday possibilities, heritage and sporting opportunities (DQ 2000/2001, 14).

As a result of such deliberations, DQ decided to establish a single brand and to use the name only, *Queenstown, New Zealand*, as “the only possible branding which can achieve the collective marketing and branding objectives” (DQ 2000/2001, 15). This brand can be used in conjunction with other brands including “adventure capital of the world”, “gateway to the great walks”, and “four seasons more reasons” (DQ 2000/2001, 15). Potential brand values include the following (Figure 7.11):

**Figure 7.11: Queenstown New Zealand Brand Values**
- 100% Pure
- Four seasons
- All year round fun - the complete four-season resort
- Beauty, adventure, rejuvenation
- From ground-sheets to silk sheets
- Adventure capital of the world
- Personal discovery
- Back to nature or in the lap of luxury
- Recharge relax
- Powerful energies
- It's peaceful at our place
- Golden heritage
- The world's southernmost wine region
- Events - celebrate the seasons
- Conference and incentives - New Zealand's top incentive destination

These brand values represent a wide variety of aspects of the Queenstown tourism product. Such branding, with a generic name and a wide variety of attachable tag lines, in essence, attempts to combine the best of both worlds - to achieve global recognition through the consistent and dominant use of a name, Queenstown, and to allow regional and local diversity in product offerings through a wide variety of attachable and alternative tag lines. This emphasis on variety in the context of the global brand Queenstown is apparent in Queenstown advertising material, where overemphasis on one particular aspects is carefully avoided. The main page of
Queenstown’s website www.queenstown-nz.co.nz, for example, advertises the resort in the following way (Figure 7.12):

**Figure 7.12: Queenstown Representations**

Queenstown is an exhilarating, year round, alpine resort, perfect for adventurers and leisure seekers alike. Nestled on the shores of Lake Wakatipu, overlooked by the majestic Southern Alps, the town was named because “...it was fit for Queen Victoria.” Queenstown is today recognised internationally as New Zealand’s premier visitor destination.

Queenstown has more than just breathtaking scenery and a diverse range of attractions, it's the people visitors find enchanting. In fact in 1998, Queenstown was again voted Friendliest Foreign City in a poll of 37,000 readers of Conde Nast Traveller, a top US Travel Publication. Queenstown first won the award in 1996. In the same publication Queenstown was positioned the 14th best city in the world alongside such names as Vienna, London, Paris and Hong Kong. It was the only New Zealand destination to rank in the World's top 20.

Queenstown enjoys four distinct and captivating seasons. Summer burns hot under blue skies before cool autumn mornings bring fire to the hills, trees change to vivid reds and gentle golds. Crisp, clear days and miles of snow covered mountains, make winter a time for snow enthusiasts, before nature bursts into colourful life in spring.

The resort boasts a range of activities second to none, all within easy reach of the compact town centre. The town centre is only one square kilometre in size and within easy walking distance of most major commercial accommodation.

Queenstown offers relaxation at its best. There is gold in them there hills, and trout in the streams, so try your hand with a gold pan or a fishing rod. Visit the Arrowtown Museum, one of the best boutique museums in the country then afterwards explore the Wakatipu Art Trail.

Join the Queenstown Wine Trail and discover award-winning wines from the World's most southern vineyards. Return to town and sample the delights on offer in the many shops, cafes and restaurants. As night falls, get ready to experience the resort's buzzing nightlife.

Queenstown's reputation as the adventure capital of the world is well earned, you can choose to join in or watch the massive selection of safe, breath-taking activities. Earth, water or air, there is something to test and thrill all adventure seekers.

Bungy Jump from the world's first commercial bungy site, swoop and soar in your own controllable “rocket”, whitewater raft or surf, jet boat down canyons, tandem hangglide or parapente...it simply doesn't stop! Long walks, four wheel drive treks, or lunch on a majestic steamboat, you choose, it's your holiday.

Take a short drive back in time to the historic goldmining settlement of Arrowtown, or drive the shores of Lake Wakatipu to discover the beautiful hamlet of Glenorchy, the gateway to the Paradise Valley and the famous Routeburn walking track (DQ 2001).

Everything from peace and tranquillity to adventure tourism is represented, both activities and relaxation are emphasised, and the resort is suitable for both adventure-seekers and leisure-seekers who simply want to relax. The challenge, according to
Mark Quickfall, then chairman of the DQ Board in 2000, is to target a broader range of people: "Everyone associates Queenstown with skiing, bungy jumping and rafting .... That's great, but we also offer much more - wineries, walks, gardens, lake cruises, excellent restaurants and unique shopping. We have to get that message across".94

At the level of the region and the locale, then, while critical versions of constructed place identity are identified as important, this is always framed in terms of the need to be competitive. The macro-regional strategy acknowledges the need to be inclusive of local values, but does so in an international marketing context, essentially necessitating critical reflection on those local values in terms of their marketability. At the local level, attempts by DQ to maintain a global brand that is 'customisable' through different tag-lines, thereby serving the interests of a number of local versions of place, could also be seen to represent a critical version of constructed place identity. At the level of the local operator, as the next section will show, however, one particular version of place identity, that of adventure tourism, is once again prominent.

7.6 Representing Adventure

The Southern Lakes has a wide range of attractions, activities, dining and nightlife targeted at young travellers. Some of the region's most successful tourism operations are based on adventure tourism. For this reason adventure activities are often prominent in advertising and information to the extent that when browsing brochure racks in the region one has to search to find a range of activities which would appeal to more mature travellers (NZTB 1998, 21).

Adventure tourism representations are prominent in Queenstown’s promotional material. As discussed, adventure tourism receives a strong emphasis in national tourism promotion, and this is partly because of Queenstown’s iconic status at the national level. At the level of the local tourism industry, adventure tourism operators have a dominant industry position, and this is evidenced in the level of adventure tourism representations in Queenstown tourism information centres and the number of adventure tourism shops.

---

7.6.1 The 'Adventure Tourism Capital of the World'

Queenstown is known as the adventure capital of the world and you are about to find out why! One of Queenstown's most famous attractions consists of throwing yourself off a variety of structures with only a large rubber band tied around your ankles! Queenstown pioneered commercial bungy jumping and visitors from the four corners of the globe have defied gravity here (Today and Tonight Queenstown, November 2000).

Analysis of Queenstown brochure material collected for the year 2000 shows that adventure tourism activities are indeed predominant in the town's tourism portfolio. Adventure tourism imagery is particularly apparent at the level of the tourism operator. As the Southern Lakes Tourism Strategy put it: "The strong adventure image has been created largely because a significant amount of marketing is undertaken by large adventure operators" (NZTB 1998, 88). Indeed a number of important local operators (e.g. Shotover Jet, Pipeline and A.J. Hackett Bungy, Challenge Rafting, Queenstown Combos and Tandem Skydive) have joined together in a collective marketing group, with an 'adventure capital' website. The following are a number of examples of adventure tourism advertising (Figures 7.13-7.17):

Figure 7.13: The Greatest Half Day of Fun in your Life - Triple Challenge
(The Greatest Half Day of Fun in your Life)

The "greatest half day of fun" includes a Shotover Jet ride, a helicopter ride, and a rafting trip and is advertised as an opportunity to "enjoy the best of Queenstown's adventures in four hours of fun and excitement" (The Greatest Half Day of Fun in Your Life).
Figure 7.14: Skippers' Grand Slam: Wam Bam Grand Slam

(Skippers' Grand Slam)

Snake around sheer cliffs high above the Shotover River on a road hand carved from solid rock. Our 4WD vehicle takes you deep into Skippers Grand Canyon. Take the plunge from the mighty Pipeline Bungy, conquer your fear as you leap into the canyon. Then enjoy the bungy's bouncing rebounds before being lowered into the waiting boat. Fly across the dramatic Skippers Canyon, suspended spider-like from a cable 102 m above the Shotover River on the unique Skippers Flying Fox. Surge upstream to the roar of Skippers Canyon Jet's powerful V8 engine. Then 'fang it' downstream as your driver skillfully skims past schist cliffs and hulking gold mining relics. Complete the Skippers Grand Slam: Half a day of madness and excitement (Skippers Grand Slam!).

Figure 7.15: Crazy Kiwi

(Crazy Kiwi)

Queenstown Combos advertises such trip combinations as the "Triple Thriller", and the "Awesome Foursome", which combine a variety of adventure tourism activities into packages (Figure 7.1). Crazy Kiwi advertises another combination of jetboating, bungy jumping, helicoptering, and rafting (Figure 7.15). Even such traditional - and relatively sedate - attractions as the Skyline Gondola are advertised in terms of their potential for action (Figure 7.16):
Thrillseekers will find plenty to keep them busy too. Hurtle round a winding downhill Luge track above the Skyline complex - it's the fastest fun on wheels. Plummet to earth attached to a bungy cord from A.J. Hackett's 'The Ledge'. Or take off on a tandem parapente flight, soaring high above town into the wild blue yonder before spiralling back down to ground zero.

Such adventure tourism representations are dominant at the level of individual tourism operator advertising in Queenstown's information centres. The main street of Queenstown's downtown precinct also consists of shop after shop emphasising adventure tourism activities (Figure 7.17), and adventure tourism advertising and attractions are prominent (Figure 7.18).

The limited 'shelf-life' of many adventure tourism activities leads to the need to continually re-invent new "spectacular opportunities for challenging participation in landscapes of natural grandeur ... through the provision of adventure-tourism attractions" (Cloke and Perkins 1998a, 189).
Consequently, new adventure tourism activities constantly have to be reinvented (Figures 7.19-7.20). Many tourists participate in thrilling, and physically challenging, activities in scenic places. Many more others come to watch these performances in their scenic settings. This leads to new imagined geographies for the region. Queenstown becomes the 'adventure capital', and all manner of places in the region become thrillseekers’ domains, either to be gazed upon or participated in.

Such emphasis on adventure tourism becomes self-perpetuating, as more and more entrepreneurs attempt to add new activities to Queenstown’s adventure tourism portfolio:

The composition of the business community has changed. And it dates back probably particularly to the introduction of bungy jumping, and the whole sort of outgrowth of the adventure tourism industry, and the people within that are of a particular ilk, a particular breed, they tend to be younger, they tend to be a lot more unconventional, they tend to party hard as well as work hard (Tourism operator).
And:

As you get more interest in the place, you get more people wanting to live here, you get more people wanting to make money out of here, and you get more people in positions of power wanting to dictate what the place should be like, rather than from what the people understand the essence of the place to be, so to hold on to the essence is really, really difficult (Queenstown resident).

In summary, there is conflict and argument over the nature of the adventure tourism image at most promotional levels. This is expressed mainly in the interests of its potential market appeal. As the Southern Lakes Tourism Strategy puts it, in the context of the wider Southern Lakes area:

“The high level of exposure given to adventure activities, such as in promotional material is resulting in an unbalanced image of the Southern Lakes” (NZTB 1998, 88). Instead, the Strategy suggests, “promotion organisations and groups need to provide a balance by ensure [sic] their marketing efforts reflect the diversity of the Southern Lakes” (NZTB 1998, 88).

There is a recognition, however, that - to some degree - tourism markets determine what can and what cannot successfully be advertised:

We've felt that perhaps we've overdone the adventure capital a bit, and we've tried to be arty and crafty, and also just the natural scenery and things as well. But at the end of the day, research has shown that the images of bungy jumping and whitewater rafting, people quite like to go there, they don't necessarily want to do it, but oh, that happens there (Tourism operator).

Clearly, the level of national advertising aimed at portraying Queenstown as an international adventure tourism resort has implications for the development of critical versions of constructed place identity at the level of the region and the level of the resort itself. Constructions of place identity that try to emphasise things other than adventure may be difficult to sustain in an environment characterised by the need to appeal to international markets and perceived media interests:
The adventure tourism image is quite false, because it's only occupying about 30% of our economic activity. But because it is that type of activity that's high profile, that's really driven by the appeal of those activities to the media. Nobody, for instance, would care that Princess Anne's daughter went to Walter Peak (a sheep farm tourism attraction, see Figure 7.21) on the steamship, that's not regarded as news, but when she bungy jumps, it is (Tourism operator).

Figure 7.21: Walter Peak
(McLeod and Ross 1999, 31)

7.7 Conclusion: Implications for Critical Regionalisms

Critical regionalism presents an ideal version of place identity that is based on resistance to both the universalising forces associated with globalisation and the reactionary forces sometimes attached to reproductions of place based on vernacular traditions and icons. It calls for reflection and self-awareness in the creation and maintenance of version of place identity in order to “foster a mosaic of regional subcultures”. In a tourism context, and for the case study of Queenstown, infusing constructed place identity with a degree of critical reflection is faced with a number of difficulties.

First, the international marketing context, characterised by volatile demand characteristics, to some extent necessitates the design of imagery that is based on customer needs and wants. If these needs and wants change, or the customer base changes, as they have done over the last decade, advertising changes with this,
making the creation and maintenance of critical versions of place identity extremely difficult.

Second, place promotion takes place at the different levels of the nation, the region, the locale, and sometimes the individual operator. Thus, there are various versions of local place identity, which, individually, may very well contain a critical dimension. At other levels, however, they do not. The adventure tourism image, for example, at the national level, could be understood as a critical version of constructed place identity based on existing outdoor practices, elements of which have been taken out of context and defamiliarised, in order to appeal to international markets, thereby showing a certain responsiveness to contemporary priorities and agendas. These priorities and agendas, however, are different again at the level of the region and the locale. The macro-regional context and that of the local Queenstown tourism marketing context both attempt to steer away from the excessive use of the adventure tourism label for various reason. At the level of the individual operator, however, the adventure tourism label is strongly promoted, based on commercial imperatives.

This opens up a problem with the theory. Critical regionalism as a theoretical perspective on the space/place relationship sets forth a number of criteria for the design of critical local place identity. Its fundamental strategy is to "mediate the impact of universal civilization with elements derived indirectly from the peculiarities of a particular place" (Frampton 1983, 21, emphasis in original). What the theory is essentially silent on is who might decide what those elements are and how this might be decided. In other words, who are the participants and what are the arenas and processes in which decisions about critical or progressive versions of place identity are made? Is it the people who live in a place who are supposed to, in critical theoretical fashion, be alienated and/or suffer from a false consciousness? How will they meet and decide upon critical place identity? Is there only one critical version of place identity that all subjects should agree on? My data appears to indicate that multiple subjects exist at different levels, with different interests, power bases and potentially widely differing interpretations of, and motivations for, a critical dimension of constructed place identity.
At each level, the development of critical versions of constructed place identity is possible, because each of these levels utilises different place identities, based on different agendas, audiences and contexts. The same physical location - Queenstown in this case - can be promoted in many different ways to many different people. One group of people is conspicuous by its absence, however: Local residents. Where in this multi-level promotional picture can a local community begin to develop and maintain critical versions of place identity? As the next chapter will show, the nature of the institutional context in which tourism place promotion is situated has a fundamental influence on this.
8 CHAPTER EIGHT: STRATEGIC AND INSTITUTIONAL CONTEXT - LINKING DESTINATION MARKETING AND DESTINATION MANAGEMENT

8.0 Introduction

In Chapter 7, I identified a number of tensions with regard to the development of critical regionalisms. These tensions are inherent in the nature of the place promotional context because promotional action “takes place” at different levels, utilising different place identities. Priorities and agendas differ at different levels, as do audiences, contexts and power relationships. Whether or not a constructed place identity is critical in Frampton’s sense is difficult to establish in a place promotional context because there are multiple representations and multiple imagery, often fleeting and replaceable. The same place, that is, the same physical location, can be represented to different people in different ways, and at each of those levels, the place identity can incorporate a critical dimension. At other levels, however, such versions of place may alienate, or may be considered to be reactionary. There is thus no one critical version of constructed place identity.

To further complicate matters, some versions of constructed place identity are more powerful than others. This has to do with the institutional contexts in which they are located. In this chapter, I consider the strategic and institutional context of New Zealand tourism, in order to further scope the potential for the development and maintenance of critical versions of place identity.

8.1 Strategic Context: The New Zealand Tourism Strategy 2010


---

95 The strategy group (TSG) had the following members: Evan Davies (Chair): Chief Executive, Sky City Ltd; Geoff Burns: Chief Executive, Air New Zealand; Glenys Coughlan: then Chief Executive, Tourism Industry Association New Zealand; George Hickton: Chief Executive, Tourism New Zealand; Hugh Logan: National Conservator, Department of Conservation; Ngatata Love: then Chief Executive, Te Puni Kokiri; Kerry Marshall: Local Government New Zealand; Mike Noon: then Director, Office of Tourism and Sport; Brian Roberts: Chief Executive, Destination Northland; and Wally Stone: Whalewatch Kaikoura (TSG 2001).
Tourism Strategy 2010 ("the NZTS"), aimed at providing "a framework for decision making that will allow the tourism industry in partnership with government to face the future with confidence and build the capabilities for sustainable growth" (TSG 2001, no page). This document is a response to calls for a more strategic direction for the tourism sector, characterised by a large number of small and medium sized businesses and situated - as a rather tiny player (0.45% market share) - in an increasingly competitive global marketplace. The NZTS aims to initiate a process that helps the industry to manage conflicts between tourism growth and impacts at environmental, social and cultural levels, to optimise structural frameworks, secure funding, and generally remove obstacles for operators in the industry.

Central to the NZTS is the following vision for tourism in New Zealand in 2010:

In 2010, visitors and their host communities understand and embrace the spirit of manaakitanga (hospitality) while New Zealanders' environment and culture is conserved and sustained in the spirit of kaitiakitanga (guardianship) and, tourism is a vibrant and significant contributor to the economic development of New Zealand (TSG 2001, ii).

Such a vision, the NZTS acknowledges, requires a careful balancing of economic development objectives with the conservation of environmental and cultural values important to New Zealanders, in order to ensure that tourism development is sustainable.

Key principles identified in the NZTS include sustainability, yield driven emphasis, Maori participation and public/private commitment. The sustainability principle focuses primarily on the integration between destination management and destination marketing, the emphasis on yield is intended to both increase visitor numbers and spend per visitor, with much more effort on increasing per visitor expenditure. Maori are intended to play a key role in tourism, and the public/private commitment.

---

96 "Maori belief in the mutual respect between host and visitor. As tangata whenua [people of the land] - being the exceptional and natural host. Reciprocal standards of excellence from a Maori reality" (TSG 2001, A21).

97 "Importance to look after the natural resources and land for the collective benefit of mankind. Sustainable management of natural resources - including those currently in the Crown estate and also natural built resources: pa sites etc. Ensuring the protection of our cultural practices in managing cultural sites, flora, fauna and matauranga" (TSG 2001, A21).
principle is aimed at increasing public and private sector partnerships, consistent with a wider government focus on such partnership (TSG 2001).

NZTS goals developed around this include:

- securing and conserving a long term future;
- marketing and managing a world class visitor experience;
- working smarter; and
- being financially and economically prosperous (TSG 2001, iii).

The NZTS ends with a large number of recommendations, applicable to both the industry sector and to government. Major structural changes recommended in the NZTS include:

- the establishment of NewTNZ [new Tourism New Zealand], with a jointly owned and funded private/public sector structure, aimed at ensuring destination management and marketing are more closely aligned;
- the establishment of NewRTOs [a new form of RTOs], with an enhanced role in destination marketing and management, domestic and international marketing and regional tourism planning and development - it is expected that as part of this, the current number of 25 RTOs will be consolidated;
- the establishment of a Ministry of Tourism, with more resources;
- an increased advocacy role for the TIANZ 100, and an important role for the Association in the development of small and medium enterprises (SMEs); and
- building Maori capability and increasing Maori equity through the creation of representative Maori tourism bodies (TSG 2001, iv-v).

8.1.1 Linking Destination Management and Marketing

The NZTS' first key principle, sustainability, emphasises the need for better links between destination management and destination marketing:

Sustainable development is critical to ensure the benefits of tourism will not be short-lived. This will require greater integration between destination management and destination marketing than has been the case to date. It will also require all sector participants to embrace the values of manaakitanga and kaitiakitanga (TSG 2001, ii).

Destination marketing is defined as:

---

98 The Government’s response to the strategy was not one of adoption of all recommendation. Instead, the Ministry of Tourism is currently in the process of addressing some recommendations and working through the policy implications of others.

99 This was established in January 2002.

100 Tourism Industry Association of New Zealand
all the planned activities by tourism businesses and organisations that are designed to increase intent to travel to a destination by increasing awareness of the destination's attributes and the benefits of a visit. It includes strategic activities such as brand building and product development as well as sales-related activities such as trade relation management and providing information about products and services (TSG 2001, A8).

Destination management is defined in the NZTS as “management of the tourism destination elements related to the tourism environment and setting e.g. land management, tourism environment, tourism planning, roading planning” (TSG 2001, A8). The establishment of both NewTNZ and NewRTOs is aimed at increasing the link between the two.

The NZTS acknowledges that tourism has wide-ranging environmental effects “that could degrade the environmental, cultural and social qualities that underpin the success of the sector” (TSG 2001, A27). It also acknowledges that many communities, iwi and hapu, and interest groups seek more involvement in planning and managing the effects of tourism in their area. Projected steady growth in visitor numbers, while being welcomed by many, will challenge capacity, community acceptance and infrastructure in some communities. Addressing the process and relationship issues for tourism planning and development processes will be a key part of managing tourism growth in a sustainable manner (TSG 2001, A27).

As part of its recommendations for this, the NZTS sets out the need for territorial local authorities (TLAs) and RTOs to “develop and implement district and tourism planning processes that uphold community values and involve communities in identifying local assets and defining acceptable limits of change for these” and that “New RTOs incorporate elements of destination management into their roles” (TSG 2001, A31).

In addition, and under the rubric of cultural identity, the NZTS acknowledges the need to encourage “the whole sector to incorporate cultural heritage and contemporary culture(s) thinking [sic] in its decision making and acknowledge its importance to the tourism mix and to the longer term sustainability of our cultural identity” (TSG 2001, A34). An accompanying goal highlights the need to
“proactively foster the recognition, understanding and appreciation of New Zealand's built, historic, cultural and Maori heritage” (TSG 2001, A34).

At face value, these are laudable objectives. Better linking between destination marketing and destination management surely has the potential for the development and maintenance of critical versions of constructed place identity. The NZTS is rather vague, however, on how these objectives might be achieved. While it recommends a significant change in the role of RTOs, in order to enhance their role in destination management, and while it also calls for better links with local government, specific strategies for an increased role in destination management are not addressed.

In addition, both cultural heritage and tourism planning and development recommendations appear to utilise a definition of community which favours Maori participation in tourism, but not that of other communities. Maori participation is repeatedly singled out in the NZTS, but other communities are not mentioned to the same extent. This is exemplified by an interesting choice of words: Maori are to be partners who participate, whereas communities are to be made to understand and actively support tourism. Compare Objective 1 (securing and conserving a long term future), Goals 1.2 and 1.4:

- 1.2: To ensure Maori participate and are partners in the tourism sector and that Maori culture and identity is protected.
- 1.4: To have New Zealanders and their communities understand and actively support tourism (TSG 2001, 27).

Those are quite different objectives in terms of the level of genuine involvement implied and thus in the potential for the development of inclusive critical versions of local place identity. There are other, related, statements in the NZTS which indicate the stance towards communities, e.g.: “Communities must be encouraged to embrace tourism” (TSG 2001, 30), or “communities will understand the benefits of tourism and will be welcoming hosts” (TSG 2001, 75). In a May 2001 press release, the Minister of Tourism also talked of Maori as partners and the need to enable greater participation and the creation of representative Maori tourism bodies. With regard to communities, however, the Minister confines his message to recommending “a range of initiatives to increase stakeholder understanding and support for tourism” (Burton 2001).
No case is made for communities to be enabled to participate and make decisions about the future of tourism in their communities, although it appears that such a case is made for Maori. It is only when one looks at the Appendix of the document (TSG 2001, A 36) that more of a focus on community interaction and values is made explicit, including “making New Zealanders' level of understanding and interaction with tourism such that it encourages them to contribute to tourism growth in a manner that does not detract from community values”, and retaining “the essential elements of the host community that attract visitors and residents alike”. At the level of the strategic direction given in this document, then, critical versions of constructed place identity may be difficult to develop given the stance towards communities and their participation in tourism planning.

The NZTS, importantly, also recommends that the private sector is to have greater control of destination marketing – it is unclear how this can be linked to better integration of destination management and marketing, particularly in terms of enabling communities to have a say in the future of their places.

As the previous chapter has shown, destination marketing - or place promotion - takes place at different levels. Critical versions of constructed place identity, therefore, are multiple and multi-level in nature. Destination management, however, is a task with which the local district and region are charged (and in Chapter Four I described the land use management aspects of this). If - and how - destination marketing and destination management might be linked, and consequently if - and how – it is possible to establish and maintain critical versions of constructed place identity through the latter, destination management, is influenced by the institutional context of tourism in New Zealand.

8.2 Public Sector Tourism Structures in New Zealand

Public sector tourism structures in New Zealand have a very important impact on the potential for the development of critical versions of constructed place identity. The degree to which public sector agencies facilitate the environment in which critical place identities can be developed and maintained is instrumental in the success or failure of those critical identities. The role of government in tourism in New Zealand
follows a corporatist model, with a strong emphasis on market-led solutions to tourism problems. Such a corporatist approach to tourism can pose problems for the development of critical, inclusive, versions of constructed place identity. A collaborative approach to tourism planning would recognise that the opinions and perspectives of non-industry stakeholders (e.g. the resident community) are as legitimate as those of the planners or the industry (Hall 1999):

In an ideal 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 industry stakeholders or private interests as under a corporatist perspective (Hall 1999, 280).

In the more market-led environment of the corporatist model, this is not often the case, however. As Hall (drawing from Goodwin) argues, tourism planning and development powers are often taken out of mainstream local governmental portfolios and are carried out by unelected institutions. This is the case in many of New Zealand’s regions, with the tourism function of local government often handed over to RTOs, which are unelected bodies (although their boards may be elected by industry groups, and, in some cases, involve community group nominations). In the remainder of this chapter, I review central, regional and local level institutional arrangements for tourism in New Zealand, in view of their potential to enable the development of critical versions of constructed place identity.

8.3 Key Central Government Tourism Institutions

In historical perspective, the focus of central government tourism policy has shifted from a direct involvement in tourism attraction development and infrastructure provision to more confined involvement in one particular aspect of tourism: that of promotion and advertising, particularly international destination marketing. At central government level, the Ministry of Tourism (“the Ministry”) and Tourism New Zealand (TNZ) are primary agencies responsible for tourism policy and programmes. Current involvement is based on a particular view of the role of government in

---

101 See Appendix Seven for more detail on the historical record of New Zealand government involvement in tourism.
tourism, as articulated in a briefing paper to the current Minister of Tourism, the Hon Mark Burton, in December 1999:

In principle, the Government should not be involved in commercial activities where the market can more effectively and efficiently satisfy demand for goods and services. A role for government emerges where the private sector fails to provide services that would otherwise benefit the public good, i.e. market failure. In the case of tourism, a limited role for government arises from a market failure in three main areas (OTSp 1999, 13).

These three main areas are then identified as the generic marketing of New Zealand, the provision of research and information, and policy development. The policy development role encompasses broader public interests such as environmental conservation, the provision of public infrastructure, and regional development. In terms of the funding associated with these three roles, generic marketing of New Zealand clearly stands out as the main area of government engagement in tourism: 92.3% of government funding for tourism is spent on marketing New Zealand as an international tourism destination. Vote Tourism for 2001/2002, for example, totals $59.656 million, to be applied as follows:

- $3.061 million (5.1% of the Vote) on purchasing tourism policy advice from the Ministry of Economic Development;
- $1.268 million (2.1% of the Vote) [for] management of the Wairakei Tourist Park by the Ministry of Economic Development;
- $55.027 million (92.3% of the Vote) for marketing New Zealand as an international visitor destination; and
- $300,000 (0.5% of the Vote) on funding tourism facilities under the Tourism Facilities Development Grant Programme (Cullen 2001, 1116).

Thus, only 5.1% of the Vote is attached to the policy advice function (carried out by the Ministry), which includes broader public interest issues, such as regional development. The vast majority of funding is aimed at international marketing (carried out by TNZ).

8.3.1 Ministry of Tourism

The Ministry was established by the New Zealand Cabinet as a Ministry within the Ministry of Economic Development (MED) on 1 January 2002. It inherited its tourism policy function from the Office of Tourism and Sport, previously a semi-autonomous body within MED and, prior to that, with the Department of Internal...
Affairs. The current Minister of Tourism is the Hon Mark Burton, Labour Member of Parliament for Taupo (OTSp 1999).

The Ministry receives funding for policy advice in tourism, including ministerial servicing. Policy advice relates to “economic, environmental and social policy affecting tourism; barriers and opportunities for tourism; the purchase of promotion services from NZTB, also known under its trading name as Tourism New Zealand (TNZ); the Government’s interests as owner of the NZTB; and requests for grants of non-commercial tourism facilities” (Cullen 2001, 1123).

8.3.2 Tourism New Zealand
Formerly entitled the New Zealand Tourism Board, but now better known under its trading name Tourism New Zealand, TNZ is a crown entity established by the New Zealand Tourism Board Act 1991. It has the objective of “ensuring that New Zealand is so marketed as a visitor destination as to maximise long term benefits to new Zealand” (OTSp 1999, 16). TNZ is the major recipient of funds from Vote Tourism, receiving $55 million in 2001/2002 (92.3% of Vote Tourism).

The yearly activities of the Board are set out in an annual statement, prescribed under section 8 of the New Zealand Tourism Board Act that also serves as a purchase agreement. The Act, which is administered by the Ministry, establishes TNZ and empowers the Minister of Tourism to appoint members of the TNZ Board of Directors (OTSp 1999, 13). Current Board members include:

- Peter Allport (Chairman): previously chairman of Totally Wellington Tourism;
- Wally Stone: Chief Executive of Whale Watch Kaikoura, one of New Zealand’s leading tourism attractions;
- Matthew Boyd: private tourism consultant previously employed by Air New Zealand in marketing and regional directorship roles;
- Lex Henry: Special Counsel Public Law with Rudd Watts and Stone, trustee of the Asia 2000 Foundation and chairperson of the Auckland Festival Trust;
- Keith Johnston: chairman of ID Tours of New Zealand, director and major shareholder of Southern World Vacations in New Zealand, Australia and Fiji (ID Tours and Southern World Vacations together build the largest New Zealand inbound tour operator);
- Bronwyn Monopoli: a Nelson-based accountant;
- Peter Stubbs: partner in national law firm Simpson Grierson, specialises in law relating to marketing, sponsorship and events marketing, and management, chairman of the Events and Sponsorship Association of New Zealand;
• Mike Tamaki: Managing Director of Rotorua’s Tamaki Maori Village; and
• Liz Tennet: chairperson of Tourism Wairarapa, operator of a Bed & Breakfast
  and small-holding farmer.

In 1993, TNZ formally accepted a goal of attaining 3 million visitors per annum by
the year 2000 (Boyes 1998), but has revised this target since in favour of increasing
the contribution of tourism to the New Zealand economy. In 1996, TNZ produced a
national strategy document entitled Tourism in New Zealand - Strategy and Progress,
in which it identified five long term strategic goals for the tourism sector:

• Goal 1: Continuing growth in the contribution of tourism to the New Zealand
economy, to achieve targets of $9 billion in foreign exchange earnings and
180,000 full-time jobs (or their part time equivalent) by the year 2000;
• Goal 2: Continuing improvements in visitor satisfaction, consistent with the
positioning of New Zealand as a distinct, competitive and high value visitor
destination with authentic experiences and a friendly welcome;
• Goal 3: Encouragement of industry profitability and appropriate returns on
investment;
• Goal 4: Any adverse impacts from tourism on the environmental attractions upon
which it depends are avoided, remedied or mitigated; and
• Goal 5: Acceptance by New Zealand host communities of a diverse mix of visitors
and tourism activities (NZTB 1996, 10).

In practice, and while Strategy and Progress acknowledges environmental and social
sustainability issues, NZTB's main goal remains economic development, achieved
mainly through a focus on international marketing. This is in the context of a growing
but volatile share of international tourism markets.

8.3.2.1 The International Market Context

The global approach has proved to be essential in successfully marketing New
Zealand as a visitor attraction, both in terms of sending a consistent message that
has a greater impact in all our markets and as a more efficient method of managing
our business (TNZ 1999/2000, 3).

Tourism worldwide is a growth industry. Between 1950 and 1999, the number of
international visitor arrivals worldwide grew from 25 million to 664 million (on
average, 7% per annum) and is forecast to grow to 1.046 million in 2010. New
Zealand's share is estimated to be between 0.25% and 0.45% of all international

102 Mike Tamaki has since become the chairman of the New Zealand Tourism Board.
visitors (TSG 2001, p.5). In the year ended October 2001, 1,930,713 international visitors arrived in New Zealand (Table 8.1).

**Table 8.1: International Visitor Arrivals to New Zealand**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Month of October</th>
<th>Year Ended October</th>
<th>2001 % change from 2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>122,917</td>
<td>114,610</td>
<td>114,295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,577,596</td>
<td>1,738,438</td>
<td>1,930,713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-3.1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: TNZ 2001a

Main originating markets include Australia, the USA, the UK, and Japan (Table 8.2).

**Table 8.2: Visitor Arrivals to New Zealand by Country of Origin (2001)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Market</th>
<th>Visitor Arrivals</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>573,870</td>
<td>32.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>200,260</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>195,790</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>151,360</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>66,590</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>51,450</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>40,850</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>35,730</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>470,920</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,786,820</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: TNZ 2000a

International visitor expenditure varies per market (Table 8.3), but overall it makes up more than 60% of all visitor expenditure (whereas domestic visitors account for 90% of all visitor numbers but contribute only 44% to all visitor expenditure) (TSG 2001, 8-9).
Table 8.3: International Visitor Expenditure by Market

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Market</th>
<th>Percent of Total Visitor Expenditure</th>
<th>Spend per Visit ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>5,867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>1,535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>3,512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>3,344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>3,931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3,694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2,943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3,393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>4,675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>3,317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All Markets</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,039</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: TNZ 2000b

Historically, international tourism arrivals grew steadily between 1989 and 1997, with strong growth rates (Table 8.4) often far exceeding global tourism growth figures.

Table 8.4: Growth of Arrivals to New Zealand 1989-1999

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Ended 31 March</th>
<th>Arrivals</th>
<th>Percentage Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>867,522</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>933,431</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>967,062</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>999,714</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>1,086,557</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>1,213,318</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>1,343,003</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>1,441,838</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>1,551,341</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>1,464,766</td>
<td>-5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>1,517,324</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SNZ 1999

As Table 8.4 shows, New Zealand is vulnerable to international trends. Economic performance in key generating markets has always had an influence on tourism growth rates in this country. For example, a slow growth rate in 1989 was due to slow domestic growth rates in two key markets, Australia and the USA. The strong growth rates in the mid 1990s represent increased visitor numbers from the Asian region, with arrivals from this region increasing by 41% (Collier 1999, 73). The slower growth rates in the late 1990s can be attributed to a decrease in arrivals from the US, Canada, and Germany, all based on both recessionary trends in these countries and on emerging competitive destinations, such as South Africa for the German market. The alarming trend of negative growth rates in 1998 can be
attributed to the Asian economic crisis. Strong growth rates for the year 2000, as outlined in Table 8.1, are attributable to the low value of the New Zealand currency and the value for money aspect this generates for many generating markets. In 2001, the September 11 tragedy influenced people’s willingness to travel, and international events such as this have a continuing influence on demand for New Zealand as a tourism destination.

International marketing, therefore, is a task set in a volatile market environment, where success or failure are hard to measure. As a result, although TNZ’s key outputs in terms of marketing need to be justified with regard to influence on the number of visitors and average expenditure, there is a certain degree of flexibility in terms of the opportunity to amend annual statements, in response to changing market conditions and the resultant necessity to amend marketing strategies.

Main areas of engagement for TNZ in 1999/2000, in keeping with previous years, included:

- a consumer marketing (global) campaign, focused on a brand campaign (100% Pure New Zealand), Brand New Zealand (the fern mark jointly owned with Trade New Zealand), public relations, events leveraging and procurement (including Americas Cup and Millenium events), cooperative marketing activities (e.g. participation in newspaper and magazine advertising projects), tourism marketing networks, and information servicing;
- trade marketing, through trade show stands and trade training roadshows;
- market research and intelligence, through consumer research (e.g. International Visitor Survey, International Visitor Arrivals);
- tourism advice and strategy, for example through the development, in cooperation with the tourism industry and OTSp, of the National Tourism Strategy proposal; and
- management services.

A clear focus on demand-side activities emerges, with TNZ’s 100% Pure NZ campaign the main output of Vote Tourism.
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103 This sometimes happens in ways different than expected. The September 11 tragedy, for example, while it suppressed demand for international travel to New Zealand in the short term, appears to now have the reverse effect on the demand for New Zealand as a tourism destination. Arrival data and airline bookings in July 2002 suggest that travellers are avoiding the US as a tourism destination and that New Zealand is benefiting from extra demand at a time of year when it would not normally have such high levels of demand.
In summary, the Ministry and TNZ jointly represent the main central government agencies responsible for tourism. The overall focus of tourism policy in New Zealand is firmly on international marketing, which the current and previous governments have seen as their main roles in the tourism sector. A number of other central government stakeholders do, however, play important roles not focused on destination marketing in the tourism sector.

8.3.3 Other Central Government Stakeholders

Many of the policy issues affecting tourism are developed and implemented under other portfolios. These include the Ministries of Economic Development, Transport, Forestry, Environment, Foreign Affairs and Trade, Agriculture and Health, as well as a number of government departments and agencies, including Transit New Zealand, the Maritime Safety Authority, the Department of Conservation, Customs, and Immigration (Collier 1999, 111-115; OTSp 1999, 19). Two of these, the DoC and the MfE, warrant more detailed attention.

8.3.3.1 Department of Conservation

The DoC was founded in 1987 and took over the management of nearly 30% of New Zealand’s land mass. It is charged with the conservation of the natural and historic heritage of New Zealand for the benefit of present and future generations. The DoC is responsible for the management of all protected Crown lands, including national, maritime, and forest parks, reserves, and other conservation areas (Collier 1999).

Since a large part of tourism in New Zealand takes place in conservation areas, the DoC has a significant role to play in tourism, and, alongside its core responsibilities of management of conservation lands, species and estate protection, and science and research, it is also charged with resource use and recreation and advocacy and information functions through:

- managing commercial activities on land administered by the Department;
- providing recreation opportunities on land administered by the Department (this currently includes the provision of 250 campsites, 1000 back country huts, 11,000 km of walking tracks, jetties, viewing platforms, access bridges, boardwalks, picnic areas, and 100 visitor centres);
- providing visitor and public information; and
• managing concessions (including tourism concessions) on public land (Collier 1999, 112).

8.3.3.2 Ministry for the Environment

MfE was established under the Environment Act 1986 and is charged with promoting good environmental management in New Zealand, through sustainable management of natural and physical resources (Collier 1999, 113). With regard to tourism, its primary role is at the national level, through the potential development of national policy statements for the RMA (1991) of which there are none at present.

While DoC and MfE clearly are important central government stakeholders in tourism policy, the overall focus of government engagement remains weighted towards destination marketing, as described above. A similar picture emerges at regional and local levels.

8.4 Regional and Local Tourism Organisations

Local government, as I showed in Chapter Four, is a major participant in the tourism industry. It has primary responsibility for land use management at the local level through the RMA (1991), and provides many of the services and facilities required by tourists (e.g. water supply, sewage disposal, refuse collection, local roading). Local government may also fund information centres and the visitor information network (VIN),\(^{104}\) and provides facilities such as museums, parks and reserves (Collier 1999). The extent to which local government is involved in all of these services varies widely across the country.

With regard to tourism development, many local authorities are particularly involved in one particular aspect: that of regional and local marketing. This is mostly facilitated through RTOs.

\(^{104}\) The Visitor Information Network (VIN) is made up of 130 tourist information offices throughout New Zealand which provide tourist information to international and domestic visitors.
8.4.1 Regional Tourism Organisations

At the level of local government, there are 25 RTOs. These are regionally-based marketing organisations, and their primary role is to market and promote their region domestically and, increasingly (particularly through macro-regional alliances), internationally. RTOs are funded by their territorial local authorities (TLAs) through rates. They may also receive private sector funding, and the actual private/public funding mix varies by RTO. Central government does not provide any direct funding to RTOs. Many of the smaller RTOs, however, rely on TNZ market research, statistics and strategy. The combined annual budget of RTOs is estimated at $15 million (OTSp 1999). Budgets for RTOs range from $10,000 to $1.5 million, with an average of $390,000 (Collier 1999, 116).

8.4.1.1 Destination Queenstown

DQ is Queenstown's and the wider Queenstown Lakes District's RTO. It is funded via a commercial rates levy through the QLDC and has a mandate to "generically promote the Queenstown District as a visitor destination through a variety of distribution channels and act as the neutral coordinator of initiatives and campaigns to the benefit of its members" (DQ 2000/2001, 7). In 2000, DQ was run by a Board of Directors consisting of the following members:

- Chairman: Peter Smith, Alpha Lodge
- Major Corporate: Vance Boyd, Queenstown Rafting/Kiwi Discovery
- Retail/Service/Professional: Peter Lohmann, Peter Lohmann Consultants
- Non-Corporates: Philip Jenkins, Blanket Bay
- Accommodation: Doug Flavell, Copthorne Lakefront Resort
- Major Corporate: Nick Lambert, then Rydges Hotel
- QLDC Representative: Duncan Field, Chief Executive

The DQ Board is elected at an annual general meeting from members of the organisation. Board members are voted to represent sectors of the local tourism industry (e.g. corporate, non-corporate, accommodation) and are drawn from DQ membership. Membership is gained through contribution to Queenstown's commercial rate. A representative of the QLDC also sits on the Board (and the Mayor is an ex-officio member). David Kennedy, formerly of Totally Wellington Tourism is the current Chief Executive of DQ (DQ 2000/2001, 10).
DQ's core roles include information provision, trade liaison and media promotion. It also coordinates the collective marketing of Queenstown, including the consistency of destination marketing initiated by seasonal marketing groups, or the Queenstown Convention Bureau and events and festivals groups, which are funded by memberships, sponsorships and contributions from Queenstown tourism operators. An overarching objective is the maintenance of consistent branding and positioning of Queenstown (DQ 2000/2001, 7).

In its 2000/2001 business plan, DQ outlines its dual functions. The first, under the umbrella of coordinating year round marketing campaigns and initiatives, is the development of marketing plans for five target visitor groups (TVGs):

- Group 1: Group Inclusive Tours (GIT)/Free Independent Travellers (FIT)
- Group 2: Summer/Autumn Stayput Visitors
- Group 3: Winter/Spring Stayput Visitors
- Group 4: Conventions and Incentives
- Group 5: Events and Festivals (DQ 2000/2001, 8).

For this, DQ created advisory and marketing groups for each TVG, drawn from its Board and from members of DQ (DQ 2000/2001, 10). These individual groups create marketing plans for the individual TVGs, all under the umbrella of a coordinated marketing campaign.

The second function includes such core activities as

- DQ governance and management;
- administration and operations; and
- the branding, positioning and marketing of Queenstown as the premier 4 season lake and alpine resort in the Southern Hemisphere (DQ 2000/2001, 9).

In subsequent chapters, I will look more closely at the structures that enable or disable community participation in such branding, positioning and marketing. Suffice to say at this point that there is significant controversy over the ability of the community to have an influence over how Queenstown is portrayed to the outside tourism world. As one resident put it:

They keep changing the people in there [DQ] and that keeps changing the focus on which place they are going to market to, and how they want to portray Queenstown. I think this should come more consistently from Queenstown, from the people, not the managers they put in, it has to come from the people, has to have a mandate, how do we want to portray our town (Queenstown resident).
Structures of representation on the DQ Board were also perceived to contribute to a lack of community representation:

Representation [on the DQ Board] is by way of category of what kind of business you are in. So, for example, the major businesses in town, so I think if your turnover was greater than about 5 million, you called yourself a major business, and there was something like 2 seats available for those, and then it would sort of scale itself down. A seat available for a major accommodation property, then small businesses and that type of thing. But it is representative of commercial activity in Queenstown, no other social groups or community groups or civic groups at all are associated with it (Queenstown resident).

In terms of input into destination marketing, there is a perception that user pays applies to the participation process:

Unless we are commercial ratepayers, we have no input at all into the amount of money at all that is funded to Destination Queenstown, and therefore they can say, well if you're not paying anything towards it, why should you have input into it (Queenstown resident).

So far, the picture I have painted for institutional structures at regional and local levels is one of a similar emphasis on destination marketing as was found at the national level. The institutional arrangements for destination marketing at this level, therefore, may not easily facilitate the development of critical regionalisms through community input (see Chapter X for much more detail on this). A further element of structural arrangements that influences critical regionalisms is the presence of the Southern Lakes Macro Region and the Southern Lakes Tourism Strategy.

8.4.1.2 The Southern Lakes Tourism Strategy

In line with trends among other RTOs to form macro-regional alliances (as described in the previous chapter), DQ is one of four RTOs that have combined forces to establish the Southern Lakes Macro Region (including Queenstown, Lake Wanaka, Central Otago, and Fjordland). The existence of this macro-regional alliance in terms of a formal marketing alliance goes back to the Southern Lakes Tourism Strategy, published in 1998, a strategic marketing document for tourism in the Southern Lakes region to the year 2010. It was prepared by staff of TNZ under the guidance of a local steering group, including the Chief Executives of the Queenstown Lakes, Southland, and Central Otago District Councils, and with input from local
communities, RTOs, local promotion groups, tourism operators, the DoC and local authorities (NZTB 1998).

As a result of this Strategy, a Southern Lakes Tourism Strategy Marketing Group was formed in March 1998, charged with the implementation of the Strategy’s recommendations. Its aim is to “identify and initiate collective tourism marketing strategies that will cost effectively promote the Southern Lakes Region of New Zealand as a preferred domestic and international visitor destination” (DQ 2000/2001, 26). Key objectives of this group include the identification and implementation of tourism marketing initiatives that benefit all four regional partners, to promote the diversity and product mix of the Southern Lakes, and to maintain a strong Southern Lakes presence at key international travel shows (DQ 2000/2001, 26). Each member region contributes $15,000 (GST exclusive) to the group each year, which gives the Strategy Marketing Group an annual budget of $60,000 (GST exclusive), a relatively minor sum. From this, the Group finances presentation folders and touring pads, domestic media familiarisation, a newsletter and a presence at tradeshows.

At the level of the Queenstown RTO, then, a clear focus on marketing emerges, governed by an industry-led board, with an emphasis on coordination with macro-regional and national tourism marketing campaigns. The development of critical versions of constructed place identity in such an institutional context is made more difficult by a continuing emphasis on destination marketing rather than destination management and by the inclusion of industry members only, rather than broader community members, in DQ board representation. As I argued in Chapter Four, the possibility of countering such an emphasis through the utilisation of non-statutory planning mechanisms in the form of strategic plans depends on the support of the local authority. In the Queenstown case, I argued in Chapter Four, this resolve has not been apparent, and as a result, the marketing emphasis has not been complemented by the development of destination management objectives in a strategic context (which would have included broader community objectives).

8.4.2 Local Community Boards

The last participant in local level tourism is, in some instances, local community boards. In addition to RTOs, there are a large number of local community boards
involved in promoting their communities to neighbouring communities and others. Such local community boards are mostly based on volunteer services, sometimes develop local community plans, and may work with RTOs in an effort to align local promotional campaigns with wider regional objectives. In many cases, however, these community boards operate in relative isolation from both local government and RTOs.

8.5 Industry Stakeholders

In addition to government agencies, the nature of the tourism industry and its stakeholders also influences tourism in New Zealand. The first, and by far the largest, of a number of industry associations is the Tourism Industry Association.

8.5.1 Tourism Industry Association New Zealand

The Tourism Industry Association New Zealand (TIANZ) is a membership-based organisation representing the interests of some 3,000 tourism industry businesses. Membership includes a number of affiliate organisations including Major Accommodation Providers (MAP), the Motel Association of NZ (MANZ), the Inbound Tour Operators Council (ITOC), and the Travel Agents Association New Zealand (TAANZ) (OTSp 1999, 18).

Membership is organised around a group of activity-based councils and divisions, roughly mirroring the disparate structure of the tourism industry. These councils and divisions provide fora for issue identification and debate. The TIANZ has a Wellington-based executive which services the membership and lobbies the Government on tourism-related issues (OTSp 1999, 18).

TIANZ's work is based around four core business areas:

- industry advocacy - this includes government relations and media and industry relations;
- business networking - providing forums [sic] for business and professional development and vehicles to identify issues that impact on business and industry performance;
- industry development programmes - developing, coordinating or sourcing programmes for the industry that can contribute to improvements in business performance/results; and
In the 1999/2000 financial year, the TIANZ Board of Directors had the following members, under a number of different divisions:

- attractions and shopping division: Evan Davies, Managing Director and Chief Executive of Sky City Ltd, Auckland;
- regional division: Oscar Nathan, General Manager Tourism Rotorua, Rotorua;
- adventure tourism and outdoor activities division: Jerry Hohneck, Chairman New Zealand Commercial Jetboat Association (and also a QLDC representative at the time), Queenstown;
- tourism services division: John Sandford (Deputy Chairman, TIANZ), Publisher Jasons Travel Media, Auckland;
- air transport division: Graeme McDowall, General Manager International Affairs, Air New Zealand, Auckland;
- surface transport division: Noel Entwisle, General Manager New Zealand, Cruise New Zealand Ltd, Auckland;
- distribution division: Mark Sainsbury, Chairman of Directors, Pan Pacific Travel Corp Ltd., Auckland;
- hospitality division: Shane Evans, Chairman, Major Accommodation Providers, Wellington;
- industry: Graeme Campbell, General Manager International Markets, Ansett New Zealand, Auckland;
- industry: Fiona Luhrs, Chief Executive, Qualmark New Zealand, Auckland;
- industry: Mike Tamaki, Managing Director, Tamaki Tours, Rotorua;
- human resources and education: Maryann Geddes, Manager Human Resource and Quality, Skyline Enterprises Ltd., Queenstown; and
- Chief Executive Officer: John Moriarty.

8.5.2 Other Industry Associations

A large number of other industry associations also exist (see Appendix Three), and efforts are currently under way to consolidate the number. One industry association, in particular, warrants separate attention because of its wide-ranging influence in the tourism industry.

8.5.2.1 The Inbound Tour Operators Council of New Zealand

Tour operators have an important role to play in the tourism industry, because they purchase, in advance, bulk product from airlines, accommodation, and ground services. Because of this, they are able to negotiate substantial discounts and usually
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105 Mike Tamaki also sits on the TNZ Board and, as indicated above, has recently become its chairman.
put the purchased product together in packages for sale to consumers in overseas markets, via retailers.

The Inbound Tour Operators Council of New Zealand (ITOC) has been operating for 25 years and is made up of inbound tour operators who promote and sell New Zealand travel packages to offshore buyers, including wholesalers, travel agents and event managers. It is essentially a trade association representing the New Zealand inbound tourism industry, and it plays a key role within the New Zealand tourism industry:

In the year ended 31 March 1997 its full-member tour companies collectively handled 40% of New Zealand’s total holiday visitor arrivals (344,914 visitors). It is estimated that these visitors contributed approximately $1542 million in foreign exchange earnings (including GST). This represents 30% of New Zealand’s total tourism foreign exchange earnings .... In the same year ITOC spent $11.3 million on promoting and marketing New Zealand as an international visitor destination and employed 245 staff in overseas offices (Collier and Harraway 1997, 30) [by comparison, TNZ received $55 million from the Government for generic promotion, of which $19 million are spent on international marketing].

ITOC’s membership includes inbound tour operators (full members) and their suppliers (allied members). Today, ITOC’s full and allied members collectively handle most of New Zealand’s visitor arrivals. ITOC’s mission statement identifies it as extensively involved in overseas marketing:

To unite all inbound tour operators for the purpose of marketing New Zealand as an internationally competitive tourist destination by promoting and arranging inbound travel of the highest standards through encouragement of development of services, facilities, training and education (Inbound Tour Operators’ Council (ITOC) 2001).

According to the ITOC website, 80% of all international travel bookings worldwide are processed by the Travel Agent Distribution Network. This works in the following way: Overseas tour operators and travel agents request ITOC members to package New Zealand arrangements for their clients, based on local demand. ITOC members sell packaged suppliers’ products to overseas tour operators and travel agents. The ITOC tour operator is therefore at the centre of distribution. ITOC members put together the buyers'/tour operators' itineraries by packaging products from New Zealand suppliers (bulk purchase). New Zealand product suppliers sell through ITOC members to overseas tour operators and travel agents. Such distribution chains,
particularly through the attached marketing function, have a significant influence on promoted New Zealand place identity.

8.5.3 Major Corporates

The tourism industry is characterised by a large number of small and medium enterprises (SMEs). However, a number of major corporates have significant influence, both through their lobbying connections and their in-house marketing budgets, which influence New Zealand's international image. The Ministry of Tourism (OTSp 1999, 19) lists the major corporate entities in the tourism industry in New Zealand as the following (market capitalisation is noted for those companies listed on the New Zealand Stock Exchange):

- Air New Zealand ($1,898.7m): International and domestic aviation
- American Express: International travel, financial services
- Ansett New Zealand: Domestic aviation\(^{106}\)
- Auckland International Airport ($1,296m): Property, transportation
- CDL Hotels NZ ($132.7m): Property, accommodation
- Fjordland Travel: Tour operators
- Qantas Airways: International aviation
- Shotover Jet ($30.3m): Leisure, attractions
- Sky City ($132.7m): Leisure, attractions, casino
- Skyline Enterprises ($736.5m): Accommodation, transport, casino
- SPHC: Accommodation
- Tourism Holdings Ltd ($130.1m): Attractions, leisure, transportation, accommodation, travel
- TranzRail ($465m): Transportation.

According to the Ministry (OTSp 1999, 19), these major players in the New Zealand tourism industry collectively exert a large degree of influence. They have large marketing budgets and are well connected to distribution channels. Two major corporates are based in Queenstown (Skyline Enterprises, Shotover Jet). Collectively, these major corporates have an enduring influence on promoted tourism identity in New Zealand. Air New Zealand, for example, with its in-house marketing budget and its connection to distribution channels, is actively involved in presenting Destination New Zealand, as are a number of other major corporates. Versions of constructed place identity, therefore, will be influenced by the marketing objectives of these large corporates, and this adds a further dimension to the already complex picture that my

\(^{106}\) Since passed into receivership.
analysis of tourism industry stakeholders and institutional structures in this chapter has painted.

8.6 Conclusion

As I have shown in the previous chapter, the dominant promoted version of place identity is one heavily influenced by two main factors: the tourism market dynamics, and the different levels at which place promotion “takes place”. First, tourism markets and New Zealand’s vulnerability to changes in global economic trends as well as economic trends in generating markets make the effect of international marketing campaigns dependent on generating market characteristics. The prospect for critical versions of constructed place identity related to this, then, is one weighted towards the needs of international markets, particularly in light of the nature of the marketing paradigm, which is focused on customer needs and wants.

Second, the different levels at which tourism marketing takes place, and the need to align messages in the interests of marketing demands, makes the development of critical versions of place identity difficult, if not impossible. Clearly, some levels are more powerful than others and therefore have a much better position from which to pursue ‘their’ critical versions of place identity. To these I would add two further significant factors identified in this chapter: the structure of the tourism industry, and the philosophy of government involvement in tourism.

The structure of the tourism industry is one dominated by large industry players, some very influential in international marketing (e.g. ITOC). These industry players have significant lobbying influence on government and are involved in key sector strategy development, heavily weighted towards the needs of the industry. The prospect for critical versions of constructed place identity related to the industry structure, then, is one that may favour the needs of large companies and large sector groups, at the expense of smaller players, and, as I will show in Chapters Ten and Eleven, at the expense of critical versions of place related to the community.

This is common in a corporatist model of tourism governance. As Hall (1999, 284) puts it: “A sustainable approach to tourism would state that all stakeholders are
relevant because of the contribution they bring to the creation of social capital. By contrast, the dominant corporatist approach ... tends to emphasise that in the creation of public-private partnerships only some stakeholders, primarily the tourism industry, are relevant”. The above analysis of tourism stakeholders (e.g. board members of TNZ and DQ) reinforces this, as almost all are from industry sectors:

At one level such an observation may seem appropriate given the need for coordination between government and industry and, it could be argued, the development of a more business-like approach by government. However, such an approach also precludes the input of a wider range of stakeholders from environmental organisation, from public interest groups, and wider community interests (Hall 1999, 284).

Last, the current conceptualisation of government roles in tourism and accompanying funding commitments show a clear picture of a strong focus on generic international promotion (92.3% of the Vote). This emphasis on marketing comes at the expense of other policy functions, including a strong focus on social, cultural and environmental sustainability and the development of regions and critical versions of place identity. The same emphasis, with some notable exceptions in parts of the country, is also evident at the regional and local level.

Critical regionalism, as a model with which to critique promoted place identity, does indeed show quite clearly what a critical dimension to constructed place identity might look like. By setting forth a normative direction for a potentially critical version of place, critical regionalism transcends Lefebvre’s (1991a) focus on critical spatial practice through the introduction of normative criteria for an ideal critical version of place identity (i.e. one that showcases local place identity through potential techniques of defamiliarisation). Questions remain, however, about how to conceptualise the multiplicity of place identities, the different power relationships at different levels of promoted place identity, and about whether or not (and how) it is
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107 The New Zealand Government has, however, reinstated a regional development dimension to the Ministry of Economic Development, which, together with Industry New Zealand, has been engaged in regional development policy and programmes since mid 2000.

108 For example, Kaikoura, a small settlement on the East Coast of the South Island, with more than a million annual visitors, has, for a number of years, been engaged in the development of, and consultation on, a community tourism plan, with the assistance of researchers from Lincoln University.
ever possible to achieve a critical version of place identity. These questions are addressed in the Section Three conclusion.
SECTION THREE: CONCLUSION

In this and the previous chapter, I have shown that a fundamental tension is inherent in attempts to develop and maintain a critical dimension to tourism place promotion. Place promotion, in the form of tourism marketing and image making, is influenced considerably – if not controlled completely – by national and international level distribution channels which package destinations and attractions into marketable parcels of tourism experience. Place promotion is aligned to such packaging and reflects the needs of international markets and identified market segments.

Local culture and identity, by contrast, if they are to become part of place promotion, need to be identified, agreed upon and then aligned - to some degree - to market needs and demands. The incorporation of local culture and identity, in the face of New Zealand’s strong reliance on the demands of the international market, is often difficult to achieve. First of all, different versions of local identity exist and are not necessarily agreed upon, as I showed in Chapter Seven. At the national level, for example, and as an icon of national level tourism in New Zealand, Queenstown is invested with meanings that are not necessarily local. Rather, national level place promotion utilises certain aspects of the Queenstown tourism product in pursuit of a balanced image of New Zealand national place promotion. A focus on the alignment of regional identities under a macro-regional umbrella brand, similarly, also poses challenges to the development of critical local identity. Even at the local level, the generic Queenstown New Zealand brand which aims to transcend sector-specific imagery in pursuit of alignment with higher level (e.g. regional and national) global marketing aims is challenged by the one aspect of the Queenstown tourism product that is particularly dominant at the level of the individual operator: that of adventure tourism.

Second, even if an agreed version existed, this may not be a version of place that is marketable or appealing to identified market segments. Third, the institutional context in which place promotion takes place, coupled with the current conceptualisation of the role of government in tourism in New Zealand, does not encourage better linking of destination marketing with destination management, as
envisaged in the industry strategy document (the NZTS). If anything, the dominance of industry interests and the confinement of the role of government to the correction of market failure discourages a proactive approach to community participation that may be the foundation for the development of a degree of agreement about what are critical versions of constructed place identity.

A critical regionalist approach rejects both parochial, reactionary, romantic versions of place as well as universalistic, placeless versions thereof. It does this, in a practical architectural design sense, for example, through defamiliarisation techniques that place familiar elements of place in an unfamiliar arrangement or a particular attention-focusing frame. Landscape architecture, for example, Bowring and Swaffield (1999, 5, emphasis in original) argue, "must respond to the region" in this way, must reflect critically on the concept of the region. In tourism and the place promotional context, such a strategy is made more difficult by the continuing need to maintain and promote diversity (as in competing tourism destinations), yet be sensitive to regional and local place characteristics. The struggle to remain unique and distinctive in a very competitive environment to some extent forces the development of critical versions of constructed place identity, in an attempt to distinguish one place from another. As I argued in this and the previous chapter, the particular dynamics and structures of tourism place promotion make this development of critical versions of promoted place a contested process, and, depending on the particular characteristics of the tourism 'food chain' at different levels, one that can easily be dominated by certain - not necessarily local - interests.

The critical model, as an ideal type, and applied to tourism place promotion, should remain "aware of the political responsibility to evoke a realistic regionalism; a regionalism which would be accessible to the general populace" (Frampton 1996b, 477). In tourism, however, there is a very real danger of "confusing the resistant capacity of Regionalism with the demagogic tendencies of Populism" (Frampton 1983b, 149). Advertising as a practice aims to make products and services appeal to popular sentiment. It does this through rhetorical techniques and imagery which
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109 Architecture is the discipline in which critical regionalism has been most successfully operationalised.
function as communicative or instrumental signage, aimed at creating needs and wants rather than evoking critical perception (Frampton 1983b, 149). The capacity of a region or locality to dialectical self-expression in tourism place promotion in this context, then, is contingent on the strength and power of such demagogic tendencies as well as the coherence of the regionalisms in question, and on the degree to which they are shared and/or subsumed by different levels.

Most importantly, critical regionalism, as an ideal model for the development of critical versions of constructed place identity, neglects to provide an answer to the questions posed at the end of Chapter Eight above. There are inevitably multiple versions of promoted place identity, pushed with different degrees of emphasis and from different positions of power. Some of these versions, as I have shown, have been more successful than others at claiming place. It is unclear how critical regionalism, as a theory, can account for such multiplicity and for the different levels of power at each level.

Critical regionalism, of course, as with any critical model, attempts to help analysis identify the flaws and shortcomings in process and design by posing a counterfactual ideal. This, to some extent, is successful in that a focus on critical versions of constructed place identity has guided analysis insofar as the ideal model for a critical version of constructed place identity is relatively clear in design terms. There is less clarity with regard to the process, however. Analysis has shown that arguments over the appropriateness or inappropriateness of place imagery are not only based upon competing discourses or “competing histories of the present, wielded as arguments over what should be the future” (Massey 1995, 185). They are also wielded from different positions of power and are constantly contested, emergent and constructed. It is still unclear what the processes might be by which a critical or progressive version of place identity might be constructed. In other words, critical regionalism, as an ideal model, sets forth design criteria for a critical version of place identity, but it is essentially silent on the processes by which this might be achieved. There are, as I have already stated, multiple versions of constructed place identity, and their success or failure in asserting their place is intimately connected to the power relationships involved. Critical regionalism provides no answers for anyone attempting to account for such power relationships, including the possibility of persistently contested
multiple versions of critical local identity. To restate the question I posed at the end of Chapter Seven: where and how in this multi-level promotional picture can a local community begin to develop and maintain critical versions of place identity?
The next section of this thesis is concerned with critical theory’s attempts at theoretically resolving such problems through a focus on the rationality of communication.
9.0 Introduction
As the previous chapters have shown, the particular dynamics and structures of tourism place promotion make the introduction of a critical dimension to constructed place identity a contested process, one that can easily be dominated by certain - not necessarily local - interests. The capacity of a community to express critical local identity in this context is contingent on the power of other interests at different levels.

Critical regionalism, while setting forth a number of design criteria for critical versions of place identity, is essentially silent about the processes and power relationships involved. Critical regionalist analysis in the previous two chapters, through putting forward an ideal design model with which reality can be compared, has helped identify the shortcomings of the place promotional context for the development of a critical dimension to constructed place identity. The theory is less useful, however, for a conceptualisation of the processes by which a critical version of constructed place identity might be developed. Various stakeholder groups are likely to have a different understanding of what defines a critically local version of place.

A further spatial application of critical theory - this time in the planning realm - puts forward a set of ideal criteria aimed at incorporating such factors into analysis. Communicative planning draws on Jürgen Habermas’ communicative rationality, particularly his model of the ideal speech situation. It is an attempt to theoretically resolve problems of systems imposition on the lifeworld through a focus on the rationality of communication. It can therefore potentially guide an understanding of the processes and arenas required for the achievement of a critical dimension to promoted place identity. In this chapter I review communicative planning theory’s

---

110 As I stated in Chapter Six, critical regionalism and communicative planning theory are both spatial applications of critical theory, and are attempts to operationalise critique in a practical sense, as
origins in critical theory and examine its central tenets, in preparation for Chapters Ten and Eleven, in which I attempt to evaluate its application in my case study.

9.1 Critical Theory and Communicative Rationality in Planning

Communicative planning theory draws on Giddens and Habermas in its understanding of the cultural boundedness of thought and action, and of the transformative capacity of active agency and collective dialogue (Healey 1997). In particular, critical theory’s emphasis on communicative, rather than formal instrumental, rationality provides the foundation for communicative planning thought. Jürgen Habermas’ notion of the ideal speech, with its emphasis on undistorted communication as a basis for consensus and action, lies at the heart of many of communicative planning’s central tenets. I will begin this chapter with a brief outline of the ideal speech model.

9.1.1 Ideal Speech

Habermas develops the idea of communicative action (also called symbolic interaction), counterposed to instrumental (or purposive-rational) action:

Instrumental action is governed by technical rules based on empirical knowledge .... The conduct of rational choice is governed by strategies based on analytic knowledge .... By ‘interaction’, on the other hand, I understand communicative action, symbolic interaction. It is governed by binding consensual norms, which define reciprocal expectations about behavior .... by at least two acting subjects .... The validity of social norms is grounded only in the intersubjectivity of the mutual understanding of intentions (Habermas 1996b, 53, emphasis in original).

Communicative action as a type of social action oriented to reaching understanding is therefore counterposed to strategic action oriented to success (Habermas 1996c, 160). It is exemplified in Habermas’ use of the ideal speech situation, which considers the nature of speech acts and their role in the interactive use of language.

According to Habermas, who borrows this idea from J.L. Austin and J. Searle, any speech act has two components, a propositional and a performative one. The propositional component makes a statement about the world, whereas the performative component invokes a relationship between speaker and listener (Hallin suggested by Dryzek (1995). Communicative planning theory does, however, draw much more
1985). The ideal speech situation, according to Habermas, has four components: Comprehensibility (*Verständlichkeit*), truth (*Wahrheit*), sincerity or truthfulness (*Wahrhaftigkeit*), and legitimacy or rightness (*Richtigkeit*) (Habermas 1979, 2-3). Comprehensibility relates to the communicative nature of speech acts and their understandability to all participants. Truth relates to the sincerity of the speech act in relation to reality and implies an underlying validity claim to the truth of this act (e.g. its groundedness in theoretical discourse). Truthfulness describes the representativeness of the speech act, its sincerity in relation to the intention of the speaker, whether the speaker is sincere and says what he or she believes to be true. Legitimacy, lastly, relates to the regulative nature of the speech act and implies that it is correct and appropriate for the speaker to be saying particular words (the experiential source of the truth claim, its groundedness in practical discourse) (Kemp 1985, 185-188).

For an ideal speech situation to occur, all participants must be free from both internal and external constraints and must have the same chance to initiate and perpetuate discourses (communicative speech acts), the same chance to express attitudes, feelings, and intentions (representative speech acts), equal chance to be able both to command and oppose, permit and forbid arguments (regulative speech acts), and, lastly, all participants must have equal opportunity to provide interpretations and explanations (constative speech acts) so that in the long run no one view is exempt from consideration and criticism (Kemp 1985, 186-188). Thus, “the communicative achievement of understanding depends not only on the cognitive use of language (proposition) but also on its interactive use (the normative context) and on its
expressive use (the speaker's trustworthiness)” (Grahame 1985, 151, emphasis in original).

Habermas has, of course, been criticised for the idealistic and normative nature of his ideal speech situation (Flyvbjerg 1996; Gunder 1998; Young 1990). Gunder, for example, argues that, “in seeking universal consensus in setting actions, norms and moral, Habermas negates cultural diversity, difference and a respect for nature …. He also fails to effectively address power” (Gunder 1998, 4). Habermas has countered such criticisms by suggesting that the ideal speech situation should not be seen as an empirical ideal to be attained, rather, it should be used as a standard, critical measure, or counterfactual ideal with which discourses can be judged (Kemp 1985, 188). “The critical content of the theory is centred in the analysis of the systematically but unnecessarily distorted communications which shape the lives of citizens of advanced industrial societies” (Forester 1985a, 204). As in Weber’s concept of ‘ideal type’, it is intended to describe reality and is a heuristic device. What critical theory should do, in Habermas’ view, is “indicate … how the conditions for social integration, that is for integration via communicative action, have been negatively affected in the process … [of] colonisation” (Brand 1990, 114).

As Dryzek (1990; 1995) argues, Habermas’ is a pure critique model which criticises real-world practice to the extent that it falls short of an idea. In order to go beyond this to a point where critique becomes constructive, critical theory needs to be “progressively less alienated and more able to relate to the concerns of ordinary political agents” (Dryzek 1990, 32). It is in this sense that communicative planning theory uses the ideal speech model. Critical theory “should pursue the empirical question how and when the growth of the monetary-bureaucratic complex induces pathological effects in the Lifeworld” (Brand 1990, 116). “The symbolic reproduction of society is based on the ‘counterfactual’ ideal of the ‘ideal speech situation’, which is characterised by ‘communicative symmetry’ and a compulsion-free consensus” (Brand 1990, 11-12). The use of such a model lies in its counterfactual value as an ideal type with which to critique. As Healey (1996, 219)

---

111 Truthfulness (or sincerity) differs from truth in that the former refers to the genuine expression of the speaker’s intentions, whereas the latter refers to the fit or misfit of representations of reality with the reality that is represented (Forester 1985a, 223).
rightly points out, the central principle of the ideal speech is “that people should relate to each other in ways that aim for comprehensibility, sincerity, legitimacy, and truth .... Of course we all know that we let each other down on these criteria. But we do know how to judge each other when we do this. So could we not judge public discussion like this too?” In the context of this thesis, communicative planning theory is employed in this sense, as an ideal model with which to critique the communicative context and processes of the place making case study in Queenstown and Glenorchy. The remainder of this chapter sketches the theory’s main propositions with regard to communicative action.

9.2 Communicative Planning Theory

Communicative planning theory has its origins in the institutional turn in planning theory, which emphasises the growing importance of institutions and institutional interdependencies (e.g. shared norms, rules and values) in the process of development and planning (Appendix Four outlines spatial planning traditions and places the institutional planning tradition in its context). The argumentative (Forester 1989), interpretive (Hoch 1997) or communicative turn (Healey 1993a; 1993b; 1996) in planning theory, as it is also variously called, is seen as a paradigmatic shift in planning theory by some (Innes 1994) and builds on the recognition “that public policy, and hence planning, are ... social processes through which ways of thinkings (sic), ways of valuing and ways of acting are actively constructed by participants” (Healey 1997, 29). It is part of a much wider “re-emphasis in much western thought on the social situatedness of knowledge and action and the cultural frames of reference through which action is articulated. It represents a shift from a materialist to a phenomenological understanding of the nature of being (ontology) and the nature of knowing (epistemology)” (Healey 1997, 38). It is closely linked to the intellectual traditions of pragmatism, rhetoric, phenomenology and discourse analysis, and for this reason is sometimes called the pragmatic approach to planning theory (Hoch 1997, 13).

Communicative planning theory itself is variously referred to as communicative planning (Innes 1998), collaborative planning (Healey 1992; 1996; 1997; Innes and Booher 1999), communicative procedural justice (Hillier 1998), argumentative
planning (Forester 1989) and communicative action (Innes 1994). The differences between the various interpretations are based on slightly different foci, particularly with regard to power. Tewdwr-Jones and Allmendinger (1998, 1977) distinguish between the "micropolitical interpretations of planning practice usually based on a combination of Habermassian ideal speech and poststructuralist concern with language", characterised by Fischer and Forester (1993) and Forester (1989; 1993); the "ethnographic studies which compare this ideal to practice", characterised by Healey (1992), Healey and Hillier (1996), and Hillier (1993); and, lastly, the "prescriptive (though the authors would deny this label) studies aimed at using communicative rationality as a basis for what has now been termed 'collaborative planning'". Patsy Healey (1992; 1996; 1997) is the predominant writer in this latter tradition.

The basis of communicative planning theory is Jürgen Habermas' idea of communicative rationality in the wider context of critical theory, as reviewed in Chapter Six. Communicative rationality is distinct from instrumental rationality's focus on "relating means (how to do things) to ends (what could be achieved), in logical and systematic ways" (Healey 1997, 9, emphasis in original). Instead, communicative rationality attempts to develop consensus based on mutual understanding of intentions. It is concerned with the role of language and the search for undistorted communication. It utilises the ideal speech model to attempt to establish parameters for drawing on the multidimensionality of 'lifeworlds' in search for "achievable levels of mutual understanding for the purpose at hand – through finding ways of reasoning among competing claims for action, without dismissing or devaluing any one" (Healey 1997, 242). In the process, communicative planning is "reflective of its own processes and arenas", keeping a "reflexive and critical capacity ... alive in the processes of argumentation, using the Habermas[s]ian ideal speech criteria" (Healey 1997, 243-244). It sets forth a set of criteria with which to achieve this. As described above, Habermas' ideal speech, with its emphasis on undistorted communication as a basis for consensus and action, lies at the heart of this. The ideal outcome of a communicative planning process is the "reconstruction of the interests of participants – mutual learning through mutually trying to understand" (Healey 1997, 244). For this, the theory sets forth a number of principles.
9.2.1 Communicative Planning Theory: Key Principles

Healey (1997, 29-30)\textsuperscript{112}, perhaps the key writer in communicative planning theory, provides the following key principles for the tradition. Communicative planning theory recognises that:

- all forms of knowledge are socially constructed, individuals therefore learn about their views in social contexts and through interaction;
- the development and communication of knowledge and reasoning take many forms (e.g. can be both rational systematic analysis and storytelling);
- relations of power have the potential to oppress and dominate not merely through the distribution of material resources, but through taken-for-granted assumptions and practices;
- there is a need to progress from competitive interest bargaining towards collaborative consensus-building; and
- planning work is both embedded in its context of social relations through its day to day practices, and has a capacity to challenge and change these relations through the approach to these practices; context and practice are not therefore separated but socially constituted together.

Healey's version of communicative rationality builds on Habermas' ideal speech model but claims to be more aware of power struggles associated with conflicting gender, class, culture or race aspirations, and with resultant different systems of meaning:

The 'differences' between which we must communicate are not just differences in economic and social position, or in specific wants and needs, but in systems of meaning. We see things differently because words, phrases, expressions, and objects are interpreted differently according to our frame of reference .... It is here that I would part company with Habermas and recognize the inherent localized specificity and untranslatability of systems of meaning (Healey 1993, 239, original emphasis).

Such systems of meaning may also shift and evolve. Therefore, it is never possible to "construct a stable, fully inclusionary consensus, and the agreements we reach should be recognized as merely temporary accommodations of different, and differently adapting, perceptions" (Healey 1993, 239).

Key criteria for communicative planning processes include:

- Communicative planning is an interactive and interpretive process, drawing on the multidimensionality of 'lifeworlds' (i.e. it assumes that formal techniques of planning are but one form of discourse);

\textsuperscript{112} Healey (1997) draws on a number of contemporary planning theorists, including Bengt Flyvbjerg, John Forester, John Friedmann, Charlie Hoch, Judy Innes, and Tore Sager.
- Individuals engage with each other in diverse, fluid, and overlapping 'discourse communities', each with its own meaning systems and hence knowledge forms and ways of reasoning and valuing;
- No common language or fully common understanding can be reached and communicative action should focus on searching for achievable levels of mutual understanding for the purpose at hand - through finding ways of reasoning among competing claims for action, without dismissing or devaluing any one;
- Communicative planning needs to be reflective of its own processes and arenas;
- A reflexive and critical capacity should be kept alive in the processes of argumentation, using the Habermassian ideal speech criteria.
- The outcome of this is a process of mutual reconstruction of the interests of participants - mutual learning through mutually trying to understand (and fixed preferences may be altered in this process) (adapted from Healey 1997, 242-244).

Importantly, Healey (1997, 244) argues that through such processes of mutual reconstruction of interests and mutual learning, communicative planning has the potential to change material conditions and power relations. This is achieved through actively constructing new understandings for the purpose at hand, but without necessarily arriving at a unified - or stable - view of respective lifeworlds.

In practical terms, this necessitates a shift in established planning practices. To Forester (1985b; 1989; 1993), another influential writer in the area, the communicative approach reformulates planning practice in distinct ways (Table 9.1):
Table 9.1: A Reformulation of Planning Practice: The Shift from Strictly Instrumental to Practical-Communicative Action

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrumental Planning</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Practical-Communicative Planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>processing information</td>
<td>to shaping attention</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>problem solving</td>
<td>to problem reformulating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seeking detachment to further objectivity</td>
<td>to seeking criticism to check bias and misrepresentation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gathering facts</td>
<td>to addressing significance: gathering facts that matter and interacting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>treating participation as a source of obstruction</td>
<td>to treating participation as an opportunity to improve analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>informing decisions</td>
<td>to organizing attention to formulate and clarify possibilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supplying a single product, a document with “answers”</td>
<td>to developing a process of questioning possibilities, shaping responses and engagement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reinforcing political dependency of affected persons</td>
<td>to fostering meaningful political participation and autonomy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>passing on “solutions”</td>
<td>to fostering policy and design criticism, argument, and political discourse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abstracting from social relations</td>
<td>to reproducing social and political relations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Forester 1993, 28

To Forester (1985a; 1985b), communicative planning is primarily focused on attention-shaping, is always based on interaction between persons and thus is inevitably political. Forester (1989) more explicitly recognises the power dimensions inherent in such attention-shaping, with all its attendant possibilities of selective information disclosure, manipulation of agendas, and selective debriefing. Planners, through providing information, direct and shape the attention of others (Forester 1989; 1993, 27):

In the communicative dialogue, conversation, and play of power that constitute the planning process, the evolution of the questioning of selective possibilities and the shaping of equally selective responses, planners’ and policy analysts’ actions work to organize (or disorganize) citizens’ attention, their engagement, investment, and participation.

Hillier (1993, 89), similarly, emphasises the attention-shaping powers of stories told by planners, stories that “create ideologically potent ‘ways of seeing’ places and issues, which may affect the way people act”. Planners, through customising their language, their stories, and their styles of communication, directly influence the way in which public policy issues are represented:

For different audiences, and for different partners in various conversations, planners use varied rhetorical styles and forms of argument. Meanings may be
rendered ambiguous or may change between different versions of the same narrative (Hillier 1993, 92).

Planners’ ability to do this is directly related to their ability to control information, even sometimes distorting communication in the process (Forester 1989). Such an ability to control information is a source of power, and “planning, as the controlling power over space and its uses, has a strong hegemonic foundation, reinforced by its language and stories” (Hillier 1993, 94).

9.3 Conclusion

Communicative planning is distinct from instrumental approaches to planning in that it emphasises communicative rationality, including the importance of open and undistorted communication, consensus and trust. It is an ideal model and therefore not to be taken literally. Indeed, such consensus and harmony in planning as described by Habermas' ideal speech situation or Healey's communicative planning, is unlikely to ever exist fully. The use of such a model, instead, lies in its counterfactual value as an ideal with which to critique current planning practice. In essence, the communicative approach to planning gives an ideal forward look, because it applies the critical ideal to the planning process and arenas.

In the context of the case study that I am concerned with in this thesis, communicative planning theory provides a normative ideal that can be applied to assess the processes and arenas involved in the development of critical versions of constructed place identity. In Chapters Seven and Eight, I have shown that the development of critical versions of constructed place identity is influenced and constrained by the different levels of place promotion, the degrees of influence at varying levels and the degree of congruence between these levels. As a set of ideal parameters for the incorporation of a critical design dimension into promoted regional identity, I argued, critical regionalism offers a way forward. It is less clear, however, on the processes involved in achieving such critical regional identity. Communicative planning theory, I suggest in this chapter, sets forth a set of ideal parameters for the planning context and the planning processes and arenas that are necessarily a part of the development of a critical dimension to promoted place identity. In the final two substantive chapters, I
evaluate the potential usefulness of these parameters for a conceptualisation of the structure-agency relationship in the Queenstown case study.
10 CHAPTER TEN: THE TOURISM COMMUNITY

10.0 Introduction

As I stated in the previous chapter, communicative planning theory is an attempt to resolve problems of systems imposition on the lifeworld through a focus on the rationality of communication. Communicative planning theory draws on an ideal model (the ideal speech) as a counterfactual ideal with which to critique planning practice, in an attempt to attain better, more inclusive, planning practice based on undistorted communication, consensus and trust. This application of critical theory, I argue, needs to supplement critical regionalism, as critical regionalism, on its own, does not provide a satisfactory conceptualisation of the structure-agency dialectic in a place making context. Because the nature of the place-making context is one that makes the development of critical versions of constructed place identity a contested process, attention needs to be paid to this process and the arenas in which it takes place. In particular, there is a need for a focus on the capacity of a community or region to express, and hence to communicate (in Habermas’ terms), critical local identity.

In this chapter, I investigate the contribution of communicative planning theory to conceptualising the structure-agency relationship in the Queenstown and Glenorchy tourism place-making context. The nature of the Queenstown community is such, I shall argue, that 'bottom-up', or community-based, approaches to tourism planning (even when using a communicative planning process) may be no more successful at the development of a critically local dimension to constructed place identity than 'top-down' approaches, because the ‘bottom’, in the Queenstown case, is difficult to identify because of its complexity and fast-changing nature. I will begin the chapter, however, by first revisiting Glenorchy, because the Glenorchy community planning process appears to adhere to the communicative model.

10.1 The Glenorchy Community Plan

As I explained in Chapter Five, the Glenorchy community, a small settlement situated at the head of Lake Wakatipu 45 km by way of scenic road from Queenstown, has
recently been involved in the development of a community plan. The Glenorchy Community Plan ("the Plan") is the outcome of a comprehensive local planning exercise, initiated by concerned members of the local community. Concerns centred - among other things - on the development of Glenorchy as a tourism destination. Community members wanted to ensure that Glenorchy did not follow a similar development path as the one taken by Queenstown: "We look at Queenstown and we say we know we don't want that" (Glenorchy resident). This meant that future development needed to complement local place and community identity. In order to determine how this might be achieved, a community planning process was initiated by concerned members of the local community. These members held the view that the Glenorchy community needed to be proactive in determining its own future in view of the controversy and the wider development issues associated with the Queenstown landscape decision as described in Chapter Four. In order to incorporate the community in this process, a steering committee was formed, and a series of public workshops, facilitated by an outside facilitator, was selected as the best planning tool with which to ascertain community input into planning.

This process began in February 2000 with a two day planning workshop, followed by a further planning workshop in November 2000, and culminated in the development of a comprehensive plan for the township of Glenorchy (see Chapter X). During the planning workshops, residents were guided through a comprehensive process of determining a future vision for their town, followed by the development of concrete planning guidelines resulting from this vision. This town planning exercise was followed by a survey sent to all Glenorchy ratepayers in May/June 2000, and interviews with selected non-attendees, in an attempt to include every single Glenorchy resident in the process. The aim was to provide opportunity for all residents and ratepayers to contribute their ideas on the future directions for Glenorchy and the Head of the Lake.

The planning workshops were attended by a wide range of community members, including rural land owners, local business operators, concerned residents, local youth, and some of those responsible for marketing Glenorchy as a tourism destination. Those who did not attend (and there was a recognition in the early stages of the exercise that not all people feel comfortable in participating in such a public
forum) were invited to express their opinions in surveys sent out to all members of the community. In addition, and as described above, an attempt was made to interview representatives of sectors of the community which, the committee felt, had not been represented at the town meetings (e.g. land owners in outlying townships, representatives of particular industries, some sectors of the residential community).

Meetings were conducted in a participatory format, with the encouragement of small group work and individual contributions. Meeting outcomes were written up for community consultation and then presented to the community during public meetings at later points in time, in order to gather feedback and confirm understandings. The proposed community plan was then developed and presented to the community again, with the objective of gathering feedback and further community input. Lastly, in February 2002, the final plan was published. This plan, it is hoped, will inform broader district planning processes with planning guidelines for appropriate developments in Glenorchy and the surrounding area.

While there are inevitably those who did not participate in the process and are critical of it, the Glenorchy Community Plan is the outcome of a very considered, inclusive process, based on consensus and trust. In terms of Habermas’ ideal speech criteria, ongoing attempts were made to ensure that participants had the same chance to initiate and perpetuate communication. The outside facilitator also attempted to ensure that no one view was dominant, nor that one view was exempt from criticism or consideration. In terms of Healey’s (1997, 242-244) criteria for communicative planning practice, the Glenorchy process was interactive and interpretive, reflective of its own processes and arenas; and individuals engaged with each other from different “discourse communities” (e.g. rural landowners, tourism operators, local youth). Collaborative consensus-building was a key focus of the process, as were attempts to transcend relations of power inherent in the community. Attention-shaping was another key focus, and participation was conceptualised as an opportunity to improve analysis, rather than as an obstacle to analysis (Forester 1993). Repeated attempts were made to foster meaningful political participation and autonomy. Thus, the development of critical versions of place identity, in the Glenorchy context, was made possible through a process of communicative planning. The Plan does not represent a fully stable consensus on future development for Glenorchy and the Head of the Lake,
but has arrived at achievable levels of mutual understanding for the purpose at hand
(Healey 1997).

Without going into the further difficulties that such a community plan then may
encounter in terms of the broader district planning processes (see Chapters Four and
Five), at least at the level of the community, the planning processes employed in the
development of the Glenorchy Community Plan have gone some way towards the
ideal criteria set forth by communicative planning theory. Arguably, such community
planning processes are a necessary first step if change in the district planning
procedures is to be achieved and/or if the introduction of a critical dimension to
promoted place identity is an important goal.

The size and nature of the Glenorchy community, of course, aided this process. As
stated in Chapter Five, the community is small (402 usually resident people at the
time of the 2001 population census) and, according to its own residents, relatively
cohesive, close knit, and supportive of each other, aided by a relatively stable
population. In addition, a relatively strong consensus regarding the nature of the
community and the future vision for Glenorchy exists. At the level of the Glenorchy
community, then, a focus on communicative rationality appears to be helpful to
addressing the structure-agency dynamics, and the communicative planning process
was instrumental in the relatively successful town planning exercise the community
underwent. Adhering to the communicative ideal, in the Glenorchy community
context, appears to have led to a planning document that is owned by the community
and that may very well provide a strong basis for ongoing Glenorchy input into
broader district planning processes, even in the face of the relatively fraught processes
identified in Chapter Four around the Queenstown Landscape Decision.

Will this be the case for other communities? Can the communicative model be
applied to other contexts? In the remainder of this chapter, I scan the tourism
planning literature for answers to this question, review the Queenstown case study in
terms of the communicative planning ideal and conclude by arguing that
communicative community tourism planning may not be as achievable in a tourism
community such as Queenstown.
10.2 Community Participation in Tourism Planning

The support of planning documents for tourism strategies is more likely where strategies have been developed through consultation and within the context of sustainable development. Sound tourism strategies can also create mutual benefits for the industry and community. As the issues and associated actions addressed in tourism strategies extend beyond the sustainable management of the natural environment, strategies together with the RMA, can facilitate development that is socially, economically and environmentally sustainable. In turn, the industry can gain community support for tourism development and strategies, reducing impediments to development, while the community can have some of its needs met (NZTB/TIANZ 1996, 6).

New Zealand’s tourism industry association, in conjunction with TNZ, emphasises the importance of local tourism strategies, which, in addition to environmental management through the RMA, should lead to socially, economically and environmentally sustainable tourism development. A crucial component, according to the industry, is community support for tourism development, albeit phrased in the interests of reducing impediments to developments, while having 'some' of its needs met.

At face value, this is a laudable objective, and one echoed by the literature (Brandenburg and Carroll 1995; Hall 1997; Massey 1993b; Meethan 1996; Milne, Grekin and Woodley 1998; Norton and Hannon 1997; Ringer 1998; Saarinen 1998), which calls for a more complete consideration of place in resource planning and for an inclusion of local residents’ values in tourism place management (including place planning and promotion). There seems to be an implicit assumption that community participation in tourism planning, although difficult to achieve, would lead to better outcomes for tourism planning (Getz and Jamal 1994; Innskeep 1991; Murphy 1985; Simmons 1989; Simmons 1994). As Taylor (1995, 487) puts it, when reviewing the community participation literature, “it would be easy to conclude that, though the mechanics of community participation require clearer definition, the recognition of the need to involve the community is widely accepted”.113 Two main problems,
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113 For similar statements/conclusions, see also Brandenburg and Carroll 1995, 396; Hall 1997, 77; Massey 1993b, 64; Meethan 1996, 195; Milne, Grekin and Woodley 1998, 104; Ringer 1998, 10; Saarinen 1998, 170.
however, complicate this: First, the term ‘community participation’ can be interpreted to mean everything from direct involvement in political processes to communities ‘being consulted’ through information provision. Second, involving 'the community', often presupposes a degree of homogeneity which, in reality, tourism communities, or any communities, rarely possess.

10.2.1 Tourism and Community

The tourism literature has been concerned with the tourism-community relationship for quite some time. From earliest stage-based models of tourism development and related community reaction (Butler 1980; Doxey 1975) to typologies of tourists and their impacts on tourism development (Smith 1978), the early tourism literature reflects a desire to challenge the assumption that tourism development is good development per se. Butler (1980), for example, describes tourism development in terms of a destination life cycle model, from relatively benign exploration and involvement stages, over development and consolidation to perhaps stagnation and decline. At each of these stages, visitor impacts on the community differ, and so does the community reaction. Both Doxey (1975) and Smith (1978), similarly, relate stages of tourism development to certain community reactions and impacts. Though often cited and still used extensively, these early models of the tourism community relationship view communities as homogeneous wholes, with very little room for variety. Pearce, Moscardo and Ross (1996), in their excellent review of these and other studies of tourism community relationships, conclude that the concept of community is simply not a well understood one.

Burr (1991, 551) also suggests that the research literature suffers from a lack of “substantive theoretical conceptualisation of community”, instead narrowly focusing on a social systems approach. In a review of 25 empirical studies on travel and tourism impacts on rural community organisation and social change, he found that the great majority relied on a social systems approach to community, where community is conceptualised as “a system of roles and institutions through which a common life is organised - a structural organisation of the interaction of social units

---

114 Burr (1991) reviews theoretical approaches to community in order to analyse their application to the tourism literature. He distinguishes between the human ecological approach, the social systems approach, the interactional approach, and the critical approach to community.
which endures through time” (Burr 1991, 541). In today's fast-changing environment, Burr suggests, such an approach is no longer valid. Instead, “it would appear that a dynamic, interactive, yet critical approach, would have more utility” (Burr 1991, 551). A critical perspective would focus on “who in fact benefits and who suffers from tourism development in rural communities, and under what conditions community control and well-being might be enhanced” (Burr 1991, 551).

Pearce et al. (1996), building on Burr's (1991) analysis, advocate an interactional approach to community, combined with critical theoretical concerns. Their definition of community, therefore, is one of an “interacting and communicating aggregate of individuals, sometimes at large and sometimes at small scale in terms of population and location” (Pearce et al. 1996, 28). Drawing on Moscovici (1984), Pearce et al. (1996, 39) use the concept of social representation, which describes “how and what people think in their ongoing everyday experiences and how a wider social reality influences these thoughts”. In such an approach, individuals are given “a much more active role in the construction and experience of their social reality” (Pearce et al. 1996, 42). This social reality can be influenced by social representations existing independently of individuals or groups, through, for example, images and information generated by the mass media. Moreover, this concept of social representation also allows for individual membership of several groups, with resultant differing - sometimes even conflicting - social representations. This, then, presupposes a larger degree of heterogeneity than is generally assumed in the tourism community literature. Madrigal (1995, 87-88) puts it this way:

An individual's identification with a particular group's view usually occurs in reaction to policy and land-use decisions made by local officials .... Consequently, residents are forced to take some kind of a position on development. Residents who share perceptions may be considered part of the same nested community, whereas residents with competing views of development belong to different nested communities.

Each community, therefore, generates several 'truths', all based on different and often conflicting discourse. This creates multiple, legitimate realities, which often overlap (Hillier 1993). People may relate to several such 'truths' in their different roles. For example, residents of a tourism community may hold one view towards further
development in their role as residents, but this view may be altered if such people also operate businesses in these communities and are thus economically dependent on tourism and associated development.

Some truths, however, are more persuasive than others, because some sectors of the community are more influential than others for varying reasons: they may simply be more vocal than others, or they may be more able to participate in the discourse of planning processes, through better access to resources, lobbying access to politicians, or by virtue of belonging to groups 'inside' the planning system. A critical theoretical perspective, as expressed in communicative planning theory, aims to incorporate such "truths" through a communicative process that sets aside power relationships and strategic behaviour.

10.3 Communicative Planning and the Queenstown Community

I have already shown in previous chapters that tourism management and planning structures, in the Queenstown case study, leave much to be desired in terms of their inclusiveness of all sectors of the community. First, and as I argued in Chapter Four, tourism development is influenced through land use planning processes under the RMA (1991). These are focused on effects, deal with planning on a case by case basis and give little opportunity for a strategic focus on the management of growth. This, sections of the Queenstown community feel, has led to development pressures that have privileged private property development over the public good associated with the sustainable management of – sometimes outstanding – natural landscapes. This has significance for tourism planning and development, as there is essentially little room for a strategic approach to tourism planning unless this is undertaken as part of Council planning processes.

Second, the institutional structures associated with destinational marketing, as I argued in Chapters Seven and Eight, are such that community input into decision making is relegated to the margins: Marketing is undertaken by the local Queenstown RTO, which is governed by an industry board, with limited community input (through a Council seat, represented by the Chief Executive). Moreover, because of the nature of the place promotional context, and the different demands at different spatial scales,
national level marketing requirements – and outcomes in the form of tourist flows - have a significant influence on regional place promotion.

Third, and the focus of the remainder of this chapter, even if these institutional obstacles to communicative tourism planning could be removed in relation to Queenstown, there is still the factor of the nature of the Queenstown community.

10.3.1 Defining 'The Community'

Healey (1996, 223-224) argues that a key problem for successful communicative planning is the identification of arenas for argumentation and - consequently - the definition of community within those arenas. Two meanings of community are central:

The first is spatially based, all those in a place who share a concern and/or are affected by what happens there. The second is stake based, that is, all those who, directly or indirectly, have an interest in or care about what the people in the first community are doing in a place.

This is an important distinction in the Queenstown community. As I have shown in previous chapters, a number of interests exist at different levels, including stake-based communities in the form of marketers at different levels, overseas or absentee land owners, and tourism sector interests. Some of these, as I have shown in Chapters Seven and Eight, have greater ability to lobby for the interests of their stake-based claims due to different power positions.

Many Queenstown residents themselves comment on the complex nature of the Queenstown community:

Whenever people ask me about the Queenstown community, I've always been inclined to ask them, which Queenstown community do you mean? I think there are about five Queenstowns operating in different circles, if you like. There are the long-term locals, and there are the short-term transients. The short term transients, in the sense of younger people who come here for work experience or a working holiday. They are in and out within a year or two, or even a season or two. Also belonging to this group are construction workers, when there is a bit of a boom on, like the current one. These are out of town people coming to do development, and then they are away again. But those two groups don't interrelate a lot. There's the medium term transients, or semi-permanents, people in executive positions, CEOs of various things, managers of hotels, restaurants, banks, who are here for a year or two as part of their career, but move on after that. So that makes three groups. Then there's the New Zealand-based party circuit, they come for the skiing, they
come for the partying, they come for the holidays, they come for the festivals, and they do Millbrook. They are party party party party, and they are separate again. And finally, there's the tourists. So there are five groups, if you want to simplify it a little bit, and those groups do not interact a lot, they are by and large very different Queenstowners (Queenstown resident).

The recent Queenstown landscape issue, as described in Chapter Four, has polarised the community and created a number of different, stake-based claims. Chamberlain (2001, 74) describes five development debate factions for the wider Wakatipu Basin, which I will use here because they are identical to the ones I identified in my data. First, there is the Wakatipu Environmental Society, headed by a councillor of the 1995 administration (who was re-elected in 2001). This group is strongly opposed to unchecked development and would like to see a growth management focus. Second, there are local residents and 'lifestyle blockers' who would like their rural neighbourhoods to maintain their rural flavour (this group was featured in the media recently through the debate between actor Sam Neill and former Mayor Warren Cooper regarding the Council's subdivision policy). Third, there are farmers who would like to sell or subdivide for capital gain. The fourth group is made up of what Chamberlain (2001, 74) calls the "big boys": powerful businesspeople and developers, who own large tracts of land and are actively seeking subdivision consent for large scale housing developments. Group five, lastly, was made up of the QLDC under Mayor Warren Cooper, who, at the time, was perceived to be excessively pro-development. These groups, all part of the Queenstown community, clearly have different stake-based claims in the development of Queenstown.

Habermassian critical theory would argue at this point that by setting aside strategic behaviour associated with these stake-based claims and relying on communicative rationality instead, planning can proceed to arrive at consensus. Healey (1997) would counter such strong emphasis on consensus by looking for degrees thereof. Rather than looking for a fully stable consensus, she emphasises the need to search for achievable levels of mutual understanding. The question remains, however: in practice, how is such a community to be united? The processes and arenas for such searching for 'achievable levels of mutual understanding' do not appear to be adequate to facilitate such communicative action in Queenstown. There is strong evidence in my data that important factors standing in the way of communicative
community participation in tourism planning and management (and of community values being included in place management) are the heterogeneity of the community and the variety of stake-based claims, often held by powerful outsiders. The absence of proactive governance or enabling institutional structures for communicative planning (in the form of, for example, a Council-facilitated community planning exercise) lowers the probability of a communicative planning process in which all stakeholders participate on equal terms. Moreover, powerful outsiders (e.g. major corporates, ITOC) have little interest in participating in local planning processes, yet have a degree of influence on the reality that such planning processes aim to shape.

Beyond such problems associated with a very divided community, however, there are more fundamental concerns that relate to the demographic make-up of Queenstown, including population change and transience.

### 10.3.2 The Queenstown Population

The Queenstown Lakes District (incorporating Wanaka) had a usually resident population of 17,043 on census night 2001 (SNZ 2002). The District experienced a massive 71.8% increase in its usually resident population between 1986 and 1996, compared to negative growth rates for the other districts in the Otago region (with the exception of Dunedin City - see Table 10.1) and other regional comparisons (Figure 10.1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waitaki District</td>
<td>22,374</td>
<td>21,888</td>
<td>21,573</td>
<td>20,085</td>
<td>-3.6</td>
<td>-6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Otago Region</td>
<td>16,359</td>
<td>14,967</td>
<td>14,955</td>
<td>14,466</td>
<td>-8.6</td>
<td>-3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queenstown Lakes</td>
<td>8,316</td>
<td>9,984</td>
<td>14,286</td>
<td>17,043</td>
<td>71.8</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunedin City</td>
<td>114,093</td>
<td>114,504</td>
<td>114,342</td>
<td>114,342</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>-1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clutha District</td>
<td>19,545</td>
<td>18,213</td>
<td>18,006</td>
<td>17,172</td>
<td>-7.9</td>
<td>-5.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SNZ 2001a

115 I must restate at this point, as I have done before, that the QLDC administration elected in the 2001 local government elections, under the leadership of the new mayor Clive Geddes, has since engaged the community in a planning exercise aimed at developing a strategic plan. Outcomes from this process have not yet emerged, at the time this thesis went to print.
Between the 1996 and 2001 censuses, the Queenstown Lakes District had a 19.3% increase in its population, compared with 3.3% for NZ as a whole, and -3.3% for the Otago region (Table 10.1). Prior to that, between 1986 and 1996, the difference is even more pronounced. All districts in the Otago region, with the exception of Dunedin City and Queenstown Lakes District had negative growth rates between 1986 and 1996. Dunedin’s growth rate was 3.6%, however, the Queenstown Lakes District’s was 71.8% in that time period. The first indicator of difference, therefore, is that of a strongly growing community, compared to surrounding Central Otago communities, and even compared with Dunedin, Otago's major city. The trend is forecast to continue. For the period between 1996 and 2021, population projections estimate a 52.6% growth rate for the Queenstown Lakes District, compared with 0.7% for the Otago region as a whole. This would bring the total population in the year 2021 to 22,500 people in the Queenstown Lakes District and compares with a projected national increase of 18.1% during the same period (Table 10.2 and Figure 10.2).
Table 10.2: Projected Population Change 1996-2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Otago Region</td>
<td>188,600</td>
<td>189,900</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Otago District</td>
<td>15,200</td>
<td>12,400</td>
<td>-2,800</td>
<td>-18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queenstown Lakes</td>
<td>14,800</td>
<td>22,500</td>
<td>7,800</td>
<td>52.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunedin City</td>
<td>120,300</td>
<td>122,200</td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clutha District</td>
<td>18,300</td>
<td>16,500</td>
<td>-1,800</td>
<td>-10.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SNZ 2000, 11

Figure 10.2: Estimated Total Annual Percentage Population Change (as at 30 June 2002) Queenstown Lakes District (QLD) (1997-2001)

For the year ended December 2000, the Queenstown Lakes District had a net migration of 27, compared to negative migration of -669 for the Otago region (Table 10.3). What is of more significance, though, is the large proportion of people arriving and departing. Almost 3.7% of the population in the Queenstown Lakes District arrived and departed in 2000, compared with 2.7% of the Dunedin City population, which would also have a high migration rate, as a university town, and compared with 2.4% for the Otago region as a whole.\footnote{116} This in- and out-migration indicates a certain level of transience.

\footnote{116} Calculations are based on population estimates for the year 2000 (SNZ 2000).
Table 10.3: Permanent and Long-Term Migration Year Ended December 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Territorial Authorities</th>
<th>Arrivals</th>
<th>Departures</th>
<th>Net Migration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Otago Region</td>
<td>2,164</td>
<td>2,833</td>
<td>-669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Otago District</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>-77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queenstown Lakes</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunedin City</td>
<td>1,364</td>
<td>1,897</td>
<td>-533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clutha District</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>-57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SNZ 2000, 13

When analysing residential addresses five years ago (Table 10.4), a clear picture of transience emerges in the Queenstown Lakes District. The District had a significantly lower proportion of people (27%) who indicated that they had been at the same address five years ago compared to the Otago region as a whole (46%), and the 3 cities of Dunedin (44%), Christchurch (43%) and Rotorua (45%), as well as New Zealand as a whole (45%). The District also had a significantly higher proportion of residents who had been overseas five years ago (10%), as compared to single figures in the comparison areas.

Table 10.4: Address 5 Years Ago

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address 5 years ago (in %)</th>
<th>Central Otago</th>
<th>Queenstown Lakes</th>
<th>Dunedin</th>
<th>Christchurch</th>
<th>Rotorua</th>
<th>NZ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Same Address as 5 Years Ago</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same TLA</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same RC, Different TLA</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different RC, Same Island</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different RC, Different Island</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Specified New Zealand</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overseas</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SNZ 1996

When analysed by people's length of stay at a particular address, the Queenstown Lakes District showed significant difference compared to other districts and cities: almost half (45%) of the District’s residents had been at their current address for one year or less, compared with a national average of 31% (Table 10.5).

---

117 TLA refers to territorial local authority, RC refers to regional council.
Table 10.5: Years at Address

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years at Address (%)</th>
<th>Queenstown Lakes</th>
<th>Dunedin</th>
<th>Southland</th>
<th>Central Otago</th>
<th>Christchurch</th>
<th>Rotorua</th>
<th>New Zealand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 1 Year</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Years</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Years</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9 Years</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14 Years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19 Years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24 Years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29 Years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 30 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Pop</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SNZ 1996

This is particularly marked in Queenstown Bay itself, where the transient population has grown fast over the last 10 years (Figure 10.3):

Figure 10.3: Transient Population Queenstown Lakes District (1991, 1996, 2001)

In fact, Queenstown Bay's transient population equates to 60% of its total population (Figure 10.4):

---

118 While general results for the 2001 census had been released at the time of writing this, data related to many variables at district level had not yet been released. Data analysis in this chapter, therefore,
Population growth rates analysed over the last 10 years, in particular, show that the resident population growth rate is falling gradually, but that the transient population is increasing exponentially (Figure 10.5).

Figure 10.5: Growth Rate of Total, Resident and Transient Populations Over the Last 5 Years Queenstown Lakes District (1996-2001)

relies on a mix of 1996 and 2001 census data, as indicated in the relevant tables.
Lastly, a look at household composition further reinforces the emerging picture. On census night in 1996, the Queenstown Lakes District had a significantly higher percentage of people living in non-family households (15%) than New Zealand as a whole and the Central Otago region. Conversely, it had a significantly lower proportion of people living in one family households than the comparison areas (Table 10.6).

Table 10.6: Household Composition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household composition (%)</th>
<th>Christchurch</th>
<th>Central Otago</th>
<th>Queenstown Lakes</th>
<th>Dunedin</th>
<th>Rotorua</th>
<th>New Zealand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One Family Only</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Family + Other People</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Families</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Family Household</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Available</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SNZ, 1996

The picture that emerges thus far is one of fast population growth, coupled with a high percentage of in- and outmigration. This leads to a transient community structure, a finding that is also borne out in my interviews with Queenstown residents.

10.3.3 Transience

I don’t know whether the community stays in one place long enough to find itself (Arrowtown resident).

A strong theme in my data is the transient nature of the Queenstown community, as perceived by my respondents and reinforced by statistical data. This transience is coupled with a short-term commitment to place and community:

The number one thing I don’t like about Queenstown is transients, because most of the people that are in Queenstown at any one time are only here for a few days, the whole energy of the place is transient. Not only that, but the people that are here to work tend to be transient, so you tend to make friends, and usually within a few years they’ve upped and left - it’s quite hard to make long term friends here (Queenstown resident).

This is seen as directly related to the business of the town, tourism:

When a community focus is on farming or on mining, they are long term occupations, but tourism isn’t necessarily, it invites more transient people who
perhaps get less committed to the community, and that becomes a big issue. At a
time when so much more of government policy is pushing things back on the
community, at the end of the day you get a very wilted community (Glenorchy
resident).

Such a 'wilted community', in residents' own terms, is characterised by less
commitment to community, no sense of ownership, social problems, and no strong
community identity. A combination of a transient workforce, newcomers who are
working in the tourism industry, and wealthy weekend homeowners whose houses
take up the landscape that was once characterised by farming, is blamed for this:

We don't have a community in the sense that other places have communities, so if
you’re looking at the benefits of tourism one starts to question where the
community is. If you can't find the community, it's quite hard to ascertain the
benefits of tourism to the community .... If you wanted to change the place, you'd
have to find some kind of community to start with to figure out what the values are
(Queenstown resident).

The make-up of the labour force also contributes to the transience of the Queenstown
community.

10.3.4 Labour Force Characteristics

As early as 1985, in a report to the New Zealand Tourism Council, the transience of
the workforce was identified as a problem in Queenstown. Queenstown's workforce,
in this report, is described as having a “large number of young, single New Zealanders
without dependents” who are extremely mobile (New Zealand Tourism and Publicity
(NZTP) 1985a, 2). The nature of the tourism industry, the report continues, “has
created a town suffering to some extent from the problems of transiency. Transiency
and its threat to the established and relatively stable community structure is of
growing concern to the local authorities and to some in the Queenstown community”
(NZTP 1985a, 2).

Two characteristics are key: First, the town’s set of attractions coupled with
opportunities for seasonal work in the service sector have led to a regular in- and
outflow of transient workers. Queenstown is attractive to young workers because of
its access to the outdoors, its nightlife, and, in winter, its variety of snow sports on
offer. A low unemployment rate (2.5% compared with 7.7% for New Zealand at the
time of the 1996 census, see Table 10.7) contributes to this, as demand for skilled
labour often outstrips supply. As a result, an itinerant workforce moves in and stays for a season or less:

The culture of the transient workers themselves I think is a culture of young people coming in from all parts of the world, from some of the Asian countries, particularly Japan, from Britain, from Europe, and from the States, or North America, and from the Philippines. They work in hotels and play up, basically. And do their stuff for a season, and then they go back. And that's quite different from the pattern of working holidays from Australia that we used to see here (Queenstown resident).

Table 10.7: Labour Force Characteristics within Otago, 1996

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Unemployment Rate</th>
<th>Labour Force Participation Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waitaki District</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>60.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Otago District</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>65.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queenstown Lakes District</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>76.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunedin City</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>60.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clutha District</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>68.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otago</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>62.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SNZ 1999c, 21

As described above, this culture of the itinerant workforce contributes to the fact that, at any one time, almost half (45%) of the workforce has been in Queenstown for a year or less (SNZ 1996, see Table 10.5).

Second, the predominance of the tourism industry in Queenstown generates a particular type of employment, characteristic of which is the predominance of the service sector. 24% of the population at the 1996 census were employed in the service sector in the Queenstown Lakes District, compared with a national average of 14% (Table 10.8).
Table 10.8: Occupation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation 1996 (in %)</th>
<th>Christchurch</th>
<th>Central Otago</th>
<th>Queenstown Lakes</th>
<th>Dunedin</th>
<th>Southland District</th>
<th>Rotorua</th>
<th>NZ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legislators; Administrators and Managers</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technicians and Associate Professionals</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerks</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service and Sales Workers</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture and Fishery Workers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trades Workers</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant and Machine Operators and Assemblers</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Occupations</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SNZ 1996

By contrast, only 3.8% of local employment is in manufacturing (compared with 19.6% for NZ as a whole), and 19.5% in hotels/motels (compared with 2% for NZ) (NZTB 1998).

Fifty-six percent of businesses are direct service providers in the tourism industry, in a number of different tourism sectors (Table 10.9). If indirect servicing is factored in, 85% of Queenstown’s businesses are involved in tourism-related business, and therefore depend on tourism for their economic wellbeing (C. Geddes, personal communication, January 2000).

Table 10.9: Tourism Industry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tourism Sector</th>
<th>% of total businesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trades and Services</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurants/Bars</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourist Services</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


This high proportion of service workers in the Queenstown economy, coupled with a proliferation of seasonal, temporary or part time employment, contributes to the transience of the workforce and brings its own challenges:
Tourism is not a good employer. Most governments in New Zealand for the last 20 years would have liked to put across the myth that if we develop tourism, we get jobs for people. Yeah, what sort of jobs, 8.50 an hour, part time, and temporary. To survive in this town, people are holding down 4 jobs, and that's not good for anybody (Queenstown resident).

Career paths in the industry are often ill-defined, and opportunities outside the directly service-related jobs are rare:

If workers want to do more than serve wine or clean hotel rooms, or bum around as rafting guides, which is actually quite a well paid job, unless you are innovative enough to start up something really different as your own business, there's nothing here for you (Queenstown resident).

It is not surprising, then, that employers indicate that staff turnover is increasing and that average length of stay has dropped:

Our turnover, we've got 35 hotels in the chain, and our turnover is the highest out of any of the hotels, it used to be a huge problem. I think if there was a negative to tourism in Queenstown, the transient workforce would be it, and it's probably one of the most important factors .... When I arrived three years ago, it was a massive problem, because we did have the peaks and the troughs, so we would employ about 40 room attendants over summer, and half of them would be students, and they are here for 6 or 8 weeks to get some money together to take back to support their student loan. They are not really that interested in the standards, we give them some training to meet our standards, but you can't take them out and do serious training, because they are only going to leave again (Tourism operator).

The nature of employment in tourism, therefore, contributes to the transient nature of the town.

10.4 Conclusion

Communicative planning theory, as outlined in the previous chapter, puts forth a number of criteria with regard to an ideal planning practice. It attempts to establish parameters for drawing on the multidimensionality of 'lifeworlds' in search for "achievable levels of mutual understanding for the purpose at hand – through finding ways of reasoning among competing claims for action, without dismissing or devaluing any one" (Healey 1997, 242). In the process, communicative planning practice should be "reflective of its own processes and arenas", keeping a "reflexive
and critical capacity ... alive in the processes of argumentation, using the Habermas'sian ideal speech criteria” (Healey 1997, 243-244). The ideal outcome of such a process is the “reconstruction of the interests of participants – mutual learning through mutually trying to understand” (Healey 1997, 244). In the context of the case study in this thesis, I stated at the end of Chapter Nine, the theory should provide a normative ideal with which to critique the processes and contexts involved in the development of critical versions of constructed place identity, something which, I had argued previously, critical regionalism is essentially silent about.

Two main conclusions can be drawn from the data presented in this chapter. First, the Queenstown community is clearly divided into factions and interest groups, some place-based, some stake-based, but all of them with varying views about future development and, more importantly, varying positions of power in this. Second, a general picture of transience of the Queenstown community emerges, both in terms of its residents, and related, in terms of its workforce. This is clearly due to the business which dominates Queenstown: tourism. What, then, does this transience mean in terms of the questions I am posing in this chapter with regard to communicative community tourism planning? The nature of the Queenstown community is such that, even if institutional structures for tourism planning were in place, the transient characteristics of both the workforce and the residential community potentially influence the opportunities for communicative planning processes. Different sectors of the community have different stake-based claims in Queenstown development, but the forces of transience mean that, at any one time, there are large sections of the community which have come to Queenstown for reasons of part-time, seasonal employment in pursuit of a working holiday experience. These sections are not likely to have an influence on, or are even interested in, the ongoing planning or management of Queenstown, let alone the development of critical versions of constructed place identity. The expression of critical local identity through communicative planning processes in such a context is unlikely to be successful. In addition to this, and as I will show in the next chapter, the transient nature of the community has implications for attachments to place and resultant commitment to, and motivation for, participation in public processes such as tourism planning.
In the previous chapter I described the nature of the Queenstown community. A general picture of transience emerges, both in terms of residents and workforce, coupled with stake-based factions and interest groups. I posed the question of what this means in terms of community participation in tourism planning, in pursuit of the development of critical versions of constructed place identity and through the processes of communicative planning. In this chapter, I will show that the very nature of the Queenstown community has implications for attachments to place and resultant commitment to, and motivation for, participation in public processes.

11.1 Community Attachments to Place

A large body of literature is concerned with people’s attachment to place (see, for example, Gerson, Stueve and Fischer 1977; Fried 1982; Gibson 1996; Goudy 1982; Herting and Guest 1985; Hull, Lam and Vigo 1994; Hummon 1992; Mansfeld and Ginosar 1994; McCool and Martin 1994; Seamon 1984; Shamai 1991). Hummon (1992) distinguishes between three broad approaches to understanding community attachment: those focusing on community satisfaction, those focusing on community attachment, and, lastly, those to do with identity and community life. Community satisfaction research has roots in both social psychological quality of life studies and in work on community, environment and sentiment. It employs social survey techniques to measure people’s subjective assessment of community. A key finding is that a large variety of ecological, environmental, social, and perceptual factors influence local satisfaction with place (e.g. size and type of community, quality and ownership of housing, quality of physical neighbourhood) (Hummon 1992).

Community attachment studies are concerned with the emotional attachment to place, drawing on community and urban sociology (e.g. Toennies, Marx, Weber, Gans, Durkheim, Wirth), and understand attachment to be a function of processes other than those identified by the community satisfaction tradition outlined above. In this
approach, community attachment is not directly related to community size, density or type, or even types of settlement patterns, but more broadly to factors such as length of residence, memories of significant life experience, and local social involvements. (Hummon 1992).

Identity, place, and community sentiment studies, the third approach, explore “the ways locales are imbued with personal and social meanings, and how such symbolic locales can serve in turn as an important locus of the self” (Hummon 1992, 258). Hull et al. (1994) refer to this as the contribution of place attributes to people's self-identity. Links to the concept of sense of place (see Chapter Two) are clearly apparent, at least if sense of place is conceptualised at the level of personal orientation towards place. Indeed, as Hull et al. (1994, 118) point out, place identity (and, I would argue, other aspects of community attachment to place) “may be a subset of sense of place in that it influences peoples' connectedness or relatedness to place”.

As I argued in the previous chapter, the nature of the Queenstown community is characterised by many stake-based sub-communities and a high degree of transience. At any one time, a large proportion of the population is only resident for a brief period, and there are also many medium-term transients. Senses of place, as a result, are likely to vary, with some related to short-term residency, and others to the culture of the transient workforce. Moreover, different stake-based claims in Queenstown development may lead to different views on place management, particularly with regard to the degree of development that is acceptable.

Relph's (1976) classification of place experience and his distinction between existential outsideness and existential insideness is useful here (Table 11.1), because it enables an insight into why different stake-based communities may have different attachments to place and resultant differing views on development.
Existential outsideness
This involves a self-conscious and reflective uninvolvedness, an alienation from people and places, homelessness, a sense of the unreality of the world, and of not belonging. From such a perspective places cannot be significant centres of existence, but are at best backgrounds to activities that are without sense, mere chimeras, and at worst voids .... All places assume the same meaningless identity and are distinguishable only by their superficial qualities.

Objective outsideness
The deliberate adoption of a dispassionate attitude towards places in order to consider them selectively in terms of their locations or as spaces where objects and activities are located, involves a deep separation of person and place. Self-consciously places are changed from facts of immediate experience into things having certain attributes, within systems of locations that can be explained by 'central place theory' or some other theory of location.

Incidental outsideness
While objective outsideness is in essence a deliberately adopted intellectual attitude, incidental outsideness describes a largely unselfconscious attitude in which places are experienced as little more than the background or setting for activities and are quite incidental to those activities.

Vicarious insideness
It is possible to experience places in a secondhand or vicarious way, that is, without actually visiting them, yet for this experience to be one of a deeply felt involvement. One purpose of the artist or poet in depicting a place is to convey something of what it is to live there, to give a sense of that place.

Behavioural insideness
Behavioural insideness consists of being in a place and seeing it as a set of objects, views, and activities arranged in certain ways and having certain observable qualities. In contrast to incidental outsideness in which a place is experienced as little more than a background to events, behavioural insideness involves deliberately attending to the appearance of that place.

Empathetic insideness
There is no abrupt distinction between empathetic and behavioural insideness, rather there is a fading from the concern with the quality of appearance to emotional and empathetic involvement in place .... Empathetic insideness demands a willingness to be open to significances of a place, to feel it, to know and respect its symbols - much as a person might experience a holy place as sacred without necessarily believing in that particular religion. This involves not merely looking at a place, but seeing into and appreciating the essential elements of its identity .... To be inside a place empathetically is to understand that place as rich in meaning, and hence to identify with it.

Existential insideness
To be inside a place and to experience it as completely as we can does not mean that existentially we are insiders. The most fundamental form of insideness is that in which a place is experienced without deliberate and self-conscious reflection yet is full with significances. It is the insideness that most people experience when they are at home and in their own town or region, when they know the place and its people and are known and accepted there. Existential insideness characterises belonging to a place and the deep and complete identity with a place that is the very foundation of the place concept.
Relph (1976, 51-56) distinguishes between different kinds of place experience, ranging from existential outsideness to existential insideness. *Existential outsiders*, in this characterisation, decide self-consciously and reflectively not to be involved with places; they do not feel that they belong. Places, in this experience, become backdrops to activities, “only distinguishable by their superficial qualities” (Relph 1976, 51). *Objective outsiders* adopt a dispassionate attitude towards places, see them as possessing certain attributes, with deliberate divorce of person from place. They differ from the previous category in that they are not alienated from the places in question, but deliberately adopt a dispassionate attitude, perhaps for the purposes of objective evaluation. *Incidental outsiders* do this, too, but not deliberately. Rather, these people unselfconsciously experience places as backdrops or settings for activities. Relph's (1976, 52) category of *vicarious outsiders* describes people who experience place in a second hand or vicarious way, without actually visiting them. They have, nonetheless, a deeply felt involvement with place. The obvious example of an attempt to convey this sense of place is advertising: advertisers, along with poets and artists, try to convey a sense of place to those who have not yet visited places.

*Behavioural insiders* are distinguished from incidental outsiders (who see places as backdrops) by a recognition that places are assemblies of objects, views and activities, which amount to certain qualities. This sense of place involves more deliberate attention to the appearance of places (Relph 1976, 53). *Empathetic insiders* represent a slight shift towards even more deliberate attention to place, which Relph (1976, 54) describes as a “fading from the concern with the quality of appearance to emotional and empathetic involvement in place”. Understanding of, and empathy with, places feature highly in empathetic insiders, and are perfected, lastly, in Relph's (1976, 55) category of *existential insiders*. These people's experience of place is one of rootedness, of non-deliberate and unselfconsciously reflection, of being-at-home. These different kinds of place experience are clearly reflected in the Queenstown community.
11.2 The Queenstown Community, Attachment to Place, and Critical Local Identity

The transience of the Queenstown community has a profound impact on community identity, attachments to place, and the development of a critical dimension to constructed place identity. Relph’s (1976) description of various types of community attachment and senses of place is helpful for an analysis of the implications of such transience. It highlights the variety of attachments that underlie different senses of place and that mean that the notion of a critical dimension to constructed place identity is nonsensical. Instead, multiple versions of place identity exist, and it is here that the need for communicative planning theory’s focus on context and processes becomes apparent again. Habermas’ focus on communicative rationality, and communicative planning theorists’ adaptation thereof, propose ways and means to negotiate between such different interpretations of place and place identity as are apparent in the Queenstown context.

11.2.1 Outsiders

Existential outsiders, in Relph’s (1976, 51) categorisation, view places as backdrops to activities, “only distinguishable by their superficial qualities”. As I described above, Queenstown has a large community of transient workers, including short term one-season casual workers, and more medium term professionals and managers who spend several seasons in the resort and then move on. Added to a low percentage of long term residents, Queenstown also has a lower than average number of medium-term residents: Only 9% of the Queenstown population had been at the same address 10-19 years, compared with 15% nationally and in the Otago region (Table 10.5 in the previous chapter). By contrast, and to restate, nearly half (45%) of the Queenstown population had been at the same address a year or less.

For many of these newer arrivals, the place and community of Queenstown is defined in terms of what it can offer. Many people, and this is particularly true for the short term seasonal workers, have come to Queenstown for certain place attributes:

It’s a good place to work over the summer, there is a lot of work, you can shift between jobs easily when you’re sick of one, but most importantly, there’s all this outdoor stuff at such close range – your days off are just full up with lots of activities and fun, and the nightlife is something else (Tourism industry employee)
And:

I tend to work in Queenstown (as a ski instructor) over the winter, and then over the summer go to the States [USA] to work there. Many jet boat operators do that, too, they spend their summers here, and then go to the States to work over the winter. You only last so long, but hey, it's a great way to have some fun and earn a bit of money and see the world's beautiful places (Tourism industry employee).

To short term working holidayiers, a stay in Queenstown has elements of the traditional OE (overseas experience), a quintessential New Zealand rite of passage:

Queenstown and its environment, I don't know whether you've picked it up, it's the closest young people can experience to living overseas, the good times they had on their one or two years of OE - Queenstown is offering a very similar environment. Where else can you get the same international flavour, the same amenities? (Queenstown resident)

For Relph’s (1976) next category of objective outsiders, place attributes are particularly important, with a dispassionate attitude towards person-place relationships. For these people, Queenstown has less personal meanings and acquires commercial meanings:

People would say Queenstown hasn't changed that much in 20 years, but in fact it was a bit of a shell of a town. It had a lot of adventure activities, but it didn't have a community as such, it didn't have supermarkets, multiplex theatres, you know, it didn't have the reasons that actually people look for when they are thinking will I settle there, will I have family here, and it's all that psychology of what makes a real place, what makes a real town or city (Tourism operator).

The resultant sense of community is one much more focused on what Relph (1976, 53) describes as deliberate attention to the appearance of places, with a focus on what a place can offer but with a degree of divorce of person from place. Improved shopping developments (e.g. the development of a major shopping precinct (Remarkables Park) in Frankton, with a planned Warehouse franchise, a major furniture retailer and supermarkets (Figure 11.2) is an important part of the place’s value):

I think the community is being strengthened greatly through all the things we have through tourism, the hospital and the airport, we wouldn't have the restaurants, and the things you can do. The better schools, the better shopping, etc. It's actually changed the persona of the town (Tourism operator)
And:

It [the Queenstown waterfront] used to be just sort of a grotty park, with several nice but extremely lonely weeping willows, but now you've got all the paving, all the layout, you've got the new wharves, that's a great leap forward, and it looks like a place that people can be proud to live in. People were proud of it before, but it's a good showpiece in many ways, which it wasn't before (Queenstown resident).

Developers often display outsideness in Relph’s (1976) sense, because, of course, and this is particularly true for those who have interests beyond Queenstown, their interests in place and community are clearly stake-based:

There are those in the community who would hang on to their little piece of land in the face of huge offers from developers. You have to look at this from both points of view. These people clearly profit from development in the event of a sale. And what keeps them hanging on? They have some sort of nostalgia for preserving Queenstown the way it was. And what was it then? A sleepy little town, with boring infrastructure, just like many other towns that size in New Zealand. When I say to people that I live in a town with 10,000 people, they immediately conjure up images of the nearest small town of that size, with a milkbar or a dairy and a couple of dogs running around. That's taking it to an extreme, but you know with 146 restaurants and bars in town, Queenstown has got a very good international flavour (Developer).

And:

Let's face it, this is a tourism town, tourism is going to happen in a big way, and development is part of that. These people who continually want to apply the breaks don't see the big picture – investment is just going to go elsewhere (Developer).

Outsiders, then, conceptualise place and community in quite distinct ways, and therefore either have no firm views on development (because they are not affected in any way, as is the case for short term casual workers), or have clearly vested, stake-based interests, as is the case for some developers. This set of views is contrasted with those of some long term residents.
11.2.2 Insiders

Relph's (1976) main category of insiders, ranging in emphasis from existential to behavioural insiders, is found in a sector of the Queenstown community. Existential and empathetic insiders, for example, have strong roots, with often several generations of family having lived in the area. Many of these residents, nowadays, can be found in areas other than Queenstown itself. They have moved on (some to Kelvin Heights Peninsula across Lake Wakatipu, but many further afield to Wanaka or other parts of Central Otago) and have been replaced by new arrivals. As I explained in Chapter 10, only 4% of the Queenstown population had been at the same Queenstown address for more than 20 years at the time of the 1996 census, compared with 10% nationally and 11% in the wider Otago region (Table 10.5 in Chapter 10):

If you'd come 5 years ago, you would have found many more of those people [long term residents], they've had to get out of town, most because they could not afford to refuse an offer for their land. I just talked to a guy at the weekend, whose family moved out of town, they're all regretting moving out of town, because if they'd hung on for another year, they could have sold their places for a bit more. But they'd still like to move back here. But they can't anymore. I think you'd find a lot of that if you went round the country (Arrowtown resident).

And:

The indigenous population has decreased exponentially since the growth of tourism – the indigenous European population that is. When I say indigenous, I mean families that were here 100 years ago, they've had to leave town for a variety of reasons, some to profit themselves, some because they couldn't avoid it. I don't think the indigenous population has benefited at all (Arrowtown resident).

These long term residents often have a very particular sense of place, strongly connected to nostalgia for times past and communities that have long since changed beyond recognition. Versions of local place identity, to these people, are based on deeply rooted senses of place:

Queenstown is family for me, I've been around the world, I lived away for 10 years overseas, but this is home. Family, and then the heritage, you know I feel quite a deep-rooted sense of place, my children are 5th generation here (Queenstown resident).

Nostalgia for features of an earlier community is part of this:

When I started ... work, I'd say to my husband whereabouts is such and such a street. And he'd say never heard of it. Who lives there? And I'd tell him. And
he'd say, oh I know where that is. And that's the way we lived. And today, you never meet anyone local (Queenstown resident).

And:

There's not that nice supportiveness that you get in other places, when you actually go to the local shop and the person knows who you are and says hello .... It's changed, it doesn't have that family feel about it anymore (Queenstown resident).

Instead:

You go into a shop and they ask you 'are you enjoying your holiday', and I think 'I've been here longer than you'. They don't care, they think you are a tourist (Queenstown resident).

Some locals are forced out, many have sold homes and land in lucrative deals with real estate developers. Many others, however, feel trapped by development pressures. They are, in a sense, insiders who have mentally been outsiders for a period of time, but cannot move (or do not want to) for a variety of reasons:

You see what really is hurting me an awful lot is the fact that I feel I can't stay here [in a single residential property on prime development land surrounded by new accommodation developments]. But if I sell it, the first thing that will happen is there will be a bulldozer coming right through it and bulldozing all my trees, my garden and everything in it. It's hard to sell your home knowing that is going to happen. The fact that I've lived here a long time, that my husband is buried here and that all my friends are here makes it even more difficult to think of moving (Queenstown resident).

And:

They are pushing everybody out of the town, there used to be a lot of elderly people living in Queenstown, and dear little houses that have now been gobbled up, and they've put big buildings in, you know, for shops, for hotels, for everything. And all these houses, the whole character of the town has changed (Queenstown resident).

Local aspects of infrastructure are replaced with those that cater for tourists:

There's an uneven emphasis on tourism shops and facilities. You can't go downtown and buy a pair of work jeans, the town is heavily balanced towards tourism with its services and facilities. The local tends to have to go away to shop (Queenstown resident).

And:

I haven't been down the mall for I don't remember how long, I mean there's no reason to go down there, there's just tourists, people with sheepskins and paua
shells, selling all that rubbish to tourists. It's been like that ever since I was a kid, though, but at least years ago you knew people, you knew everybody in the shops, now they're half Japanese, you don't even know who they are (Queenstown resident).

Such removal of local elements changes people's sense of place and place attachment:

I was born in Queenstown, and I grew up in Queenstown, but I don't actually feel any attachment to the town at all, except for little pockets of it that I have really strong memories of. Queenstown has changed so much that I don't really have any sort of sense that it's my home town, it's not emotionally loaded anymore. For me now it's the district, it's the mountains, it's the colours (Wakatipu Basin resident).

11.2.3 Emergent Localisms?

People who move there [Queenstown] now, who don't know it the way I knew it, they love it (Queenstown resident).

A second set of insiders, consisting of some long-term locals and many of those medium term residents who have moved to Queenstown for lifestyle or business reasons, recognise that tourism development in Queenstown has brought certain benefits to the place. Their views on Queenstown's place identity are often more 'progressive', less backward-looking and to them, tourism has improved local senses of place to some degree, has contributed to a critical version of place identity:

It's an exciting place to live, too, because we have the best of both worlds out here. We can go in and mix with the tourists in town, and you hear people talking in different languages, and it's got that exciting ambience which you don't get in places like Dunedin or Invercargill (Queenstown resident).

These are perhaps Relph's (1976) behavioural insiders, where a recognition of places as assemblies of objects, views and activities, as well as certain qualities, becomes important. Thus, perceptions of benefits from tourism are mixed with apprehension with regard to Queenstown's current state of development:

Growing up in Queenstown, it is a tourist town, but it gave us a huge range of people and experiences that we would never have had growing up in a similar sized town. As much as I detest and dislike how much it's changed, I'm very grateful that I grew up here and had these opportunities (Queenstown resident).

And:
I have some disquiet that the development in the last 30 years has removed the sense of place. My sense of place goes back quite a long time, and change for me has paradoxically been more gradual than it has been for people who have been here 10 years, who say wow, it has changed fantastically in that time. One tends to obviously know fewer people, given that it was 1000 people 30 years ago, now it’s 10000. It’s lost the sense of the small town. But on the other hand, there is a certain buzz about the place which I quite like. It might be terrible but it’s interesting at the same time (Queenstown resident).

In this view, the development of tourism has contributed to the development of a progressive place identity, one that picks the best of global influences and incorporates them into the local. The level of cosmopolitanism is one example of this to some people:

I think Queenstown is probably more cosmopolitan than any other town of its size in New Zealand and a lot of places in the world, because it does have such a great range of influences from many different parts of the globe, there’s a lot of Asian ownership of property here, there’s quite a few Americans here. There is a very good smattering of locals, of New Zealanders, both from this area and sort of Southland, and other parts of New Zealand, so I think it is very cosmopolitan, and that’s good for me from a social perspective (Queenstown resident).

In many Queenstowners’ views, tourism representations also add to their sense of place and pride in Queenstown:

I'm quite proud of living here, because when I travelled overseas, you can take little picture books, oh isn’t that fantastic, people have heard about it. I always feel proud that I'm from Queenstown (Queenstown resident).

To others, the town’s iconic status adds to its intrinsic worth:

One of the things I do is talk to elderly Americans, and it's quite humbling to talk to them about Queenstown in a personal sense, as opposed to the tourism presentational sense of the thing. And you realise, talking to them, that the place has an intrinsic worth, if you like. And I think here we're talking about the landscape, we're not talking about the shops downtown. Presentation as a national icon - one has a certain cynicism about the way it's presented, but you cannot deny its iconic status (Queenstown resident).
11.3 Implications for the “Argument that Builds a Community”\textsuperscript{119}

The transience of the Queenstown community, coupled with a diverse set of different sub-communities, has implications for the process of developing critical versions of constructed place identity in several ways. First, the building of community, one of the prerequisites for the identification of critical versions of place identity, is difficult in a place like Queenstown, with its transient nature. To engage such transient “discourse communities” (Healey 1997, 243) in a communicative planning process is extremely difficult, as the constant moving in and out of large sectors of the community has implications for attachment to place and community:

As a resident here, I actually find it a very difficult place to live in. I don't actually like living in the basin. I don't like living in the basin because I don't have a sense of belonging. It's very transient, I make friends, they go, I make friends, they go, and there doesn't seem to be that support. Everyone's so busy, there's not that nice supportiveness that you get in other small town places, when you actually go to the local shop and the person knows who you are and says hello. I can go into Queenstown, I'll get no recognition from any of the people, and I might not see anybody I know. It doesn't have that nice warm sense of belonging (Arrowtown resident).

Even medium term residents acknowledge that it is difficult to build a sense of community, albeit a personal community, in Queenstown:

I think it's a hard place for people to get in to make friends. I mean people get into their little set, maybe, but it's not an easy access place. That's a particularly sorry issue for mothers at home with children. For nine years, I worked in Alexandra, and although I was living outside the area, it had a nice sense of belonging, you felt like you were going to an ordinary town, and there's something rather nice about that. It had a structured through the ages population that you run across all the time. You don't get that in Queenstown (Arrowtown resident).

The transient nature of the community introduces a certain wariness to people's attempts to build community:

People are wary. We might go tomorrow. People are very very cautious of us. In fact sometimes when I've met people they've said, look, are you going to stay? Which means, and they've said, look, I don't want to invest energy in friends now who might leave (Queenstown resident).

And:

\textsuperscript{119} Term coined by one of my respondents.
I think tourism indirectly, and growth directly, have changed the community, because community ties depend, it's a bit like a tree, to bring up roots, it needs time, it takes a while. The problem here is because you're starting from a low base, a lot of people who have come here lately haven't got family here, so it either works and you stay or it doesn't work and you leave. People come here and there's no grandparents here, there's no aunts here, family ties are somewhere else - they come in there and get into a tourism job and burn out and go back out. Every time that happens, they break ties (Queenstown resident).

The transience of the Queenstown community and the different attachments to place have important implications for what one of my respondents termed "the argument that builds a community" (Arrowtown resident):

In the Oamarus, Balcluthas, the Alexandras and Gores [other central Otago small towns], .... there's been gigantic argument, there have been rival groups, and they've eventually arrived at some synthesis, not without having a great deal of hot air and going at throats. And Queenstown simply doesn't have that; you don't have people that have the time to get involved in that argument that builds a community (Arrowtown resident).

This is a key point: Communicative planning depends on people's ability to get involved in planning processes. Such processes take time and effort, scarce commodities for most people in today's society, let alone people in the Queenstown community.

Second, the prominence of tourism in Queenstown leads to what one of my respondents called "no real spaces or times for the community" (Queenstown resident):

The impact of that [the 24 hour 7 day a week business] has been that there are no real spaces or times for the community - Saturday and Sunday is the same as a midweek day, is the same as Easter Monday. And you don't have times of the year or the month that are community times. And you really notice it when you go to functions in particular, if you try to put on something during the day, if you go for Saturday/Sunday, which would be a logical thing to do in any other town in NZ, it doesn't make any difference here (Queenstown resident).

And:

Everybody is so busy, and that's another effect of the tourist thing, everybody has so much going on in their work and just keeping things going while we've got umpteen thousand strangers coming through the place, that you really don't see the locals at all. There are other times of the year that you do see them, and you see them in particular places. I picked it up last year, going up to the Frankton Events
Centre on a Saturday morning for the netball, when the school netball is on. You pick it up at the library; you'll see the locals at the library (Queenstown resident).

This has implications in terms of the maintenance of community activities:

There's a small professional group who are basically a Monday to Friday 9-5 group, and they are a very very small portion to keep things like Lions and Rotary or the schoolboys' cricket or soccer or anything going, and they are always the same ones, because so many of the other workers in town have to work Saturday mornings, or they work to 3 o'clock on Friday night and they're still asleep when it's time to take Jo to cricket. And it gets worse, we are continually busy, there are fewer quiet times, fewer downtimes when you go away (Queenstown resident).

It also severely affects the ability of the community to partake in political processes:

People are finding that because it's a rat race, they've got to work all that much harder, and enjoy it less, and where's the community? To get a community group here, if you call a meeting and get 50 people here at your meeting, you're doing really really well, because everyone is so busy or has got other commitments, or hasn't got the time or the energy or whatever. There's no real community community [verbatim]. Even at election time, I think if we've got 100 people at a public meeting, that's pretty good going. And that's elections, and where are the other 11,000, isn't anybody interested out there? (Queenstown resident).

The central tenets of communicative planning theory, those of interaction, mutual engagement and reasoning, and the searching for achievable levels of mutual understanding, are difficult to achieve in such a community. Added to this is the lack of arenas where the community can be a community. There is a concern that community spaces have vanished, as local pubs, for example, are replaced by tourist establishments:

The other day I tried to think where I would go to buy some beer. Gosh, we haven't got Eichardts, we haven't got Wicked's, we haven't got the Mountaineer [all three are former local pubs, see Figure 11.3]. Then we had four locals, for years. Now if you want to go to have a beer after work, you've got to go home and get changed, there's nowhere where you can just go in your old working clothes .... The boutique shops and bars, they are not much use to scruffy old buggers like us who like a beer (Queenstown resident).
Figure 11.3: Flood-Damaged Eichardt's Pub Prior to Closure in 2000

And:

In Queenstown, you've got so many different groups and so very few places to meet - and in those you always get the tourists amongst them. Getting rid of Eichardts¹²⁰, getting rid of Wicked Willies, there's no places to meet anymore. There's no place you can just meet (Tourism operator).

As a result, there is no clear demarcation between tourists and locals anymore:

We can't divorce ourselves from them [tourists]. No matter how much we would like to in certain circumstances. We are just linked to them irrevocably (Queenstown resident).

What this means is the critical distance between tourism culture and local culture disappears - there are no spaces for the community:

There seems to be something here about not being able to demarcate local places from tourist places - no place to be just a local without having to meet tourists. And yet the Council are trying to keep the locals in, otherwise the 'local atmosphere' disappears, which will be detrimental to tourism (Queenstown resident).

Lastly, and most importantly in the context of Habermassian notions of the setting aside of strategic action and power relationships, the town's dependency on tourism as its main business also has implications for people's willingness to question the status quo or to become involved in environmental disputes. Again and again, statements such as the following were made in this regard:

My sense of it so far is that people depend a lot on the tourism business here and that they also depend a lot on the good will of other people, so they don't like to stir. Rocking the boat is not done in Queenstown. You take an equivalent small place, you can say those places have a kind of a sense of community, the

¹²⁰ The pub has now become an exclusive boutique style hotel with an upmarket café/bar and shopping precinct.
community gets together and argues about things. Here, it doesn't. It just accepts, if you like, the status quo .... Rocking the boat is not done in Queenstown (Tourism operator).

And:

We are all so much dependent on each other here, that you don't become too obvious about criticising development – it might have implications for you further down the track, you might lose business, you might be seen to be anti-development (Tourism operator).

All this has implications in terms of the community's vision and the ability to form a consensus regarding a vision for Queenstown development:

The community has no vision, or if it does have some, it hasn't expressed it. And therefore, developments have happened that the community didn't get consulted on, because the community doesn't have a strong stand, everyone is pretty happy making good money, and working in tourism, having their own business, looking at their own business all the time, a bit of a tunnel vision - and suddenly, 11 years on, development has overtaken us, and everyone is going 'oh my God, but, but, but' (Tourism operator).

Communicative rationality principles in planning, as heuristic devices with which to examine actual planning processes, offer an ideal type of rationality that is useful for the purposes of critique. Existing planning processes and their contexts can be examined through this, and their shortcomings laid bare. What comparison to this ideal model has identified in the Queenstown context is a community that is diverse, multidimensional and fast-changing. Attempts to draw it together in some way to formulate critical versions of constructed place identity, therefore, are likely to be fraught with difficulty. "Achievable levels of mutual understanding for the purpose at hand" (Healey 1997, 242), in Queenstown, are made more difficult both through the complex community context, but also through the lack of arenas in which such communicative processes can take place. As I have shown above, in the Queenstown case, these arenas – in both temporal and spatial terms – are constrained by the nature of the 24 hour 7 day a week tourism context, and by the inability of the community to retain spaces distinctly separate from tourism.

In the context of a tourism community such as Queenstown, lastly, and in view of the characteristics and dynamics described above and in previous chapters, it is perhaps
less clear how, in the communicative process, considerations of power and strategic intent can ever be set aside in the interests of achieving consensus. This might suggest that communicative rationality, as a tool or device in the pursuit of critical enlightenment, through setting aside the contexts of power inherent in process, fails to offer steps towards emancipation in the Queenstown context.

In order to further this argument, it is necessary to return to the Glenorchy context with which I opened the previous chapter.

11.4 Glenorchy Revisited

In Glenorchy, many of the same issues with regard to the larger RMA and land use planning context as in Queenstown apply, because the QLDC is the responsible Council, and because the case before the Environment Court described in Chapter Four also covers the landscapes in the Glenorchy area. In terms of the outcomes of communicative planning processes, however, there are distinct differences with regard to the ability of this particular community to come together in a degree of consensus. This is linked, as I explained, to the smaller size of the community, its cohesiveness, and the availability of local leadership willing and able to initiate a planning process.

As described at the beginning of Chapter Five, the Glenorchy community developed a community plan with which to guide future development at the Head of the Lake. The primary purpose of this plan was to provide the community with a framework for decision-making, planning and development consistent with the community’s vision. At the level of this community, the planning processes employed in the development of the community plan have gone some way towards the ideal criteria set forth by communicative planning theory. Collaborative consensus-building was a key focus of the planning, with attempts to transcend community power relationships. Repeated attempts were made to foster meaningful political participation and autonomy. The development of critical versions of place identity, therefore, was made possible in the Glenorchy context through a process of communicative planning. In other words, in Glenorchy, the relevant arenas and institutional structures for communicative planning processes existed. This, combined with the small size and cohesive nature
of the Glenorchy community (including the existence of a relatively strong and stable consensus regarding the nature of the community and the future vision for Glenorchy) meant that achieving mutual levels of understanding for the purpose at hand in Healey's (1997) sense was possible. At the level of the Glenorchy community, then, adherence to the ideal criteria of communicative planning theory appears to have aided the reconciliation of multiple senses of place and place identity (although, of course, these senses of place identity were never as multiple as in Queenstown). It has led to a planning document that may well provide a strong basis for Glenorchy input into broader district planning processes.

However, although initially successful through the achievement of a variation of the District Plan, ongoing communicative planning processes in Glenorchy still have to withstand the test of time in terms of the influence they have on broader district planning processes. There is certainly a perception in the local community that only a limited degree of influence can be exerted over the District Plan:

Perhaps the biggest things is we're all gonna come together to an understanding of what we can change and what we can't, because some things are taken care of in the District Plan, and some are beyond our input anyway (Glenorchy resident).

In many respects, a planning exercise such as the Glenorchy one should have been done at the beginning of the broader district planning process, in order to facilitate input into the current District Plan, rather than for the purposes of litigation at a later stage. In this latter context, though, community plans are seen as powerful tools in the context of the Environment Court:

These plans are very useful if you are giving evidence in the Environment Court to say the community has come up with direction, it's good in the Environment Court to have something like that, the community does have a plan, they plan a vision and an identity, and this is where they want to go, and they want to see something like this happen. In a format like that, usually the planning judge will put quite a lot of emphasis on it (Glenorchy resident).

---

121 In many ways, the current review of the LGA addresses this problem through a focus on community planning as a mandatory requirement. The RMA district planning processes, of course, have only existed since 1991, which means that many local authorities are still on a steep learning curve and we have only seen one generation of district plans.
As in Queenstown, however, there are perceptions that power and influence, as well as resources, are needed for successful planning appeals, and that businesses are advantaged over communities:

Because at the end of the day, those ones that have got the big money and have got the big ideas, have got the most intrusive projects afoot, and they are the ones that are winning out over the community aspirations, they've just pushed us aside. I mean the community goes to the first stage [of the Environment Court process], and very rarely can afford to go to appeal or anything and just loses it (Glenorchy resident).

And:

It really is the situation of the best lawyers, the most money that wins, and I don't think as a community we've got a way of fighting that, we've got no funds, no way of dealing with big business (Glenorchy resident).

There is also a perception that some tourism developers have more influence than others, and that the community can do little to stand in their way:

We've got Shotover Jet here, which will do what it wants to do, and no community will stop it. That's been proven already and elsewhere, anything where it takes money and people to wangle the RMA, a community just doesn't really at the end of the day stand any chance (Tourism operator).

Associated with this are feelings of apathy because there is a perception that Council processes are pre-determined and difficult to influence:

If Glenorchy's voice has to go against the Council, in regard to what happens, I have my doubts at the moment, because I think the Council is just overturning and doing what they want (Glenorchy resident).

11.5 Conclusion

The Queenstown community is characterised by high levels of transience, high levels of work commitments (and therefore little time for involvement in public processes), and high levels of community heterogeneity. In addition, spaces and times for sectors of the community to participate in tourism planning are constrained, both in terms of the pressures of a 24 hour, 7 day work week but also in terms of the institutional structures that frame the management of tourism in Queenstown, which are more accessible to some sectors of the community than to others (see Chapter Eight). In addition, and in terms of the physical arenas for community interaction, the ability of
the community to demarcate community spaces from those to do with tourism is decreasing.

Together, these characteristics make it difficult to achieve communicative rationality in the Habermassian sense. First, the transience of the community means that, at any one time, large sectors of the Queenstown ‘community’ are either not interested in planning for future development in the resort, or have strongly external stake-based interests (as in the case of developers). Alternatively, and this is true for large parts of the tourism business sector, strategic interests are very much part of the planning process, and these strategic interests are well-connected to the power structures that enable representation in tourism planning (see Chapters Seven and Eight). As for the ‘community’ in the sense of the original Queenstown residential community with roots that go back generations, many of these people have moved away from Queenstown (not necessarily reluctantly, in the context of profits to be gained from selling off prime land for developmental purposes). Their places have been taken by more recent arrivals, who have come to Queenstown because tourism offers them opportunities, or because of the lifestyle attached to living in the Wakatipu Basin (which requires a certain amount of minimum income, given the current land prices). These people, in the true spirit of the ‘last settler’ syndrome, would like Queenstown preserved in the way that they found it when they moved in, a state which already incorporates transformation from an earlier state. This, of course, is an ongoing process. A critical dimension to local place identity, in such a context, then, is a shifting goalpost.

In Glenorchy, by contrast, a degree of communicative rationality appears to have been achieved at the level of local plan development. In terms of comparison of the two communities’ experience, communicative rationality, as a critical tool, is successful – to some degree - in identifying the process characteristics that have been achieved in one setting, as opposed to the other, and that have contributed to success. However, communicative rationality as a critical tool, through setting aside power relationships and strategic behaviour, remains somewhat utopian when applied to a context such as the one identified in Queenstown. Section Four’s conclusion pursues this argument further.
SECTION FOUR: CONCLUSION

I drew on communicative planning, as another spatial application of critical theory, because its focus on process - in this case communicative planning processes - supplements critical regionalism's focus on design in the place-making context. With regard to critical regionalism, I concluded that the development and maintenance of critical versions of constructed place identity is dependent, to a large extent, on the contexts and institutional arrangements in which such design processes take place, the levels of control that individual communities have over these arrangements, and the strength and power of competing interests over such design processes (as is the case, in tourism marketing, through different marketing interests at local, regional and national levels). As a result, I suggested that the critical model, as an ideal type, provides useful progress towards the development of design criteria for critical versions of place identity, but is essentially silent about the nature of the process of arriving at such design criteria. As I stated in Chapter 1, the case study question in the Queenstown and Glenorchy place-making context centres on the ability of tourism places to maintain local uniqueness in the face of global pressures. How tourism communities maintain local characteristics when the pressures of tourism and associated development erode difference and distinction through commodification cannot be conceptualised through a focus on ideal design criteria alone. I suggested that the practices associated with such design, and the power contexts in which these are located, would be better addressed through a supplementary focus on the rationality of communication, as suggested by communicative planning theory.

The use of communicative planning theory as a critical yardstick with which to measure the processes of, and arenas in which, the development of critical versions of constructed place identity might take place permits analysis of the shortcomings of these processes and contexts. The theory's orientations towards the achievement of consensus and the criteria it puts forward towards its achievement provide the analysis of the Queenstown case study with parameters by which to judge where the processes and contexts of the development of critical versions of constructed place identity might be less than adequate.
It is unclear, however, how the theory can account for the power relationships that shape planning processes. By setting aside power and strategic intent, communicative planning theory weakens its own case: "What does it have to say about resources and the ability to speak (the traditional problem of participation)? How does it deal with the complex configuration of power relations in which planners and participants are enmeshed?" (Tewdwr-Jones and Allmendinger 1998, 1988). By focusing on the ideal of communicative rationality, communicative planning theory abstracts the process of planning from its contextual setting, thereby setting aside power asymmetries, strategic action, and relations of domination. For example, in Queenstown, a focus on a consensual planning process alone, where people set aside strategic intent, is unlikely to achieve anything when not all participants (and perhaps even only a minority of participants) are interested in achieving a degree of communicative planning (e.g. some think that the community is not well informed enough to make decisions on what Queenstown should be marketed as). In addition, action and interaction are shaped by institutional and political contexts from which they are impossible to divorce. These contexts are also fundamentally linked to prior history of engagement, local political culture and the degree of adversity involved (McGuirk 2001). Thus the degree of influence that outside interests (national government, large tourism corporates, industry associations) have over what happens in Queenstown must be taken into account in any planning process if this planning process is to be anything other than a 'feelgood exercise' for some members of the community.

The expression of critical local identity in such a context is likely to be fraught with difficulty. As the Queenstown case has shown, it remains unclear how local communities can achieve critical versions of constructed place identity, when participatory processes and planning and community structures make it difficult for some groups to be part of the process. Communicative planning theory, drawing on Habermas' ideal speech situation, attempts to overcome the distortions associated with hidden agendas, manipulation, lobbying and strategic intent through communicative planning practice. While this may provide a critical yardstick with which to measure current planning practice, it does not provide any guidance for progress towards a different type of planning practice in the face of powerful entrenched interests, politically motivated strategic action and enduring relations of domination. In other words,
the abstraction of CPT [communicative planning theory] from the context of power
glosses over the political realities of what is likely to happen when relations of
domination persist and infiltrate the ‘soft infrastructure’ of bottom-up participatory
practices, and then converge with ‘hard infrastructure’ geared towards top-down
governance practices (McGuirk 2001, 213).

The strengths of critical regionalism and communicative planning theory, as ideal
models, lie in their usefulness as tools with which to question tourism place making
practices. In doing so, however, one must remain mindful of the strategic context in
which such place making is located. A key component of this strategic context is the
different spatial scales at which place making “takes place” and the different realms
through which it is enacted (e.g. the design/imaginary realm, and the process/practical
realm, as well as the different power relationships at each of these levels). In the
collection that follows, I will return to Lefebvre (1991a) for guidance on the
incorporation of these realms.
12 CHAPTER TWELVE: THESIS CONCLUSION

12.0 Introduction

In this thesis I have examined and compared different theoretical attempts to conceptualise the structure-agency relationship. These theoretical attempts were chosen because of overt similarities in their conceptualisation of this relationship, and because of their apparent suitability as analytical tools for the place making problem presented in Chapter One. Both the superimposition of abstract space on everyday life (Lefebvre) and the colonisation of the lifeworld through the system (Habermas) are concepts that attempt to explain similar processes. Both are concerned with the influence of structural systems on everyday life, and with the ability of agency to mediate this influence. Lefebvre and Habermas both focus on the dialectical nature of the link between structure and agency. Lefebvre makes the link in terms of the production of space and material spatial practices. Habermas, by contrast, sees critical communicative practice as the dialectical link, and both critical regionalism and communicative planning theory formulate specific normative criteria for this in particular spatial contexts.

In this chapter, I present a set of conclusions that has emerged from my empirical analysis of the theoretical propositions described above. I begin by re-tracing my analytical path and re-stating my interim conclusions at each point where the thesis changes direction. I then revisit the main theoretical propositions in view of the case study findings. I reconcile my findings with broader concerns expressed in the literature and, finally, conclude with some suggestions for a synthesis of Lefebvrian production of space with elements drawn from critical theory.

12.1 Chapter Reviews

In Chapter One, Section One, I introduced both the practical research question with which the case studies of tourism place making in Queenstown and Glenorchy are concerned, and the broader theoretical questions that underlie such practical
questions. I then formulated research questions for this thesis and introduced my research strategy, based on a case study approach, utilising qualitative methods. In Chapter Two, I reviewed the debate surrounding the structure-agency relationship in the geographical literature, and introduced one theoretical attempt at reconciling space and place in more detail: Lefebvre's (1991a) *The Production of Space*.

In Section Two, in Chapters Three, Four and Five, I proceeded to explore Lefebvre's (1991a) theory's utility in the context of the particular problems evidenced in the case study of tourism place making in Queenstown and Glenorchy. In Chapter Three, I sketched short histories of tourism in Glenorchy and Queenstown. Despite similar beginnings, I argued, the two settlements have differed in the extent to which tourism has been inscribed in their geographies, both materially and in the imagination. With regard to Lefebvre's (1991a) theory, I concluded that a focus on the productive processes of spatial relationships is a valuable analytical tool, somewhat hampered by the theory's lack of specific guidance on how to distinguish between spatial categories, particularly when it comes to identifying the spatial practices associated with lived spaces.

In Chapter Four, I focused on the contemporary Queenstown place making context. I outlined the nature of representations of space that determine land use planning in the wider Wakatipu Basin and focused in particular on the influence of the RMA, the LGA and the Environment Court have on spatial practices. Representations of space associated with the RMA and the LGA, I argued, have, in the Queenstown case, led to spatial practices that have privileged private property rights over the public good associated with the sustainable management of – sometimes outstanding – natural landscapes. In the absence of strong tourism planning mechanisms at the level of the Council's annual and strategic plans, the spatial practices of land use planning therefore "colonise" (Lefebvre 1991a) the spaces of everyday life, through imposing a particular regime of development management that has concrete - and everyday - consequences for people in the Wakatipu Basin.

I also showed that another representation of space, that associated with the Environment Court's *Queenstown Landscape Decision*, is likely to lead to another set of spatial practices, based on much more stringent rules for landscape management,
and potentially imposing a different regime of development management that has consequences for other lived spaces in the Wakatipu Basin (e.g. those of private landowners wanting to subdivide and/or develop land in ONL landscapes). There are, then, multiple lived spaces and representations of space in the Wakatipu Basin, and mapping the dialectical relationships between these is likely to be complex. Analysis in Chapter Four also reinforced the conclusion reached in Chapter Three: it is somewhat difficult to identify and categorise lived space values, and it is unclear how lived space values might be asserted in ways other than through becoming represented in Council planning processes or Environment Court case law.

In Chapter Five, I showed how the use of a non-statutory planning mechanism, in the form of a community plan, helped to elevate the status of lived spaces in Glenorchy. In the broader picture of tourism development in the Wakatipu Basin, such lived spaces, as expressed in the community plan and developed as part of a consensual process, have the potential to contribute to the establishment of what Lefebvre (1991a, 356-366) calls differential space. The irony, I pointed out, is that, to exert any degree of influence over representations of space, lived spaces have to become represented in a formal document, have to ‘speak the language’ of contemporary representations of space. The right to difference (from Queenstown), therefore, does not come easily, as the promotion of the qualities of lived space is set against the powerful forces of abstract space associated with tourism development.

I concluded my first “cut” at the data by arguing that Lefebvre’s (1991a) The Production of Space, through its concern with the productive processes inherent in space and its conceptualisation of the dialectical interplay of representations of space, spatial practices and lived space, does enable a mapping of the power relationships involved in the production of space. It shows how the recent full development of the Glenorchy road, for example, contributes to the assembly of a new kind of space, potentially transforming notions of frontier and taking away some of the local control of the landscape (in that tourist flows cannot be controlled to the same extent). By focusing on such productive processes, Lefebvrian examination of space enables analysis to transcend the question of who has power to one focusing on the practices involved in achieving certain ends. The theory’s strengths, therefore, lie in its ability
to incorporate systemic processes and power relationships into an understanding of space as productive process.

This productive process, to Lefebvre (1991a), should enable lived spaces, or the concrete spaces of everyday life, to establish a counter-movement of resistance to the colonisation of everyday life through abstract space. What Lefebvre (1991a) is essentially silent on, however, is some form of direction regarding the processes by which lived spaces may achieve this. While he calls for an analysis that "must imply and explain a genesis and constitute a critique of those institutions ... that have transformed the space under consideration" (Lefebvre 1991a, 404), he does not give guidance on the normative criteria with which to enact critical difference. How can spatial practice associated with lived space values assert itself if representations of space force it to speak the language of representations? What are the specific ideals and criteria that such practice should aspire to? While Lefebvre's (1991a) dialectics enable analysis of the modes of power and the different sets of relationships that allow tourism space to assert its dominance, the theory does not set forth a clear direction with regard to how lived spaces can subvert or contradict such dominant space. This, I suggested, might be the task of critical theory.

In Chapter Six, the first chapter of Section Three, I introduced the second set of theoretical propositions regarding the reconciliation of structure and agency, in the form of spatial applications of Jürgen Habermas' critical theory. I focused in particular on what Dryzek (1990, 32) calls constructive critique, that is, "critical theory [that] becomes progressively less alienated and more able to relate to the concerns of ordinary political agents". I suggested that critical regionalism, as one of the spatial application of critical theory, ought to allow us to transcend a Lefebvrian-based analysis, by suggesting a set of criteria with which to design difference and with which to transform space. In other words, I intended to explore whether critical regionalism would give guidance with regard to specific ideals and criteria that could guide lived spaces in asserting critically local identity. Chapters Seven and Eight contain the second "cut" at my data, in the context of critical regionalist propositions.

In Chapter Seven, I argued that critical regionalism presents an ideal version of place identity that is based on resistance to both the universalising forces associated with
globalisation and the reactionary forces sometimes attached to reproductions of place based on vernacular traditions and icons. It calls for reflection and self-awareness in the creation and maintenance of version of place identity in order to foster regional sub-cultures. In a tourism context, and for the case study of Queenstown, such an ideal is faced with a number of difficulties, including the nature of the international marketing context, and the multiple levels at which place promotion takes place. My research shows that various versions of local place identity exist. Individually, these may very well represent critical versions of local identity at relevant levels (e.g. community, region, nation). At other levels, however, they do not. There are, then, multiple versions of promoted place identity. The same physical location - Queenstown in this case - can be promoted in many different ways to many different people, making conflict over place identities inevitable and the notion of a critical version of place identity nonsensical. Critical regionalism, I argued, fails to consider who might decide what the critical elements are and how they might be communicated and reconciled. In other words, the theory pays scant attention to the power relationships and systemic processes involved in the creation of place identity.

In Chapter Eight I argued that two further significant factors influence the development of critical versions of place identity: The structure of the tourism industry, and the philosophy of government involvement in tourism. The former privileges larger industry players with regard to their influence on the international marketing of Destination New Zealand, at the expense of critical versions of place related to other stakeholders. The latter, the current conceptualisation of government roles in tourism, with its dominant emphasis on generic international promotion and industry advocacy, means less funding commitments to other policy functions such as concerns with social, cultural and environmental sustainability or the development of regions and critical regionalisms. Again, questions emerge about how to conceptualise the multiplicity of place identities clearly evidenced in the case study context, and how to account for the different power relationships at different levels of promoted place identity.

I concluded this section by suggesting that a fundamental tension is inherent in attempts to develop and maintain critical versions of place in tourism place promotion. On the one hand, the struggle to remain unique and distinctive in a very
competitive environment forces the development of critical versions of constructed place identity, in an attempt to distinguish one place from another. On the other hand, the particular dynamics and structures of tourism place promotion make this development of critical versions of constructed place identity a contested process, and, depending on the particular characteristics of the tourism 'food chain' at different levels, one that can easily be dominated by certain - not necessarily local - interests. With regard to the theory's utility in the context of my aim in this thesis to evaluate different attempts to conceptualise the structure-agency relationships, I concluded that critical regionalism, as an ideal model, proposes criteria for the development of critical versions of place identity in an ideal design sense. Its focus on design, however, comes at the expense of understandings of process.

The fourth section of this thesis, consisting of Chapters Nine, Ten and Eleven, is concerned with critical theory's attempts at theoretically resolving such problems through a focus on the rationality of communication, in the form of communicative planning theory. In Chapter Nine I introduced communicative planning theory, based on Habermas' ideal speech situation and the ideal of communicative rationality. Communicative planning theory, I suggested, sets forth a set of ideal parameters about planning processes and arenas that are necessarily a part of the development of critical versions of constructed place identity. In other words, the theory provides a normative ideal that can be applied to assess the processes and contexts involved in the development of critical versions of constructed place identity. In Chapters Ten and Eleven, the final two substantive chapters, I evaluated the potential usefulness of these parameters for a conceptualisation of the structure-agency relationship in the Queenstown and Glenorchy case study.

In Chapter Ten I focused on the nature of the Queenstown community and concluded that it is divided into factions and interest groups, some place-based, some stake-based, but all of them with varying views about future development and, more importantly, varying positions of influence in this. I also painted a general picture of the Queenstown community's transience, both in terms of its residents, and related, in terms of its workforce. This, I argued, means that the nature of the Queenstown community is such that, even if supportive institutional structures for tourism planning were in place, the transient characteristics of both the workforce and the
residential community clearly influence the opportunities for communicative planning processes.

In Chapter Eleven, I continued this line of argument by showing that the transient nature of the Queenstown community has implications for attachments to place and resultant commitment to, and motivation for, participation in public processes. Together, these characteristics make it difficult to achieve communicative rationality in the Habermassian sense. In Glenorchy, by contrast, a degree of communicative rationality appears to have been achieved at the level of local plan development. In terms of comparison of the two communities’ experience, communicative planning theory, as a critical tool, I argued, is successful – to some degree - in identifying the process characteristics that have been achieved in one setting, as opposed to the other, and that are a necessary first step in determining the essential processes involved in the development of critical versions of local promotional identity. Communicative planning theory, however, by choosing to set aside power relationships and strategic behaviour, remains somewhat utopian when applied to a context such as the one identified in Queenstown. Particularly difficult are assumptions of a relatively stable community which has the time, motivation and space to participate in planning processes.

I concluded this section of the thesis by arguing that the strength of communicative planning theory, as an ideal model, lies in its usefulness as a tool with which to question tourism place making practices and arenas. It is unclear, however, how the theory can account for the power relationships that shape planning processes. By conceptualising strategic intent, power, manipulation and hidden agendas as distortions of the planning process that are to be overcome (through a communicative process), the theory weakens its own case. What is missing is guidance for progress towards a different type of planning practice in the face of powerful entrenched interests, politically motivated strategic action and enduring relations of domination.

12.2 Power, Context and Rationality: Evaluating the Critical Model

Both critical regionalism and communicative planning theory, as critical theoretical ideal types, when applied to the context of tourism place promotion, suffer from a
lack of conceptualisation of the institutional and political contexts in which tourism place making ‘takes place’. These contexts and their power-laden processes must be understood if the development of critical local identity is a goal, because without such an understanding of - and engagement with - strategic context, no change will ever be effected. Critical theory’s emancipatory ideal, to which both critical regionalism and communicative planning theory aspire, involves a process of transition from an initial state of false consciousness, error, and unfree existence to one of enlightenment, guided by certain criteria. This cannot take place in a powerless vacuum. If it attempts to do so, then it does so at its own peril: consensus that does not anticipate power, manipulation and strategic intent does not endure.

The examination of my case study data has shown that critical regionalism, by proposing a set of criteria for the development of critical versions of place identity, neglects to consider the practices and power relationships that affect the content of this design. It neglects the actual ‘doing’ of design by abstracting from process, arenas and context and concentrating on content. In critical theoretical fashion, it proposes a set of criteria with which to judge critical local design identity. It fails to conceptualise questions of power, multilevel interests, and contested versions of identity. Who might decide what is critical local identity in a context of multiple stakeholders, with different power bases and potentially widely differing interpretations of a critical dimension of place identity?

The empirical analysis of the Queenstown and Glenorchy case study has equally shown that communicative planning theory, while focusing on the planning context and putting forward a set of criteria for an ideal model of such a context (e.g. searching for achievable levels of mutual understanding for the purpose at hand, finding ways of reasoning among competing claims for action, keeping a reflexive and critical capacity alive in the processes of argumentation, using Habermassian ideal speech criteria, see Healey 1997, 242-244), offers no answers for a situation “in which not all participants [are] ... interested in building new relations of power, and may .... [value] legitimising their claims above developing trust” (McGuirk 2001, 206, emphasis in original).
My findings are echoed in the literature, and a number of authors have criticised communicative planning theory,\textsuperscript{122} in particular, for its disregard of historical context and power relationships (Flyvbjerg 1998; Huxley 2000; McGuirk 2001; North 2000; Tewdwr-Jones and Allmendinger 1998; Young 1990).\textsuperscript{123}

By setting aside power relationships, both theories have limited utility in the place making context of Queenstown, because power relationships are intimately bound up with place making practice. As McGuirk (2001, 200) argues, “any analysis of the practical workings of CPP [communicative planning practice] needs to attend to its regulatory, institutional, and political embeddedness”. Similarly, any critical regionalist analysis of promoted place identity needs to take into account the multi-level interests and power relationships involved in design in the place promotional context. In Queenstown, the place promotional planning and design contexts are indeed characterised by hidden agendas, powerful outside interests, manipulative behaviour, strategic intent and many other power-related obstacles to communicative planning and critical regionalist design. In other words, it cannot be simply assumed that “participants will behave openly, collaboratively, and with integrity while being faced by interest alignments they perceive as conflicting with their own” (McGuirk 2001, 207). It is also quite naïve to assume that all stakeholders possess the required knowledge about issues and the skills to participate, are interested in enhancing democracy or have the same desire to make sense together. Such assumptions set aside individual motivations, knowledge bases and skills levels and deny the existence of strategic behaviour, based, for example, upon material interests.

Clearly, the fragmented nature of the Queenstown community includes large sectors who have dual roles (sometimes as residents, sometimes as business operators), which necessitates different agendas, sometimes shared, sometimes presented to evoke an

\textsuperscript{122} Yiftachel (1999) labels this group of authors the critical group, following the 3rd Oxford Conference on Planning Theory in 1998, because of their inclusion of analytical and critical components of Habermassian theory, and their interest in examining planning from a critical distance, ie. from the outside. This is opposed to the communicative-pragmatist group, concerned with the normative task of analysing planning from within and in the process influencing the way things are done in the profession.

\textsuperscript{123} There are, of course, degrees of difference between different communicative planning theorists’ understanding of power and historical context as part of communicative rationality. Forester (1989), for example, recognises these aspects in his work to a much larger degree than Healey does.
acceptable image, sometimes hidden to bring about desired ends (Tewdwr-Jones and Allmendinger 1998, 1981). An agreed version of local place identity is unlikely, then, and both critical regionalism and communicative planning theory, by abstracting from the cultural, social, political, and economic power relationships deny "that subjects, and indeed all social objects, are unavoidably constituted in power and difference rather than solely in rationality" (McGuirk 2001, 213). The theories also deny an acknowledgement that the pursuit and maintenance of privilege(s) 'bounds' people's rationality. One only has to remember Weber's view that modern society is dominated by zweckrational action (i.e. action motivated by discrete individual goals and associated with choosing the means to a particular rational end) to question the ability of communicative planning theory to achieve a level of consensus by "searching for achievable levels of mutual understanding for the purpose at hand" (Healey 1997, p.243). The type of consensus that can be reached in such a process may be fundamentally flawed. What is necessary, instead, is planning that uses conflict rather than consensus as its frame of reference .... The key task thus becomes one of identifying where relations of domination are working through planning, and to imagine institutional conditions and planning practices which might limit those relations in politically legitimate ways (McGuirk 2001, 214).

As Focault (1982, 222-234) argues, "power relations are rooted deep in the social nexus, not reconstituted 'above' society as a supplementary structure .... A society without power relations can only be an abstraction".

In Dryzek's (1995, 109) terms, then, neither critical regionalism nor communicative planning theory manage to put forward feasible alternatives to abstract critical theory through their failure to suggest "institutional and structural alternatives" to the problematic status quo. They have not become what Dryzek (1990, 32) suggests is

124 Weber offers a way to conceptualise such bounded rationality with his concepts of zweckrational and wertrational. Zweckrational action (goal-oriented action, or rational means to rational ends) is an orientation towards discrete individual ends, conceptualised by Weber as technocratic thinking, action that seeks the most efficient means to an end. Such action is counterposed to wertrational action (value-oriented action, or rational means to irrational ends), more closely aligned to a conscious belief in absolute values (e.g. ethical, religious or philosophical values, tradition, or emotions). To Weber, modern society, through the growth of bureaucracy and industrialism, is characterised by zweckrational behaviour, goal-oriented rationality. Zweckrational action dominates rational action based on values, or actions motivated by traditions and emotions (Ellwell 1996). Communicative planning theory, by setting aside the complications associated with strategic intent in zweckrational action, is likely to be of little effect in the face of an orientation towards individual needs. 
necessary to make critical theory more relevant: critique "progressively less alienated and more able to relate to the concerns of ordinary political agents". How could they, if they set aside precisely those concerns central to 'ordinary' political agents: power, manipulation, and hidden agendas? Too much hinges on things beyond design and communicative practice, including legal requirements, development regulations and broader social and economic power relations. What is required to enable progress towards a reconciliation of space and place, instead, is a focus on the power relationships inherent at different spatial scales, the contradictions these generate, and their underlying social relations.

As writers such as Focault (1982; 1994) and Flyvbjerg (1998) point out, power is present in all relations and cannot be set aside for the purposes of analysis. Rather, analysis should focus on how power is exercised. To understand power, it is necessary to look at day to day operations, at the micropractices of everyday life, because "power plays a 'directly productive role', 'it comes from below', it is multidirectional" (Dreyfus and Rabinow 1982, 185):

> Unless these unequal relations of power are traced down to their actual material functioning, they escape our analysis and continue to operate with unquestioned autonomy, maintaining the illusion that power is only applied by those at the top to those at the bottom.

A return to Lefebvre seems pertinent at this point, for Lefebvrian production of space has something to offer with regard to the micropractices of everyday life.

### 12.3 Evaluating the Production of Space

Thirdspace\(^{125}\) must be additionally guided by some form of potentially emancipatory *praxis*, the translation of knowledge into action in a conscious — and consciously spatial — effort to improve the world in some significant way (Soja 1996, 22, emphasis in original).

The theoretical problem that I have been concerned with in this thesis centres on the reconciliation of space and place, and structure and agency, through some form of dialectical connection. By contrast to the Habermassian focus on communicative rationality, Lefebvre (1991a) conceptualises this dialectical connection in terms of

\(^{125}\)Thirdspace is Soja's (1996) term for Lefebvre's (1991) lived space.
productive processes in space. To him, emancipatory politics cannot focus on the rationality of communication alone. It must have a material dimension:

A revolution that does not produce a new space has not realized its full potential; indeed it has failed in that it has not changed life itself, but has merely changed ideological superstructures, institutions or political apparatuses. A social transformation, to be truly revolutionary in character, must manifest a creative capacity in its effects on daily life (Lefebvre 1991a, 54).

In practical terms, and for the case studies of tourism place making in Queenstown and Glenorchy, a successful attempt to utilise the explanatory and/or analytical power of Lefebvrian dialectics needs to provide guidance to the problematic of how to preserve local uniqueness in the context of a globalising tourism environment. While Lefebvre (1991a) proposes a dialectics of space consisting of a “particular set of theoretically informed spatial practices aimed at overcoming separation and dissociation between the global ‘whole’ and the ‘local’ everyday” (Merrifield 1993, 526), he is frustratingly vague on just how such spatial practices might practically do this and how representations of space, spatial practices and lived spaces interrelate. As I have argued in Section Two of this thesis, having examined Lefebvrian (1991a) dialectics in the context of the Queenstown and Glenorchy case studies, Lefebvre (1991a) does not provide much guidance on these matters. He does not tell the reader how lived spaces should subvert or contradict dominant codings of tourism (or any other dominant) space other than to point us to art, symbolisms and poetry. How such art, symbolisms and poetry associated with lived spaces might differ from those associated with representations of space is unclear. Moreover, how art can stand in the way of powerful structural economic forces is even more unclear. In Queenstown and Glenorchy, it appears, spatial practices asserting lived space values have to become represented in the language of representations of space. Is this a legitimate or desirable way for lived spaces to assert themselves? Lefebvre (1991a) is silent on this.

At the end of Section Two, therefore, I called for a more normative dimension to Lefebvre’s (1991a) theory, perhaps the development of an ideal type of spatial practice with which to compare the spatial practices observed empirically. For guidance on this, I turned to Habermas and spatial applications of critical theory,
where a normative dimension is central. I hoped for guidance on how emancipatory praxis might best assert itself in design terms in critical regionalist thought, and for guidance on how to facilitate arriving at such emancipatory praxis in communicative planning theory. Both these avenues, as described above, only provided part of the solution.

Given my conclusion regarding Lefebvrian (1991a) dialectics (i.e. the lack of a normative, guiding focus, but an essential strength in terms of incorporating systemic processes and power relationships into an understanding of space as productive process), and given my conclusion on the utility of critical theory in its spatial applications of communicative planning theory and critical regionalism (i.e. strengths in terms of the provision of a normative, guiding focus, but a substantial lack of focus on the power relationships inherent in the place making context), there must be utility in synthesising features of both theories. As Harvey (1996, 354) comments:

For all his [Habermas’] occasional references to material circumstances, he treats the problem of communicative action as a linguistic, discursive problem and consequently provides a very weak understanding of how the discursive ‘moment’ ... internalises effects of power, of material practices, of imaginaries, of institutions, and of social relations.

Chapter Ten, for example, where I described the Queenstown community, could clearly have been analysed in Lefebvrian terms, with a focus on the power relationships inherent in productive spatial processes, and through mapping the spatial practices of (sometimes transient) place- and stake-based factions and interest groups. My conclusion in that chapter regarding the unlikely success of the expression of critical local identity in a communicative planning context could have been supplemented with a Lefebvrian (1991a) understanding of the power relationships expressed in space through the forces of transience. There may be scope, therefore, to infuse the ‘ideal’ nature of communicative planning theory and critical regionalism with Lefebvrian (1991a) concepts of strategic context. Conversely, there may be scope to take Lefebvrian (1991a) analysis further through the introduction of a normative, guiding dimension taken from critical theory.
12.4 Producing Tourism Space: Revisiting Queenstown and Glenorchy

At the (practical) heart of this thesis is a concern with the ability of a local community to meaningfully participate in place construction. How is it possible, I asked in Chapter One, for a tourism place such as Queenstown to maintain local uniqueness in the face of global pressures and accompanied by countless other places attempting to do the same? Second, what 'space' is there in place promotional practice for the ability of communities, of people in regions/localities, to 'make' their own places? I suggested that these concerns and questions in the Queenstown and Glenorchy tourism place making contexts lead to a more fundamental theoretical question: how best to conceptualise the relationship between structure and agency in contemporary tourism-based place making. At the theoretical heart of this thesis, therefore, is a concern with different theories' conceptualisation of the structure-agency relationship, and their evaluation in an empirical context. What, then, has this thesis contributed to an understanding of the place making question? What can a focus on a synthesis of aspects of Lefebvrian (1991a) dialectics with elements from critical theory contribute? What could a synthesis of useful features from Lefebvrian (1991a) dialectics and from critical regionalism and communicative planning theory look like? Furthermore, what would such a synthesis contribute to the problem at hand. Most importantly, perhaps, what lessons should a sympathetic planner take from this discussion? I will turn to a case study example to illustrate my answers.

12.4.1 A Contradiction of Space?

In Chapter Four, I outlined the spatial dynamics associated with the Queenstown Landscape Decision. I identified competing representations of space aligned with, first, QLDC practice of, in essence, allowing development in the outstanding natural landscapes of the Wakatipu Basin. This, I argued, privileges lived space values associated with private land ownership and associated development rights. Environment Court decisions, by contrast, have lent support to the broader publicly held lived space values associated with the unbrokenness of the landscape as a whole. The Court ruled, de novo, that lines had to be drawn on maps in order to determine where development was appropriate and allowable and that limits had to be put on development in outstanding natural landscapes. This latter representation of space
essentially takes away some private landowners’ rights to subdivision and development, without, as yet, any view on financial compensation for this.

Clearly, this is a problem for some land owners. Development pressures under the current representation of space associated with tourism make it more profitable for individual farmers to subdivide than to maintain their land in farming use (which would maintain the wholeness of the landscape better than subdivision). Development to bring additional economic resources into the area (through the attraction of tourism, for example) further increases the values attached to land, thus perpetuating this particular spatial practice.

The pressures associated with the spatial practices emanating from one particular representation of space (subdivision and development because it is more profitable than maintaining land in farming use) directly clash with those spatial practices associated with the representations of space that emerge from Court decisions (rules prohibiting subdivision in outstanding natural landscapes, thereby locking up the land of individual farmers in its present form, without financial compensation). This, in essence, is what Lefebvre (1991a) would call a ‘contradiction of space’.

Contradictions of space, to Lefebvre (1991a, 359-360), are essentially clashes between a “consumption of space which produces surplus value” (associated with the selling and development of farmland) and one “which produces only enjoyment - and is therefore ‘unproductive’” (associated with the unbrokenness of the landscape). These are essentially clashes between different social and economic interests, and they can become expressed in space. Quite clearly, this is the case in Queenstown. The contrasts between subdivision and development policy emanating from different representations of space (in the form of different district plans, or EC case law) can be mapped in the Queenstown context, both in Environment Court maps and QLDC plans. Their spatial representations, in some cases, are entirely contradictory.

To Lefebvre (1991a), it is in such contradictions of space that the first glimpses of a new space (which he calls differential space) appear. Such differential space arises

---

126 It could be argued, however, that, in a tourism context, this particular representation of space associated with the unbrokenness of the landscape is also aimed at a consumption of space related to the generation of surplus value in the form of tourism earnings.
“on the margins of the homogenized realm”. It is based on lived space values, asserted against the dominance of abstract space. In Lefebvre’s (1991a, 381-382, emphasis in original) own words:

What runs counter to a society founded on exchange is a primacy of use. What counters quantity is quality .... When a community fights the construction of urban motorways or housing-developments, when it demands ‘amenities’ or empty spaces for play and encounter, we can see how a counter-space can insert itself into spatial reality: against the Eye and the Gaze, against quantity and homogeneity, against power and the arrogance of power, against the endless expansion of the ‘private’ and of industrial profitability; and against specialized spaces and a narrow localization of function.

What Lefebvre’s (1991a) concept of differential space contributes, therefore, is an understanding of particular junctures in material spatial practice. These junctures are indicative of changing social relations and are therefore helpful for a conceptualisation of the structure-agency relationship: they represent opportunities for the design and implementation of new, more critically local, material spatial practice. Once again, however, and as I have argued throughout this thesis, Lefebvre (1991a) is tantalisingly vague on just how such spatial practice might assert itself. Critical theory, which, on the face of it, might come to aid, gives guidance on some of the normative criteria for both good design and planning practice, but is itself tantalisingly vague on another aspect, that of the incorporation of power relationships. What, then, might be the value of a synthesis of some features of both theories?

In the Queenstown Landscape Decision, the power to draw lines on maps and therefore declare some landscapes in the Wakatipu Basin outstanding natural landscapes is exercised by the Environment Court. The power to zone landscapes into subdividable residential areas is essentially exercised by local government. The power to designate Queenstown as an adventure tourism destination, lastly, is exercised at the national level by TNZ, and at the local level by individual tourism operators and the RTOs. An analysis that focuses on critical design criteria and communicative planning processes and that attempts to set aside such power relationships fails to conceptualise the structure-agency relationship in a way helpful to an understanding of the problems arising from tourism place making.
Conversely, a focus on the analytical power of Lefebvre’s (1991a) production of space alone is not sufficient either. Critical theory’s concerns not just with explanation but also with anticipatory politics are important, if we are to achieve what Dryzek (1990) calls ‘constructive critique’. This matters so much because the explanatory-diagnostic moment in critical theory is intended to expose the present in such a way that we can glimpse, however faintly, the outlines of a better future: It is supposed to transform our grasp of the situation in such a way that the prospects for a more humane society are opened up rather than closed off (Gregory 1993, 89).

If, as Lefebvre (1991a, 43) argues, the producers of space “have always acted in accordance with a representation [of space], while the users passively experienced whatever was imposed on them inasmuch as it was more or less thoroughly inserted into, or justified by, their representational space [lived space]”, then critical theory’s focus on freeing these users from their unfree existence and false consciousness, translated into materialism, calls for critical spatial practice. As I have shown in Part Two of this thesis, spatial practices are contested, and a transition to a stage of critical spatial practice is necessary to halt the complete colonisation of lived space values by the abstract space of capitalism.

In theoretical terms, the potential solution to this is the design of ideal type criteria for spatial practice in the Lefebvrian (1991a) sense. In practice, the PCE's report regarding development pressures in peri-urban areas provides guidance on this. What is needed, according to the PCE (2001, 65), is for planning and design processes to “recognise the value of property rights and [to] seek to integrate the rights of private landowners with the interests of the wider community”. Overseas examples show that a variety of techniques (spatial practices) exist that aid such an integration. Transferable development rights or alternative forms of valuing farmland for rating purposes, for example, offer overseas farmers realistic alternatives to selling farmland for residential development through rating land “on its use value rather than its market value, thus removing an incentive to subdivide for residential development” (PCE 2001, 75).
In practical terms, new spatial practices are needed. These could take the form of tradeable development rights, moratoria on development (to better consider effects and to provide room for strategic planning), or the balancing of incentives to subdivide and develop with other incentives, perhaps through rating valuation or financial compensation to individual landowners. What is needed, then, is more concrete guidance on such emancipatory planning practice, including, in the current case study, the investigation of innovative solutions to development and landscape management pressures.

In theoretical terms, what is needed is specific guidance on spatial practices, mindful of power relationships and institutional structures. Critical theory's concern with emancipatory politics, as drawn from critical regionalism and communicative planning theory, can infuse Lefebvrian (1991a) material spatial practice with a normative, guiding focus that allows transition from an initial state of false consciousness (or repressed lives space values) to a degree of emancipation. A normative, guiding focus to material spatial practice, in other words, may offer progress towards the reconciliation of space and place and structure and agency, at least in the place making context of the Queenstown and Glenorchy case study. How this might apply more broadly or translate into other contexts is the task of another thesis, and my thesis has laid the groundwork for further studies of this kind.

Lastly, a complicating factor in the particular case studies in this thesis (and, by extension, probably in many other tourism place making contexts) is the particular nature of a tourism community such as Queenstown. If, as Bell Hooks (1990, 149) argues, resistance in the margins is central to "the production of a counter-hegemonic discourse that is not just found in words but in habits of being and the way one lives", then lived space discourse is particularly important. The transience of the Queenstown community, however, challenges Lefebvre's idea of lived space as an active opposition to representations of space. In the Queenstown case, it appears, tourism space formulations lived spaces in its own image and thereby becomes the lived space of much of the community. What this means in terms of a theoretical model of reconciliation of space and place in such a context is that a degree of non-interest in the maintenance of a critical dimension to local identity will always be present, due to the short term nature of some of the residents' stays in the Basin, and due to the high
degree of transience of the community. At a practical level, planning techniques need to reflect this transience. All the more important, as the PCE (2001) has outlined, to have supportive local government structures that initiate and support efforts to engage the local community in strategic planning, in order to formulate a degree of consensus on local identity and resultant appropriate development in the Wakatipu Basin.

Communicative planning theory's and critical regionalism's principles, combined with the lessons learned from Lefebvre's (1991a) theory's utility in terms of the mapping of power relationships and the importance of spatial practice, might offer a way forward that combines materialist and idealist conceptions of the space-place relationship and that offers a "discursive 'moment' [which] ... internalises effects of power, of material practices, of imaginaries, of institutions, and of social relations" (Harvey 1996, 354). Ultimately, this might, as Gregory (1993, p. 89) suggests, provide progress towards exposing the present in such a way "that we can glimpse, however faintly, the outlines of a better future".
POSTSCRIPT

It is perhaps fitting here to point out that, as this thesis went to print, the QLDC had already engaged in a community planning process, and some of the outcomes of this community planning process were indeed calls for new ways to conceptualise development in the Basin and to look at moratoria, limits to growth and the investigation of overseas models for tradeable development rights. This progress towards new development practice (spatial practice) in the Wakatipu Basin was enabled through the Council’s initiation of - and support for - an ongoing strategic planning process in the Wakatipu Basin and an associated commitment to translate community wishes for their place into planning practice.
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APPENDICES
APPENDIX ONE: DETAILED METHODS

As I explained in Chapter One, a case study method is appropriate with broadly defined topics, when contextual conditions are important, and when the researcher relies on multiple sources of evidence. In the context of this thesis, I selected qualitative research methods to guide my research approach towards those multiple sources of evidence:

Qualitative research is a process of enquiry that draws data from the context in which events occur, in an attempt to describe these occurrences, as a means of determining the process in which events are embedded and the perspectives of those participating in the events, using induction to derive possible explanations based on observed phenomena (Gorman and Clayton 1997, 23).\footnote{127}

Qualitative research provides the researcher with an understanding of the meaning of events and interactions in the context of particular settings and through the eyes of participants. It is thus an attempt to understand a social phenomenon from the perspective of the subjects under study, with particular emphasis on understanding context and processes (rather than outcomes).

Qualitative methods provide a rich set of data particularly useful for theory development (Glaser and Strauss 1967, 17). Research methods utilised in this research include document analysis, semi-structured interviews, and direct observations.

Research Process

The research process in qualitative research is iterative, rather than linear, with individual stages overlapping, and with data analysis an important part of the entire research process. One generally begins with an idea, for which theoretical information is gathered, theoretical assumptions are formulated, data is collected, and theoretical formulations are re-examined. Throughout the research process, no stage is completely closed off, that is, literature is reviewed throughout the process,
theoretical propositions are formed, changed, discarded and re-selected at all stages, and recursivity is a dominant part of the process (Gorman and Clayton 1997).

My research began in July 1999 with an idea for which I began to gather theoretical information in a review of the literature. This was followed by the establishment of a tentative theoretical framework, in the form of the structure-agency question, and by the selection of appropriate case study material with which to examine the theoretical framework and particular theoretical propositions with regard to this framework (e.g. Lefebvrian dialectics and Habermassian critical theoretical propositions).

Following this, I set out on a broad exploration path, beginning with detailed document analysis of material relevant to the place making contexts in Queenstown and Glenorchy.

**Document Analysis**

Documents of relevance to the analysis of the tourism place making context include historical and contemporary imagery as produced in brochures, on postcards, in travel guides, travel journals and administrative documentation (e.g. strategy documents, progress reports). Analysis of these documents enabled me to become familiar with past and present place promotional imagery, as well as providing me with a historical and ideological background to the place(s) in question. Part of this was a historical analysis of place promotion in New Zealand and in the case study area, through historical brochure material held in the Alexander Turnbull collection in Wellington. This was followed by an analysis of contemporary tourism place promotional material in the form of brochures, videos, postcards, television advertising, websites, and newspapers, including, as relevant, regional and national level place promotional material. Documentary analysis also included agendas, meeting notes, written reports, administrative documents and newspaper material relevant to the place making context in the Queenstown / Glenorchy case study areas.

127 For in-depth discussions of the theoretical discourse associated with qualitative methods, see Glaser and Strauss (1967); Strauss (1987); and Strauss and Corbin (1990; 1994).
Fieldwork

I began my fieldwork in late 1999 by analysing the documentary material, then taking this analysis as a basis for the design of semi-structured interviews to be conducted with residents, place promoters and public sector representatives (at the local, regional and national level), local area resource managers, and local tourism organisations. These interviews began in December 1999, when I entered the field, and concluded in May 2002.128

Semi-structured Interviews

I interviewed 120 people who were key stakeholders in the production, reception and reproduction of place meanings: local residents, people involved in destination marketing, and public sector representatives. This was done to gain a broader understanding of the issues surrounding the creation of place meanings, but also to engage the place promoters in a dialogue with their own place creations (the place promotional material), as well as gain an understanding of the local reaction to place promotional meanings.

Interviewing formed the dominant mode of enquiry in my data collection, with a number of focus group interviews also conducted, where peer support or group discussions of a particular issue were important.

Interviewees

In the interests of respondent anonymity, I chose to use broad categories only to indicate which groups interviewees belong to. This sometimes reduces the ability to judge the contexts from which respondents speak or to gain an understanding of the representativeness of particular comments. Throughout the thesis, I have attempted to

128 The majority of the fieldwork was undertaken in the six months from December 1999 till May 2000. Since then, I have been back 'in the field' repeatedly for short periods of time, in order to explore previously unexplored data collection paths, follow up with respondents, clarify or confirm understandings and in order to attend follow-up workshops in the tourism planning contexts of Glenorchy and Queenstown.

129 Interviewees were selected using a combination of theoretical sampling and the snowball method, where interviewees guided me towards other people to speak to. Once I had gained an understanding of the research setting, a continued effort was directed at making sure that I spoke with representatives of all sectors of the communities in question. Interviews ranged from half an hour to four hours in length and were guided by a set of interview questions developed prior to entering the interviewing stages.
identify the relevant contexts (e.g. identifying respondents as ‘developers’ or ‘tourism operators’) where this was necessary and did not jeopardise anonymity. I therefore do not believe that confining respondent identification to broad categories affects the presentation of my data.

**Participant Observation**

Overt participant observation was utilised for particular contexts of the research, such as planning meetings and workshops, particularly in the Glenorchy community planning process. Observation of participants and processes at these workshops was usually followed by in-depths interviews with some participants.

**Data Analysis**

Qualitative research utilises an inductive mode of enquiry. In contrast to quantitative methods, which often begin with certain assumptions or hypotheses and then search for data to support or contradict these hypotheses, the qualitative researcher collects evidence and then uses this evidence to develop an explanation for events or phenomena (also often referred to as ‘grounded theory’). The strength of this approach lies in its flexibility regarding the formulation and reformulation of theory to accept data analysis variations (as clearly evidenced in my thesis through the three ‘cuts’ at my data), based on systematic analysis of many data forms. Constant comparative analysis is a key focus, as theory evolves during the research through continuous interplay between analysis and data collection (Strauss and Corbin 1994, 273). This approach allows an investigation of the critical relationships between theoretical perspectives, which are ‘taken through’ the same case studies. Strauss and Corbin (1994, 273) explain that grounded theory allows theory to be generated or elaborated upon/modified, and it is of course the latter approach that is the focus in my thesis.

Data analysis was mainly conducted employing the idea of ‘pattern matching’ “whereby several pieces of information from the same case may be related to some theoretical proposition” (Yin, 1994, p. 25). Interviews were transcribed and coded

---

130 I gained permission for participant observation from the meeting organisers prior to meetings and made myself known as a participant observer to the meeting participants.
using NUDIST, a qualitative data analysis software package which allows the researcher to code data into themes and to build ‘theme trees’ of related sets of data. Notes on these and on documentary analysis as well as participant observations were analysed in the context of the theoretical framework.

**Ethical Considerations**

Approval from the Lincoln University Human Subjects Ethics Committee for this research was gained.
Tourism as an activity in place is largely regulated by land use planning legislation in New Zealand. Two key legislative acts that apply are the RMA (1991) and the LGA (1989). Both are set within a particular planning discourse, or representation of space, that has important consequences for the spatial practices emanating from tourism and land use planning at the local level.

**Historical Context**

Environmental change in New Zealand has been dramatic since European settlement in the early 1800s and, according to Memon and Perkins (2000, 14), is largely due to "widely held utilitarian values underpinned by a strong belief in the unfettered rights of the private property owner and faith in the ability of the government, supported by scientific ingenuity and technical application, to manipulate the environment and promote growth". A strong growth mentality and predominantly exploitative attitude towards the environment are characteristic of historical planning practice (Memon 1993).

Rixecker (1998) traces the historical context of environmental planning legislation in New Zealand and argues that the *Town Planning Act 1926* was the first local government planning statute that had significance in resource management planning and policy in New Zealand, through a focus on zoning land use. In 1953, with the introduction of the *Town and Country Planning Act (TCPA) 1953*, local authorities were given greater control over land use planning, removing some central government authority over local planning (Rixecker 1998). Rixecker traces the origins of today’s Environment Court to the TCPA (1953), because it established a Town and Country Planning Appeal Board, a "quasi-judicial appellate body chaired by a specially appointed judge" (Memon 1993, 24), with influence on planning practice similar to that of today’s Environment Court.
While environmental legislation became more important in the 1960s and 70s, Memon and Perkins (2000, 15) argue that this largely served a symbolic function. The ideological premises on which this new environmental legislation was based were notions of the freedom of private property owners to "make land utilisation decisions unencumbered by excessive regulation“. This, combined with a strong historical focus on economic growth, led to environmental management that was "internalised within the mainstream development bureaucracy and consequently marginalised" (Memon and Perkins 2000, 17). Maori concerns were also largely ignored, as New Zealand society is dominated by European values, "whilst Maori values, economic systems and forms of government, including traditional institutions for resource management, have been marginalised" (Memon and Perkins 2000, 16).

Both Memon and Perkins (2000) and Rixecker (1998) identify historically strong centrist tendencies in planning practice. Central government, as the largest landowner, tended to believe that it held "constitutional supremacy" (Memon 1993, 26), and public policy and programmes for resource utilisation and infrastructure provision were regarded as national responsibilities. As a result, "it was difficult for decision-makers to appreciate the implications of territorial diversity or to permit local and regional flexibility in the choice of policy options" (Memon and Perkins 2000, 15).

Rixecker (1998) argues that the era of ‘Think Big’ programmes is a direct result of this centrist stance of the state. The role of local governments in this planning framework was effectively marginalised (Memon and Perkins 2000). The TCPA underwent two revisions in 1973 and 1977, incorporating a limited notion of Maori ancestral land issues and an emerging social consciousness that was "no match for the strength of the central government and its entrenched bureaucracy" (Rixecker 1998, 121). As a result, central government, in the ‘Think Big’ era, was able to ignore local government and instituted large-scale projects that "tended to have considerable

131 ‘Think Big’ refers to the growth strategies developed by the Muldoon-led National Government in the late 1970s in response to the second oil crisis. The idea was to “seek to insulate New Zealand from the vagaries of the world economy by making it at least 60 per cent self-sufficient in energy through the development of its natural gas and abundant hydro-electricity energy potential. The objective was to provide a platform for the development of a more extensive and sophisticated heavy industrial and manufacturing base" (McRobie 1991, 395).
environmental and social impacts" (Rixecker 1998, 121). This was aided by legislation such as the 1979 National Development Act, which took away local authorities' powers in the consent management process for such projects (Memon 1993; Rixecker 1998).

**Resource Management Law Reform**

In the late 1980s, and closely aligned with local government reform, a process of resource management law reform began to institute considerable changes in environmental management in New Zealand. This was part of a wider process of restructuring, instituted by the 4th Labour Government in 1984 and aimed at more liberal market-led economic policy. Two key legislative enactments were involved in resource management law reform, the *Environment Act* 1986 and the *Conservation Act* 1987. The *Environment Act* 1986 created the Ministry for the Environment (MfE) and the Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment (PCE), both responsible for environmental policy development and coordination (the MfE is a policy and planning agency, whereas the PCE is an ombudsman’s office with 'watchdog' functions). The second key legislative enactment, the *Conservation Act* 1987, established the Department of Conservation (DoC), charged with the management of all natural and historical resources allocated to conservation purposes. In addition to these legislative changes, the state development bureaucracy of the 'Think Big' era passed, and public sector resource production functions (e.g., mining, forestry) were either privatised or delegated to state-owned corporations (Memon and Perkins 2000).

Today, the DoC, MfE and PCE together "provide the skeleton for central government environmental administration in Aotearoa New Zealand" (Rixecker 1998, 123). This is the basis for local government environmental management, which became much more important with the introduction of the RMA.
A large number of other industry associations also exist, including:

- Adventure Tourism Council
- Aviation, Tourism and Travel Training Association
- Backpacker Accommodation Council
- Budget Backpacker Hostel of NZ
- Events & Sponsorship Association
- Federation of Independent English Language Schools
- Holiday Accommodation Parks Association of NZ
- Hospitality Standards Institute
- Inbound Tour Operators Council
- Information Centres of NZ
- KiwiHost Ltd
- Major Accommodation Providers
- Motel Association New Zealand
- NZ Association of Farm & Home Hosts
- NZ Commercial Jet Boats Association
- NZ Institute of Travel & Tourism
- NZ Outdoor Instructors Association
- NZ Professional Hunting Guides Association
- NZ Rafting Association
- NZ Ski Council
- NZ Vehicle Rental & Leasing Association
- Rural Tourism Council
- Sea Kayaking Operators Association NZ
- Sport, Fitness, Recreation Industry Training Organisation
- Travel Agents Association of NZ
Spatial Planning Traditions

Contemporary planning, along with many other aspects of Western culture, is grounded in the Enlightenment tradition of modernity. Healey (1997) argues that this planning tradition has been framed within a modernist instrumental rationalism for many years. She reviews traditions of planning thought and argues that three planning traditions, economic planning, physical development planning, and public administration and policy analysis have been particularly influential in spatial planning practice.

Economic planning, based in the materialist and rationalist conception of a planned social order and dominated by economists and political philosophers, arose in part from a general critique of the processes of industrial capitalism and has had enormous influence across the world. John Maynard Keynes was influential in this tradition, and Keynesian economics, together with the establishment of the welfare state after World War Two, dominated economic planning until the early 1970s. The neo-liberal turn in economic planning replaced Keynesian demand-stimulation strategies and heralded "the return of the market as the key organising principle of economic life" (Healey 1997, 15). This has also been questioned more recently in the face of the inability of markets to provide for externalities. A rediscovery of the "institutional preconditions for market 'health' and 'vitality' has awakened interest once again in strategies which might foster economic development" (Healey 1997, 15, emphasis in original).

Physical development planning has been dominated by engineers and architects and ideas of urban form, urban master plans (e.g. Ebenezer Howard's 'Garden City'), and land use zoning. Healey (1997, 21) argues that, despite firm roots in rationalism and

---

132 I concentrate here on spatial planning traditions. For a comprehensive review of planning paradigms and associated rationalities, see Weaver, Jessop and Das (1985).
modernism, physical development planning embodies a critique of materialist rationalism, particularly in the form of concerns about environmental sustainability. In the 1980s, physical development planning moved towards a form of policy analysis focused on the "practical management of the dynamics of social, economic and environmental change in urban regions" (Healey 1997, 22). This move shows strong links to the tradition of policy analysis.

Policy analysis draws on Herbert Simon's idea of management by objectives and on rational planning processes guided by "instrumental reason as a form of argument, drawing upon scientific analysis" (Healey 1997, 24). The rational planning process was influenced by Charles Lindblom's "disjointed incrementalism" and Herbert Gans' sociologically informed conception of planners' moral responsibility, as well as by Sherry Arnstein's (1967) Ladder of Citizen Participation which introduced a power dimension into the theory of local politics (Healey 1997).

All three traditions, Healey (1997) argues, have recently sought new directions, to some extent foreshadowing current developments in planning theory. The economic tradition "incorporates an increasing appreciation of the institutional preconditions for economic health", the physical development planning tradition recognises social processes at the heart of spatial development, and the policy analysis tradition attempts to make policy processes more interactive (Healey 1997, 28). This has provided a basis for the 'institutional turn' in planning theory.

The 'Institutional Turn' in Planning Theory

Recognition of the increasing plurality of society, and of the decreasing importance of place-based gemeinschaft communities, has led to a need, in planning theory, to accommodate increasingly diverse interest group conflicts. Conflict mediation and consensus building have become increasingly important, and this, Healey (1997) emphasises, has been recognised by the 'institutional turn' in planning theory. This institutional turn, or new institutionalism (Healey 1996; 1997), as it is also often called, has links to phenomenology, structuration, and critical theory, and "it is grounded in a relational view of social life, which focuses on people actively and interactively constructing their worlds" (Healey 1997, 35). Local cultures, understood
here as "systems of meaning and frames of reference through which people in social situations shape their institutional practices" (Healey 1997, 37), matter. New institutionalism recognises that diversity of, and conflict between, cultural communities are much more likely than notions of place-based, relatively homogeneous communities (Healey 1997).

Such diversity is contrasted with the neo-classical understanding of communities as collections of individuals who are utility-maximisers, "with material preferences and interests, disconnected from social situations of existence", dominated only by the abstract systems of the market and of the hierarchical bureaucracy (Healey 1997, 40). The institutionalist approach rejects such assumptions of neoclassical economic theory (utility-maximisation, unique equilibrium, technology as a constant, perfect competition, no explicit economic structure, including no institutions). Drawing on Giddens and Habermas instead, it focuses on complex webs of social relations, and is related to the recent ‘third way literature’.

Third way literature refers to the attempt in economic theory to transcend the dualisms attached to the classic paradigms of state versus market or public versus private. The third alternative is based on evolutionary economics, and is variously described as an institutionalist perspective on regional development (Amin 1999; Amin and Thrift 1994; Gibbs, Jonas, Reimer and Spooner 2001; Healey 1999; Raco 1998), new regionalism (Deas and Ward 2000; Ethier 1998; Jones and McLeod 1999; Lovering 1999; Storper 1992; 1995; Tomaney and Ward 2000; Webb and Collins 2000), the ‘network or associational paradigm’ (Cooke and Morgan 1993; Morgan 1997), or the ‘learning region’ (Hassing and Lagendijk 2001; MacLeod 2000; Morgan 1997). Healey (2000) traces the origins of the term new institutionalism to Marxist political economy, phenomenology, social exchange theory, French regulation theory, and Giddensian structuration theory. It tends to favour bottom-up and region-specific

133 Note, however, that this is a matter of degrees of change rather than an abrupt juncture. Lovering (1999, 391, emphasis in original), for example, points out that this so-called third way is not really a third alternative, but closer to both neo-Keynesianism and neo-classicism than it claims to be: "It is hard to think of anyone, neo-Keynesian or neoclassical, who seriously advocates the position from which these New Regionalists claim to be distancing themselves. No sophisticated liberal economist argues that the market is a self-correcting mechanism .... The emphasis on building up regional industrial elites and the development of 'trust' ... is not a radical alternative to the mainstream. It is the mainstream".
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policy actions, based on regional ‘governance’ (which indicates plural-based self-organisation, as opposed to ‘government’ associated with central hierarchical organisation) (Cooke 1997; Gibbs et al. 2001; Jessop 1998).

This institutional turn emphasises the growing importance of institutions (e.g. firms, financial institutions, trade associations, development agencies, infrastructure) in the process of regional development. More importantly, it also emphasises the importance of the institutional embeddedness (Granovetter 1985; Keeble, Lawson, Moore and Wilkinson 1999; Raco 1998) of economic processes in a territorial milieu. The region, in this literature, has assumed a central theoretical status with regard to economic development because of what is described as territorial capital, which partly consists of specific factors of production (e.g. labour market characteristics), and partly of untraded interdependencies. Untraded interdependencies include institutional norms and values such as trust, reciprocity and cooperation, as well as regional conventions inherent in labour markets and public institutions (Storper 1997). These interdependencies are vital to economic and organisational learning and co-ordination. They are also based on tacit knowledge, that is, knowledge that is collective rather than individual and that cannot be removed from its human, cultural and social context. In other words, it is knowledge that “is more territorially-specific than is generally thought” (Morgan 1997, 495).

Most importantly, this approach recognises the collective social and cultural foundations of economic development. These foundations are referred to as institutional thickness by Amin and Thrift (1994, 14). These include levels of institutional support and of inter-firm collaboration, the strength of a consensus on a common purpose, and structures that encourage innovation, and skills and knowledge transfer.

What Giddens (1984) and Habermas contribute to this is an understanding of the cultural boundedness of thought and action, and, most importantly, the transformative capacity of active agency and collective dialogue (Healey 1997). This transformative capacity is based on the building of relationships, or networks, and it is in such network-building processes that the idea of collaborative planning is grounded (Healey 1997, 58): "The driving forces of social change, though actively constituted
within the interactions of daily life, arise through the mobilisation of networks". These networks, or relational worlds, mobilise perceptions and understandings.

Planning's role in this is one of building new relational links between networks, in an effort to connect different meaning systems. This has been referred to as the building of institutional capacity (Healey 1997, 61):

The concept of institutional capacity refers to the overall quality of the collection of relational networks in a place. It has been developed in the regional economic literature to refer to the social qualities which seem to make a difference to regional economic performance (Amin and Thrift 1995, cited in Healey 1997, 61).

Such institutional capacity is fundamentally dependent on dialogue based on communicative rationality.
APPENDIX FIVE: REGIONALISM

Regionalism in New Zealand

Samuels (2000) describes a number of regionalist expressions in New Zealand, including in the arts, through painting and literature, through regional geographies and bioregionalism, through architecture and landscape architecture, and, importantly for the context of the current thesis, through planning.\footnote{For a comprehensive literature review of disciplinary expressions of regionalism and for New Zealand examples of regional expression, see Samuels (2000, 6-54).}

Political history plays an important part in the definition of regions in New Zealand. The provincial government system introduced by early settler society lasted for a period of 24 years (1852-1876), ending with the establishment of central government in Wellington, but has remained prominent in people’s minds. Thus, the original six provinces of Auckland, Taranaki, Wellington, Nelson, Canterbury and Otago (with Hawkes Bay, Marlborough and Southland added later) remain important in people’s minds "and continue to be bolstered by sporting boundaries in particular" (Samuels 2000, 85).

New Zealand local government organisational reform in 1989 and a process of resource management law reform in the late 1980s resulting in the introduction of the Resource Management Act in 1991 meant the delegation of greater responsibility to territorial local authorities (district and regional councils). Environmental management, in particular, was at the centre of this delegation. Some central government roles were passed to territorial local authorities who now have the main responsibility for environmental planning and decision making. New Zealand’s regions and districts, therefore, play a larger role in environmental management.

Samuels (2000) categorises versions of regionalism in architecture in her research (Table A7.1):
### Table A5.1: Regionalisms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Regionalism</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Most Common Disciplines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implicit</td>
<td>Unintentional regionalist approach to the vernacular, regionalism as inevitable rather than deliberate</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romantic</td>
<td>Attempt to reinstate some of the values of a past that is more desirable than the present</td>
<td>Architecture, Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic</td>
<td>Uses symbols (such as identifiable characteristics of a region, or the use of icons and imagery) to reference regional character</td>
<td>Architecture, Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td>Attempts to reflect the culture of a region (through accommodating the way people behave and interact - links to regional geography)</td>
<td>Geography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areal</td>
<td>Drawing boundaries or limits around areas, division into distinct units</td>
<td>Geography, Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecological</td>
<td>Relates to ecosystems and indigenous planting</td>
<td>Landscape, Architecture, Bioregionalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>Relates to the physical elements of the region, e.g., landform, geology</td>
<td>Landscape, Architecture, Bioregionalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climatic</td>
<td>Takes into account constraints and opportunities of climatic considerations</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationalised</td>
<td>Relates to recognising a nation as a region rather than having a number of regions within it</td>
<td>Architecture, Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Localised</td>
<td>Rejects the concept of regional expression for a more localised form of specificity</td>
<td>Landscape architecture, Geography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universal (Critical)</td>
<td>Emphasis on acknowledging the role of universal influence in regional expression, aims to produce a contemporary style that acknowledges history and tradition but avoids a sentimental revival of the past (now referred to as critical regionalism)</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from Samuels (2000, 63-76).

---

135 Interestingly, this and the next version of regionalism were particularly prevalent in Samuels' (2000) New Zealand sample of landscape architects. She attributes this to New Zealand landscape architects' familiarity with "exploring the relationship between ‘native’ and ‘imported’" (Samuels, 2000, p. 92).
APPENDIX SIX: CENTRAL GOVERNMENT TOURISM STRUCTURES IN HISTORICAL CONTEXT

Central government structures for tourism policy and delivery have had a changeable history in New Zealand. On 1 February 1901, the Tourist and Health Resorts Department was established in New Zealand, believed to have been the world's first government department dedicated to tourism. This department was initially very active in infrastructure development and was involved in areas as wide-ranging as resort control, electricity supply, immigration, attraction development and information distribution. Its tasks varied over the decades, and, in 1954, it was renamed the New Zealand Tourist and Publicity Department, introducing a more obvious focus on the importance of tourism advertising in tourism policy. This name was changed to the New Zealand Tourism Department in 1990, the New Zealand Tourism Board in 1991, and Tourism New Zealand (as a trading name) in 1999. With these latter changes came changing roles for government in tourism, connected to an extensive review and restructuring of the public sector in the 1980s.

In brief, the review of the public sector begun in the 1980s saw an increasing focus on competition, public sector profitability, full cost recovery through a user pays principle and significant privatisation of state assets (see James 1990). This involved the setting up of state-owned corporations under new state-owned enterprise legislation introduced in October 1986, with an operational mandate to create and maintain profitable business entities. Many such state-owned enterprises have since been sold off to the private sector (James 1990).

Within the tourism industry, this resulted in the sale of formerly public corporations such as Air New Zealand, the Tourist Hotel Corporation, the New Zealand Railways Corporation, and the commercial services section of the then New Zealand Tourism Department. The Tourism Publicity Department was renamed the New Zealand Tourism Department and given a special marketing function (Collier 1999).

The 1989 New Zealand Tourism Conference Tourism 2000 - New Zealand Grow For It took stock of tourism in New Zealand, and brought together tourism industry
leaders, decision makers, and a wide variety of stakeholders. The *Tourism 2000* Taskforce was charged with the implementation of the recommendations of the conference (Collier 1999, 60). These recommendations included:

- the establishment of a joint private/public sector directed and funded New Zealand Tourism Board to market and develop 'Destination New Zealand'; and
- a review of the structure and funding of the New Zealand Tourist Industry Federation (NZTIF) (Collier 1999, 107).

Resultant policy decisions included a change in the Government's role in tourism, shifting emphasis away from investment and finance towards marketing and promotion. A number of new bodies were established to facilitate this change, including the establishment of a group of New Zealand companies involved in the marketing of New Zealand overseas, entitled the *Tourism Strategic Marketing Group*. (Collier 1999).

The early 1990s saw a change in political parties in power, and the incoming National Government restructured governmental tourism policy and delivery yet again, with a focus on a private sector-led New Zealand Tourism Board and a Ministry of Tourism (later to be renamed a policy group within the Ministry of Commerce, and subsequently an Office of Tourism and Sport within the Ministries of Internal Affairs and Economic Development, only to return to full Ministry status within the Ministry of Economic Development in January 2002) (Collier 1999, 109; NZTB 1999/2000).
APPENDIX SEVEN: ENVIRONMENT COURT LINES ON QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT TOPOGRAPHIC MAPS

Source: EC 1999