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Abstract

Rural decline associated with government restructuring in New Zealand in the 1980s has reduced the security of the agricultural economic base in many rural communities. These communities must find additional economic drivers to survive, and the appropriateness of possible economic drivers needs to be explored. Lawrence is a small rural town in New Zealand which has developed from a purely rural service centre to an attractive day-trip destination and host for tourism events. In 2011 Lawrence held a one-off anniversary festival. This study focuses on this festival to explore the way in which Lawrence reinvented itself and to assess the success of its reinvention. Twenty Key Informant interviews were conducted with the local council, businesses and event organisers. Further data were gathered through observation and document analysis. This study showed that event tourism has expanded the economic base in Lawrence. The anniversary festival provided economic benefits and helped build a degree of social cohesion. Heritage tourism is being further explored and there is planned a bike trail. However, the Lawrence community still faces social tension as different groups fail to work together and the community feels ignored by the district council. A lack of both communication and cooperation are key barriers to future growth in Lawrence. While these results are limited to this particular case study, they indicate that tourism is a viable secondary activity in rural areas and that there is a need for local governments and organisations to be actively involved in their communities to achieve community cohesion, communication and cooperation.
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1. Introduction

“What do we care about such a one-horse place as Lawrence”
- Ratepayer in a letter to the editor of the Tapanui Courier in 1876
  (as cited in Marks, 1977)

1.1 Introduction

The function of small rural towns is changing. These towns often developed as service centres for a variety of rural production activities (Keen, 2003). However agricultural decline, caused by a reduction in government subsidies for farmers and a belief in free market economics, removal of import licences and price controls as well as globalisation, rural-urban migration, changes in demand for rural products, transportation improvements, agricultural production improvements and a reduction in services are threatening the existence of some of these towns. To survive many rural towns have to reconsider their function not only in their hinterlands but also in a regional, national, and global framework. In New Zealand, government restructuring in the 1980s and a belief in free market economics has reduced government support (tax incentives, subsidies, price controls, floating exchange rates, and removal of import licences) for rural communities, and led to an era of self-dependence and community development (Chile, 2006; Keen, 2003; Willis, 2008; Wilson, 1995). Similar restructuring in Australia and the United Kingdom has been linked to agricultural economic downturns (Evans, et al., 2002; Holmes, 2002).

Tourism is an activity of growing significance in rural areas and small towns as society shifts from production to consumption activities. Tourism is increasingly being recognised as a replacement for traditional activities in rural communities (Harril, 2004; Walmsley,
Tourism in New Zealand is growing and at present employs one in ten people nationally (Ministry of Tourism, 2007). The ‘New Zealand Tourism Strategy 2015’ suggests that the tourism industry should work with communities for mutual benefit. So what is the benefit of tourism development to local communities? The suitability of tourism, with particular reference to a festival event, to small town reinvention is explored in this thesis.

1.2 Research Rationale

In New Zealand, rural communities can no longer rely on agricultural production alone or on government support of production yields for their economic wellbeing (Wilson, 1995). Communities must find new economic drivers to survive. Local economic development is a process by which local resources and networks are utilised to stimulate economic activity (Blakely, 1989). Local economic development is increasingly relevant because the fundamental driver for government restructuring was a belief that local resources and advantages should be utilised (Keen, 2003). Communities should be able to seize the opportunity to develop based on their local advantages (Keen, 2003). The appropriateness and sustainability of economic drivers should be considered. Replacing traditional activities with an economically vulnerable activity will only lead to future decline.

The replacement of traditional ‘production’ activities with new activities, particularly with those that trend away from intensification and specialisation of production is described by the theory of post-productivism (Evans, et al., 2002; Holmes, 2002; Ilbery and Bowler, 1998; Wilson, 2001). This theory provides a framework for considering changing rural landscapes that no longer rely on production yields. However there is a growing recognition that, particularly outside Europe, there is not a clean-cut change from production to post-production activities, and the theory of multifunctional agricultural regimes has developed in response (Daniels, et al., 2008; Wilson, 2010; Wilson, 2001; Woods, 2011). In particular, the concept of multifunctionalism is being applied to not only the on-farm activities but also the diversification of activities in rural communities (Wilson, 2010).
Tourism in rural communities can be considered as a post-productivist or multifunctionalist activity, and also as a local economic development strategy. The changing functions of small towns, combined with a societal shift from production to consumption is allowing for the emergence of new activities, such as tourism, in small New Zealand towns. Agricultural decline and the need for replacement, or the co-existance of new activities to support local economic development in towns is fuelling tourism development. The rationale for this research is to explore the use of tourism for developing economic activity in rural communities following the agricultural downturn.

1.3 Research context

Lawrence, a small New Zealand town, has reinvented itself. It has changed from a purely agricultural service centre to an attractive stop-over point and day-trip destination for tourists. In particular, a number of business, such as boutique shops and cafes have developed that are not commonly found in similarly-sized service centres.

In 2011, Lawrence held its 150th anniversary celebrations. The festival focused on heritage resources in the area that were key to the town’s development. The festival was a one-off celebration but a number of other festival events are held throughout the year in Lawrence. Festival tourism is growing in New Zealand (Higham and Ritchie, 2001).

While the Lawrence anniversary was a catalyst for the present study, associated plans for further tourism development, in the form of a recreational bike trail, as well as the focus on town promotion and hospitality make Lawrence a particularly suitable location in which to explore the changing functions of small New Zealand towns. The present study will seek to understand the implementation of tourism development and festival tourism, particularly the roles of local stakeholders, in a small New Zealand town. The study will also seek to understand the context in which tourism development occurred and the community’s perception of tourism development.

1.4 Research Scope

The aim of this research is, through a case study, to investigate the role of tourism as a driver for economic development in small towns, and the impact of tourism on local
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communities. The research seeks to establish the success of Lawrence’s economic reinvention through town promotion and event tourism. This research will build on previous research that explored the changes in agriculture-economy linkages in New Zealand following the 1980s government restructuring (Wilson, 1995). Among other things, this study will focus on the development of festivals, heritage, and bike trails as tourism resources due to their particular importance in Lawrence. The research aim will be achieved by addressing the following general research objectives as evidenced by the particular instance of Lawrence:

- Objective one: Explore the context in which a small New Zealand town begin to develop tourism activities
- Objective two: Discuss how the implementation of tourism development as a driver for local economic development in small New Zealand towns parallel best-practice principles described in current literature
- Objective three: Understand the roles local government and local stakeholders play in the planning of tourism development
- Objective four: Consider the local stakeholder’s perception of the effects of tourism development

Interviews with local stakeholders and observation of activities were the key techniques used to gather data in this study. Current literature and government documents are reviewed to assist in answering these research questions. A key element of this research is exploring the Lawrence experience relative to previous literature, and broader frameworks. The research questions are applied to Lawrence through four research questions. These are:

1. In what context did Lawrence begin to develop tourism activities?
2. How does the implementation of tourism development in Lawrence provide for local economic development?
3. What roles do local government and local stakeholders play in the planning of tourism development?
4. What is the local stakeholder’s perception of the effects of tourism development?

Tourism-led local economic development in Lawrence will be compared to best practice principles (Rogerson, 2002a). The co-existence of productionist, post-productionist, and
multifunctional activities in rural communities will also be explored (Daniels, et al., 2008; Wilson, 2010; Woods, 2011).

1.5 Research structure
Chapter one has introduced the topic, context, and the guiding theories which are the basis for the research. Chapter two will provide a review of current literature to explore the principle theories of local economic development, post-productivism, and multifunctionalism. It will also explore trends in the literature on relevant topics such as government restructuring, rural decline, tourism resources, and communities’ perceptions of tourism development. Chapter three will outline the research approach. In particular it will discuss the value of qualitative research for exploring the real world as well as justifying the use of a case study in this instance. Chapter four, five and six will present the results of the research. Chapter four will provide an in-depth contextual overview of the study with a focus on the historic economic drivers in Lawrence. Chapter five will present the anniversary festival findings. Chapter six will present the perceptions of future development in Lawrence. Chapter seven explores the implications of these results through addressing each research objective individually. It will also focus on comparing the Lawrence experience with previous studies. Chapter eight will provide a conclusion to the research as well as discussing the future for Lawrence, and recommending possible strategies to extract maximum benefit for the community through tourism development.
2. Theoretical Framework

2.1 Introduction
This chapter provides a framework for the research by summarising current, relevant trends and theories within academic literature. In 1984, government restructuring in New Zealand led to reduced support for rural communities in New Zealand (Wilson, 1995). The first section in this chapter focuses on the changes in small rural communities in New Zealand. It also explores the United Kingdom theory of post-productivism, which provides a framework for understanding farming practices that no longer focus on production. This regime’s validity and applicability in New Zealand small towns is explored. The second section discusses economic development in small towns through the theories of local economic development and of community driven development. The final section addresses the use of tourism as a development driver in small towns. It also discusses the benefits and impacts of three tourism activities that directly relate to the Lawrence experience: festival; heritage; and rail trails.

2.2 Rural Development: Beyond Production Targets
2.2.1 Introduction
On-farm practices and the role of agriculture in supporting local economies have significantly changed in New Zealand since the 1980’s and, without this traditional dependence, rural communities have been forced to think beyond agricultural production. This change has occurred in Lawrence in that the community has reinvented the town to provide new income sources as they are less able to rely on on-farm incomes to support the community (Business Owner pers.comm, 2010b).
This section focuses on how government restructuring led to changes in rural communities in New Zealand. Small rural towns in New Zealand experienced decline because government restructuring in the 1980s has reduced support and funding for farming communities as well as reducing the role of rail in transporting goods to urban areas. Similar restructuring has also been linked with decline in rural areas in Australia (Holmes, 2002). Wilson (1995) states that it is important to study the effects of these changes on local communities life, sense of place, and security to understand the human element of any change. It is especially important to consider people’s responses to events since constraints as well as opportunities can result from government induced change (Wilson, 1995). New Zealand literature on the long-term impact of agricultural restructuring has shown an increase in off-farm jobs to support on-farm incomes (Robertson, *et al.*, 2008). General economic trends in rural communities which are no longer supported by revenue from on-farm production, and small town reinvention should be explored (Robertson, *et al.*, 2008; Scott and Pawson, 1999; Wilson, 1995). Lawrence is a small rural service centre, affected by agricultural restructuring, and can provide a case study to explore more recent economic trends in this type of town.

### 2.2.2 Rural Restructuring in New Zealand

In 1984, the Labour government began sweeping agricultural restructuring (Wilson, 1995). By 1987 deregulation of the agriculture sector included removal of financial assistance, (subsidies and tax incentives), fixed exchange rates and import licences, that had previously protected farmers (Wilson, 1995). The basis for restructuring was the idea that regions should develop according to their local resources and potential rather than following a national plan (Scott and Pawson, 1999). However, just when the New Zealand agricultural sector was undergoing deregulation world commodity prices fell and New Zealand interest rates and inflation rose, meaning farmers had significantly lower incomes causing a rural downturn (Wilson, 1995). Government support for farmers was replaced by two divergent support systems; the first focused on small urban business, global business building and direct investment in centres, while the second responded to those suffering the most from financial restructuring, predominantly rural communities, through local community support (Scott and Pawson, 1999). In addition, Maori developed
unemployment and development policies and created jobs through revenue received from Treaty settlements (Scott and Pawson, 1999).

Agriculture restructuring has resulted in dramatic restructuring of the rural economy as a result of New Zealand's historical reliance on the agricultural industry (Wilson, 1995). The restructuring significantly changed the way farms operated and led to centralisation of government-run services. Restructuring policies and agricultural change in New Zealand affected rural communities through out-migration, increased unemployment, reduced services and led to economic decline (Higham and Ritchie, 2001). Farms now operate with less reliance on farm based incomes, taking actions such as one household member moving to other work, reducing spending on inputs and wages, and making changes to product quality, type, pricing and marketing (Wilson, 1995). This streamlining of farming practices has resulted in a decline in on-farm employment, and although this decline has been counterbalanced by an increase in employment opportunities in agriculture-related businesses (farm input or output processing), this increase was often in the larger urban centres (Wilson, 1995). As well as the decline in private employment opportunities there was an outflow of government investment that has not been matched by an inflow of private investment, and there has been centralisation of services in larger centres, which has further contributed to the rural rise in unemployment (Scott and Pawson, 1999; Wilson, 1995). In rural areas there was less reliance on farm yields as a means of driving economic activity.

2.2.3 Post-Productivism: a European Concept

After World War II, agricultural policies in the United Kingdom focused on food production yields. This has been termed the “productivist” phase and lasted from the 1950s until the mid-1980s (Ilbery and Bowler, 1998). It focused on increasing farm yields through intensification, concentration and specialisation (Ilbery and Bowler, 1998). In Europe governments used policies and financial support to increase domestic agricultural yields and so decrease reliance on non-domestic food production (Wilson, 2001). More recent rural processes that trend away from ‘production’ as a result of government policy change, and especially away from principles of intensification, concentration and specialisation, are often grouped in the literature under the regime of post-productivism.
Post-productivism is seen as the ‘mirror image’ of the productivist phase (Wilson, 2001).

The post-productivist theory holds that, in the United Kingdom, rural wealth is declining because on-farm outputs are decreasing due to reduced government support, the competition associated with an international food market, and an increase in environmental regulation. Post-productivism theory is therefore a descriptive, rather than predictive, concept. It describes a transitional regime rather than being a definition of an absolute shift in the economy of rural landscapes (Wilson, 2010).

General trends in the United Kingdom which fall under the regime of post-productivism may be useful for providing a framework within which to explore the impacts of New Zealand’s rural restructuring. In particular, the framework can provide a set of characteristics to explore the rural processes in New Zealand that result from a decrease in government support for agriculture and an increase in environmental legislation. Understanding the concepts within the post-productivism regime is important for establishing characteristics of a trend away from productivism in New Zealand. Specifically it is important to ask in what way post-productivism is manifesting itself in New Zealand, and whether the theory can provide guidance for future changes. Evans, Morris and Winter (2002) summarised previous studies in the United Kingdom and found five categories of change in the United Kingdom commonly attributed to post-productivism. Despite their evidence that these changes are not absolute, even within the United Kingdom, their categories provide a means of assessing rural change in New Zealand under the post-productivism regime.

2.2.4 United Kingdom Post-Productivist Characteristics in New Zealand?

A comparison of United Kingdom characteristics with New Zealand shows that, as in Australia, while there is evidence of a trend away from ‘productivist’ activities there is also evidence that it is manifesting in a different way (Holmes, 2002). In this section the five categories established by Evans, Morris and Winter (2002) will be used to explore how and if New Zealand’s rural environment is moving away from the ‘productivist’ phase.
1) The ‘shift from quantity to quality food production’ is driven by the added value farmers receive from quality products. This value has been predominantly created through demand by consumers (Evans, et al., 2002). There is a wide variety of opposing characteristics that can be deemed quality (local and environmentally friendly, or mass production and food supply reliability) therefore entirely different changes in farming practice can fall under this category (Evans, et al., 2002). In the New Zealand context, following the downturn associated with rural restructuring, farmers have reduced expenditure, especially in terms of quantity of inputs such as fertiliser, shopping around for the products, and quantity of on farm employment (Johnsen, 1999; Wilson, 1995). This could cause a reduction in both quantity and quality of food production but there is no evidence to indicate this is the case in New Zealand.

2) Diversifying on-farm incomes for example growing a variety of crops, has not been demonstrated to actually occur in the United Kingdom, and the diversity is generally created in other forms of production (Evans, et al., 2002). In some cases these are simple changes (for example diversity in the breed of livestock) that are more suited to the farm (Johnsen, 1999). In New Zealand it has been shown that the loss of income and employment has forced farmers to diversify into other products, such as wine and forestry; however in practice this diversity occurs between farms rather than diverse income streams on a single farm (Keen, 2003).

There is recognition that undertaking multiple activities on a farm is the future of farming in New Zealand (Fisher, 2006). Tourism is seen as a possible post-productivist driver in New Zealand (Conradson and Pawson, 2009). Rural tourism is growing, especially in terms of farm stays (Fisher, 2006). Off-farm employment is also becoming vital to rural communities (Johnsen, 1999). Off-farm employment in service and urban centres was seen as see as negative through the 1990s (Robertson, et al., 2008). However, as diversity of employment opportunities in rural areas has grown (especially in tourism, recreation and conservation), income streams that do not depend on farm yields are now seen by the communities as more positive, especially as they can provide steady income streams not affected by seasonality and single sector fluctuations (Robertson, et al., 2008).
3) ‘Extensification and the promotion of sustainable farming’, is supposed, in the theory, to arise primarily from policy changes in Europe, which required land to be set aside for environmental protection and related requirements (Evans, et al., 2002). Evans et al. (2002) contend that it was not achieved ‘on the ground’ and the policy changes were merely ‘paying lip service’ to goals, especially as decreases in the percentage output did not match the percentage of land set aside. A study by Holmes (2002) investigating post-productivist processes in Australia and New Zealand found that the areas with the highest post-productivist value (for example amenity or ecological value), were those with the least agricultural damage, which were by nature those with the least agricultural value (Holmes, 2002). Studies in Gore, and Waihemo, in New Zealand suggest that extensive downscaling, after the 1984 restructuring, was a survival strategy (reducing input costs) rather than an environmental consideration (Johnsen, 1999; Wilson, 1995). Connell, Page and Bentley (2009) contend that tourism is seen as a way of reducing environmental damage caused by agriculture in that it provides for a new income stream in rural areas.

4) ‘Dispersion of production patterns’ might also be expected in a post-production phase, but has also not been demonstrated. This may be because there is a lack of policy incentives in the United Kingdom to encourage dispersion (Evans, et al., 2002). It is accepted that to some extent a rise in small farming operations may indicate dispersion but it does not guarantee it (Evans, et al., 2002). New Zealand is cited as an example where large-scale farming is increasing, particularly with regard to dairy-farming (Daniels, et al., 2008).

5) ‘Environmental regulation and restructuring of government support’ is suggested as a driver for post-productivism. In the United Kingdom the opportunity for change developed as government support for high production agriculture declined and environmental awareness grew (Evans, et al., 2002). However the decline of government support for intensive production and growing environmental awareness has not been effectively integrated into policy. Government support still relies on production units and environmental policies have had little tangible outcomes (Evans, et al., 2002). In New Zealand, the introduction of the Resource Management Act in 1991 produced an increase in environmental regulation as it incorporated a number of different acts into one body. The focus of the Act on the effects on the environment rather than the activity taking place
means that it does not relate directly to on-farm production units or farming intensity. It sets out an integrated planning framework that placed an emphasis on the effects of activities on the environment and on the importance of ecosystems. However it did provide a number of tools to protect the environment that can be used in a farm context. For example esplanade strips can be introduced as part of development consent conditions to increase protection of and access to waterways (Quality Planning online, 2006a). Protection of biodiversity is also an important aspect within the Act and habitat protection can be achieved through regulatory, non-regulatory and economic measures (Quality Planning online, 2006b).

To summarise: Evans, Morris and Winter (2002) discussed these categories in an effort to demonstrate the ineffectiveness of using a single term, such as post-productivism, to study changes resulting from multiple independent aspects of agricultural restructuring. The use of the post-productivism regime is contentious because of its abstract nature but it does, to some extent, provide a coherent, if linear, viewpoint for exploring rural change. The post-productivism theory is not clearly defined, and it tends to be descriptive of general trends that can be connected to the reduction in ‘productivism’ (Wilson, 2001). In Australia there is evidence to support the post-productivism trend (Fisher, 2006; Holmes, 2002). Specifically there is reduced reliance on production outputs for agricultural income streams, escalation of alternative crops and the growth of rural heritage tourism. However there is disagreement about whether the Australian trend accords with the strict European characterisation of post-productivism (Fisher, 2006; Holmes, 2002).

2.2.5 Beyond Post-Productivism

Wilson (2001) argues that in many cases productive and post-productivist activities are occurring concurrently. Importantly post-productivism does not override productivism even within a single location (Wilson, 2001; Woods, 2011). According to these authors, a single farmer may chose to adopt more environmentally friendly practices while their neighbour does not, and even a single farmer may believe in supporting environmentally friendly practices but also in achieving higher crop yields (Wilson, 2001; Woods, 2011). A belief in a linear progression from productivist to post-productivist landscapes is being replaced with the concept of productivist and post-productivist activities occurring in the
same spaces at the same time (Woods, 2011). Wilson (2001, p.94) considers post-productivism as the transition from productivism to a state ‘beyond post-productivism’: a state he calls the ‘multifunctional agriculture regime’. This suggests that post-productivism as a concept is relevant, in terms of its description of change, but not as a predictive theory.

While multifunctionalism was originally only concerned with the agricultural activities it has been expanded to include all of the activities in rural areas and communities (Wilson, 2010). “Multifunctionalism implies that the countryside across the world is used for both productive and post-productive purposes and the combination of uses, including commodification and conservation, varies from place to place” (Daniels, et al., 2008: 254). Multifunctionalism suggests that values associated with rural landscapes should be considered in a holistic manner that includes both their direct production value and other characteristics, such as open space, which are valued for tourism and recreation (Woods, 2011). These indirect values should be promoted to ensure that as production subsidies decline in rural areas other values are recognised and developed to ensure income streams based on consumption support rural communities rather than allowing them to disappear (Woods, 2011).

Daniels et al. (2008) argues that in the global South, what was originally multifunctionalism is being replaced by single-crop-productivism that is growing under neoliberal policies. Further, post-productivism, in terms of a move back to family-owned farms, commodity diversity and diverse income streams, has not been clearly identified in the South and that productivism is the dominant regime. New Zealand is given as an example from the North where the productivism characteristics of intensification are increasing to meet demand of off-shore markets in dairy produce and neoliberal policies are eroding the diversity of both on-farm, and rural communities activities (Daniels, et al., 2008).

This analysis demonstrates the complexity of the notion of post-productivism and, while accepting that change has occurred, it is suggested that research should focus on specific aspects of rural processes rather than a broad investigation of all rural change (Evans, et al., 2002). It is evident, regardless of the term used, that in parallel with agricultural restructuring that there was a move in society from a mode of production to one of
consumption (Walmsley, 2003). Consumption is a behaviour that includes lifestyle, leisure and tourism (Walmsley, 2003). Multifunctionalism presents a picture of multiple activities and values occurring at the same time; however it is recognised that recreational and conservation values existing in NZ's high country, at some level, compete with production values (Holmes, 2002). The competing values associated with production and tourism in New Zealand must be explored, particularly with reference to the existence of competing values in small towns.

2.3 Economic Development in Small New Zealand Towns

2.3.1 Introduction

The reduced support of farming by government flows on to the income streams of small rural communities since, with reduced income streams in farming areas, local services become less viable. The way in which small towns react to this change is a key focus of this study and is discussed in this section. Small rural towns need to develop new approaches to economic development as they must go beyond relying on income from production and face potential decline due to both restructuring of remaining production-related activities and a shift away from traditional production. Despite the generally negative view of agricultural restructuring, this process has allowed communities with strong leadership and entrepreneurial skills to seize opportunities to reinvent themselves and their economic base (Keen, 2003). The approaches taken by small towns in New Zealand to support their economies beyond production targets are an important aspect for research. A common response to job loss and immediate economic decline is subsequent local economic development.

2.3.2 Local Economic Development

“Local economic development refers to the process in which local governments or community-based (neighbourhood) organizations engage to stimulate or maintain business activity and/or employment. The principle goal of local economic development is to develop local employment opportunities in sectors that improve the community using existing human, natural, and institutional resources” (Blakely, 1989:15).
Many overseas authors have discussed local economic development theory; but few specify detailed plans for achieving local economic development in a range of communities. The main goal of local economic development is that of developing local employment opportunities in locally appropriate sectors through building relationships between local government, community groups, and the private sector to manage resources (Blakely, 1989; Kolo and Watson, 1992; Rogerson, 2002a). Local economic development is not an outcome but a process, to establish and maintain a good environment for business in order to maintain jobs and income streams in a community (Blakely, 1989).

The term 'economic development' faces problems in that it implies a linear path to predetermined goals, with measurable steps on the way, and excludes notions of enhancing nonmarket resources (Eversole, 2003). There are a range of established measures, which are often not linear, for development policies. The driver of successful local economic development is not usually a quick fix but lies in community capacity to attract business and maintain it (Blakely, 1989). Investment in infrastructure, human capital and social capital are broad measures that produce long-term economic development results, and tax preference and financial assistance are focused measures that provide quick benefits (Gorin, 2008).

The problems facing communities are unique and therefore there are no general policies to support development (Blakely, 1989). “Strategies emerge from the circumstances” and are therefore unique to any context (Blakely, 1989:138). The solutions must be established for each locality (Blakely, 1989). Courtney and Errington (2001) note the difficulty in providing a single definition for “local economy”, despite the ease of defining it in a single case. They illustrate this by suggesting it could be defined as the area from which the labour market commutes, or as the shopping area, or as a defined radius from a central point (Courtney and Errington, 2001). None of these will provide significant meaning in all research cases, but all are a way of describing an economic area (Courtney and Errington, 2001). Communities can be easily identified in spatial terms, especially when considering the territorial boundaries of local authorities, but it is more difficult to identify a community in economic or social terms (Hampton, 2005). It is important to consider not only the creation of new jobs but the appropriateness of the jobs to the community; high
tech jobs in areas with low skilled workers will not provide relief in the same way as jobs that are matched to the skills of the unemployed workforce (Blakely, 1989).

Local economic development policies aim to create employment opportunities within local communities, but guidance on appropriate policies is limited due to the circumstantial nature of the problem and the difference in communities. Blakely (1989) gives some guidance by defining five key resources for successful local economic development: namely the five M’s (see Blakely, 1989). These are Materials, (Hu)Man-power, Markets, Management and Money and without any one of these resources any local economic development initiative is likely to fail (Blakely, 1989). Blakely (1989) also groups local economic development policies by the target resource used. Firstly, ‘Locality development’ makes use of and develops the community’s assets. ‘Business development’ promotes the locality’s resources to attract new businesses, but these can be inappropriate. ‘Human development’ views the target unemployment group as a resource for new business and develops the resource through training (Blakely, 1989). There are a number of different ways to categorise local economic development strategies, but they are commonly categorised as either exogenous (originating externally) or endogenous (originating internally).

2.3.3 Exogenous Local Economic Development Strategies

Exogenous policies are often the focus of local economic development discussion but are also often less effective in the long term (Blakely, 1989; Jones, 2008). Exogenous policies involve attracting businesses from other locations, through enhancing the environment from a business point of view (Jones, 2008). Methods for creating this environment include providing incentives, reducing barriers to development or offering tax reductions (Jones, 2008). Neoclassical economic theory, while often criticised for its anti-interventionist approach, can provide useful insights for development theory. Consequent to the concepts of equilibrium and mobility, private capital investment should be naturally drawn away from high cost areas to lower cost areas as this provides for a higher return on the investment (Blakely, 1989). Therefore barriers that stop this movement of capital should be reduced and resources actively put into attracting capital to low cost areas (Blakely, 1989). A limited government budget means that providing monetary incentives
for business reduces spending on other public goods and services such as education (Gorin, 2008). However, there is no indication of whether the provision of business incentives or the provision of public goods and services is better for economic development (Gorin, 2008). Any businesses attracted through these methods are likely to be equally happy to move on again when there is a better offer, leaving a community with no permanent benefit (Jones, 2008).

2.3.4 **Endogenous Local Economic Development Strategies**

Endogenous policies focus on local assets and resources and on partnerships within the community to build social and economic capacity (Jones, 2008). A central ideal in local economic development theory is that development should focus on opportunities that suit the local area’s workforce and resources focusing on what they can supply, rather than necessarily on what is demanded by the broader economy (Blakely, 1989). They also aim to encourage businesses already connected to the community, which are less likely to move on (Jones, 2008). Firms that are well integrated in the community should be supported as the support is more likely to result in benefit for the community and sustainable benefit (Courtney and Errington, 2001). Endogenous methods include providing the right conditions for small local business growth, so that as local businesses grow they are able to provide more jobs for members of the community (Jones, 2008). “The growth of industries that use local resources, including labour and materials for export elsewhere, will generate both local wealth and jobs” (Blakely, 1989:62).

Endogenous policies are broadly categorised as more beneficial than exogenous policies but there is a lack of direct and specific guidance on how to encourage and implement endogenous policies. The focus of endogenous policies on the creative and efficient use of locally available resources parallels a reduced basic production focus (simply sustaining and increasing output) that has already been discussed. A new approach to the use of local resources is evident in both endogenous local economic development policies and in the fundamentals of post-productivism. The focus of endogenous policies on local assets, resources and partnerships within the community leads to a discussion of local economic development policies initiated by the community itself.
2.3.5 Community-led Local Economic Development

The role of the community in economic development is often initiation and, to a lesser extent, control of the development process (Eversole, 2003). The people in the community are the ones experiencing the problems that development aims to fix; and they are the ones most in touch with what solutions may be feasible or may provide the most benefit for them (Eversole, 2003). Local initiative and support is often the only driver for any rural development, including tourism (Eversole, 2003; Walmsley, 2003). The focus of Community Development Corporations is usually on achieving social goals through the use of economic development, rather than on purely economic development goals (Blakely, 1989). The key difference is in the outcomes sought by the development group. Economic development is seen as a means to achieve social outcomes (such as community education, leadership and cooperation) rather than an outcome in itself. Chile (2006) defines community development as policy and practice concerned with processes aimed at bringing about desirable change in society through organizing, coordinating and initiating activities that enhance the wellbeing of individuals, groups and communities (Chile, 2006:408). Community-driven development usually has lower capital investment and higher community input into decisions (Davis and Morals, 2004). Community Development Corporation’s and community groups face other problems including lower skills and planning, and benefits can also be directed at only some groups in an area rather than spread through the community (Blakely, 1989). The role and impact of Community Development Corporations is far from comprehensively understood. There is debate surrounding the positives and negatives of Community Development Corporation contributions. Case studies can be used to compare the role of Community Development Corporation and their attributes in different situations (Squazzoni, 2009). In the present case study a community group (the Lawrence Community Board) has focused on achieving social goals through economic development.

‘Asset-based community development’ is a local economic development strategy which focuses on bottom-up approaches where community organisations locate and utilise their locality’s resources to achieve economic development (Squazzoni, 2009). Individual communities must market themselves and their resources to attract development, as national policies usually fail to enhance the goals of individual communities. Communities
must use their resources to create a competitive advantage and establish a sustainable economic base (Blakely, 1989).

2.3.6 Local Economic Development: Shortcomings

Local economic development and community development policies assume cohesive communities and economic linkages to wide areas; but these may not be in place. A small town should not necessarily be thought of as a community, as the residents may not possess a community identity, common goals, or close relationships despite their proximity to one another (Eversole, 2003). This can create conflict when different development goals are desired (Eversole, 2003).

Inappropriate economic development goals can also put pressure on the environment, infrastructure and government resources (Kolo and Watson, 1992). Even if the goals are agreed upon by everyone, development initiatives within the community often fail due to a lack of resources (Eversole, 2003). Residents may have an understanding of which solutions will be appropriate or effective but they rarely have the resources necessary to implement change and therefore they require support from larger external agencies (Eversole, 2003).

The economic linkages between small towns and their hinterlands also need to be understood before development policies aimed at small towns can be expected to have effects on the wider community (Courtney and Errington, 2001). There is a lack of evidence about the role of settlements in their local economy and the flow of goods and services to hinterlands to justify development policies, especially those used in England, that assume these linkages (see Courtney and Errington, 2001).

2.3.7 Recent Changes in Local Economic Development in New Zealand

In New Zealand local economic development initiatives have focused on community-based, quality of life, outcomes. There was strong government support for community development initiatives during the period from 1935 to 1949. However the National government that came into power following the 1949 election did not support many of the established policies and introduced an era of reduced community support (Chile, 2006).
There were growing challenges to state influence on community decisions and communities could only depend on themselves through to the 1970s (Chile, 2006). This represented a similar case to Europe and Australia where local economic development had arisen because of failings of national governments, rather than because the value of local authorities had been recognised (Blakely, 1989).

Community development became the perceived answer to society’s problems from the 1970s, where local problems were believed to be best solved by local solutions and this mindset is evident in the Local Government Act (1974), which mandated that community development should be achieved by the newly established Territorial Local Authorities (Chile, 2006). By 1984 there was a belief that the maximum national benefit could be achieved by following free markets rather than picking winners and redistributing resources (Willis, 2008). Regional development did not disappear, instead it was transferred to local communities and, after the 1989 local government reforms and the 1991 Resource Management Act, it became a function of local government (Willis, 2008). To some extent the extreme nature of neo-liberal economics that reigned through the 1984-1999 period was the foundation for community-driven development as the communities that were suffering most began significant programmes to support themselves and this led to the creation of local economic development organisations (Willis, 2008).

2.4 Tourism Development as a Response to Rural Decline

2.4.1 Introduction

Promotion of tourism has been adopted in many western countries as a response to rural restructuring and to decline in production-based incomes (Briedenhann and Wickens, 2004). Its recent development can therefore be seen as a post-productivist activity (Conradson and Pawson, 2009). People look for local resources other than traditional production to use in the promotion of, and income generation for, their town (Eversole, 2003). Tourism is often taken up by rural communities searching for local economic development, but this is usually as a last resort or a solution to problems, rather than as a desirable strategy in its own right (Walmsley, 2003). Governments may promote tourism for creating jobs, developing infrastructure and revitalising economies; however the benefits may be less than expected, and inequitably distributed, and tourism may create
unforeseen social costs (Briedenhann and Wickens, 2004). In Lawrence, in New Zealand, a number of different tourism approaches, including festival promotion, heritage, and rail trail tourism are being explored to promote the town and to generate revenue from visitors in an attempt to achieve social and economic goals. This section will discuss the role of tourism as a local economic development response, the impact of tourism on communities, and festivals, heritage and rail trail tourism.

2.4.2 Tourism and Local Economic Development

Planners and developers increasingly utilise tourism to promote local economic development as a replacement for traditional activities (Harril, 2004; Rogerson, 2002a). There is a universal belief that tourism is good for New Zealand’s economy and job creation, but a study by Lawson et al. (1998) found that few people have said that tourism has a direct benefit to them. One reason for the belief that tourism is beneficial is that alongside agriculture, the tourism sector allows for dual market dependence. This means that economic activity can rely on more than one market, and so market fluctuations will not affect economic stability to the same extent. Rogerson (2002a) has collated the views of several authors and produced ‘ten key principles for successful tourism-led local economic development’. These principles aim to guide best practice for local economic development focused on tourism (see Rogerson, 2002a:113). The principles focus on the current situation in the community (such as available tourism product) but also the actions that need to be taken (monitoring, ensuring small developments) (Rogerson, 2002a).

Recreation and tourism provide for both the diversification of the economic base and revitalisation of the community through the use of natural and heritage resources (Allen, et al., 1993). A town cannot rely on a single resource for tourism consumption and must instead combine a range of resources from festivals or arts to infrastructure and accommodation to be successful and also provide for the host community in terms of profits and quality of life (Rogerson, 2002a). The networks of activities, services and accommodation that tourists require support each other in terms of each allowing the other sector to maintain business. In order to visit tourists need somewhere to stay, buy food and other goods such as petrol (Keen, 2003).
In rural America, recreation and tourism development have been shown to alleviate social challenges for residents through economic growth (Allen, et al., 1993). Employment generation is the key goal of rural tourism and the economic benefits depend on the length of stay of the visitors and the types of tourism activities available (Walmsley, 2003). There are direct and ripple effects of tourist spending in the community, for example the initial spend in cafes, and the flow on from the cafe’s increased revenue to the cafe’s supplier (Bowker, et al., 2007). Therefore, the benefits can be categorised as direct (tourist spending), indirect (business re-spending) or induced (higher income spend) (Nuryanti, 1996).

However, becoming a tourism destination has the potential to change the character of the original area in a negative way and alter the desirability of the location for the original community (Walmsley, 2003). Small firms are both more connected to their community in terms of ownership and more economically beneficial as they tend to use resources from within a community rather than drawing in outside resources and allowing income and employment leakage outside the area (Hampton, 2005). Therefore, planning that focuses on the development of small local firms will significantly increase the benefit stream from tourism developments to local communities (Hampton, 2005). As a locality becomes a significant tourism destination, there is a need for planning to focus on incentives for local small business owners. This allows those with lower capital to compete with large outside investors and reduce the buy-out of locals and the separation of the local community away from the tourism sector (Hampton, 2005). Planning in tourism and recreation can be disjointed and reactive, similar to planning in general, and can be complex due to the number and range of interested parties (Leberman and Mason, 2002).

There was strong growth in inbound tourism in New Zealand in the 1980s and 1990s due to a number of changes in income spending (Lawson, et al., 1998). Internationally, tourism is seen as a fast track for development due to both internal and external factors (Hampton, 2005). Tourism growth can be externally attributed to recent increases in leisure, mobility and income for significant parts of populations (Hodur and Leistritz, 2006). Further external drivers include developers identifying new areas and establishing facilities or increased mobility which creates access to unique areas (Rogerson, 2002a). Internal drivers for tourism arise from a community’s desire to establish new industry as traditional
Sources of employment decline (Rogerson, 2002a). Planning for tourism in New Zealand is largely reactive, focused on the impacts of individual projects, and is seen as a promotion activity rather than a strategic planning exercise (Leberman and Mason, 2002). Policy documents are produced in a 5-10 year cycle and are often outdated before they are implemented; hence new issues that arise require reactive planning (Leberman and Mason, 2002). The dependency of tourism in New Zealand on natural and physical resources means that planning for tourism in New Zealand is vitally important (Connell, et al., 2009).

2.4.3 Tourism and the Community

Studies investigating the attitudes of the host community towards tourism development have focused on development from outside of the community (Harril, 2004; Lawson, et al., 1998; Long, et al., 1990). There is debate and disagreement among various authors as to the causes of variation in residents’ attitudes towards tourism. Residents can perceive both positive and negative impacts of tourism and therefore be unsure of their overall attitude towards tourism, which may lead to the debate about the influence of different factors (Harril, 2004). Some factors that may influence residents attitudes towards tourism include the guest/host ratio, cultural distance between host and guest, the residents’ economic dependence on tourism, the community’s decision making power, the residents’ stage in life-cycle, seasonality, and type of tourism that has developed (Lawson, et al., 1998). Optimising social and environmental benefits to the residents and mitigating adverse impacts of tourism are important in maintaining favourable resident attitudes (Long, et al., 1990).

Socio-economic factors are often used to explain variation in residents’ attitudes toward tourism development but they may actually have a minor role (Harril, 2004). A summary of previous studies, conducted by Long et al. (1990), found that residents’ attitudes towards tourism did not depend on socio-demographic characteristics. Residents attitudes were more favourable when the individual respondent was more economically dependent on tourism, for example by working in the tourism sector; and the perceived impact of tourism was less when the resident lived further from the tourism development (Long, et al., 1990).
The level of tourism activity is an important factor that influences the residents' perception of tourism (Allen, et al., 1993; Long, et al., 1990). There is some acceptance that residents face a social exchange between the economic benefits of tourism and the negative environmental and social impacts and that at some point a threshold is reached where the exchange is no longer seen as desirable (Harril, 2004). However, Allen et al. (1993) found that favourable attitudes did not decrease with an increase in tourism, so long as the economic activity remained high.

Tourism does not necessarily benefit all members of the community and there is a need for a broad development package rather than a single tourism focus (Harril, 2004). Community acceptance or commitment is important to the long term viability and profitability of tourism and consultation is a key step in establishing community acceptance (Lawson, et al., 1998). A study by Brennen-Horley et al. (2007) demonstrated, through the example of the Parkes River Elvis Revival Festival, in Australia, that residents may prefer alternative marketing techniques and the new image of the town may not be one that they want (Brennan-Horley, et al., 2007). The festival focused on promoting the town through an invented association with Elvis Presley (Brennan-Horley, et al., 2007). Tourism development also faces problems through its seasonal nature, where businesses suffer in the off-season and can only provide short term work on a seasonal basis (Duval, 2004).

Three tourism activities that are associated with significant community outcomes are Festival tourism, Heritage tourism, and Rail Trail tourism. Some forms of Festival tourism focus on the promotion of a community’s unique assets, especially their culture, through celebration (O'Sullivan and Jackson, 2002). Heritage tourism is by nature about the history and culture of the community and is important to visitors exploring their roots (Nuryanti, 1996). The Ministry of Tourism (2007) cites The New Zealand Rail Trail as a key example of where ‘the tourism sector and communities work together for mutual benefit’ (Ministry of Tourism, 2007). The impacts of these three tourism activities will be explored in the next section by describing the activity, exploring its economic and social impacts, and by providing a New Zealand example.
2.4.4 Festival Tourism

A catalyst for this study was the Lawrence 150th anniversary celebrations. The celebrations attracted tourists from around the region for a four-day event with activities and performances initiated by the local community for the visitor’s and local community’s entertainment. Since the 1990s festivals have been one of the fastest growing tourism activities (Grunwell, et al., 2008). This section will explore festivals and event tourism as a means of addressing small town decline. The economic and social impacts of event tourism are generally seen as positive, but both positive and negative impacts of festival tourism will be discussed. The section concludes with a discussion of the development of festival tourism in New Zealand.

Festivals are being initiated in rural communities to combat economic decline (Higham and Ritchie, 2001). They are promoted as a means of addressing rural town decline as they provide for community development and attract wealthy visitors, and provide jobs and skill-building opportunities (Brennan-Horley, et al., 2007). Two key aspects critical to the success of an event are: 1) setting expectations for the outcomes of events; and, 2) setting structures within the community to ensure these outcomes are achieved (Higham and Ritchie, 2001). The evaluation of Festivals differs from other forms of tourism because the activity occurs over a shorter time-frame than many tourism developments. Festivals can be one-offs, and even annual events attract visitors only over a few days.

Events are chosen to support tourism because of their large economic impact, especially in rural areas where there are generally less diverse economic resources (Hodur and Leistritz, 2006; Jackson, et al., 2005). Events can include heritage festivals, sports events and cultural celebrations (Hodur and Leistritz, 2006; O’Sullivan and Jackson, 2002; Yolal, et al., 2009). Festivals are often about a community sharing what they have to offer, especially in terms of culture (O’Sullivan and Jackson, 2002). Places can become known for their festivals and benefits for residents include skill building and job creation (Brennan-Horley, et al., 2007). Festival benefits also include revenue for the city or town and civil projects, and there are other tangible and intangible by-products; for example, developing a sense of community pride and the enhancement of the social environment for residents. Negative social, cultural and environmental impacts also occur such as
overcrowding, crime, congestion and community displacement (Yolal, *et al.*, 2009). While festivals provide a tourism attraction their main outcome is often in terms of social benefits (Quinn, 2006). Festivals are commonly a celebration of a town’s past or identity and build on cultural or heritage resources in the area.

### 2.4.4.1 Economic Benefits of Festivals

The economic benefits of festivals are generally accepted as being positive (tourism and commercial outcomes, increased revenues and employment); but they can also have negative economic impacts (inflation, for example of house prices, business interruption, and resident out-migration) (Arcodia and Whitford, 2006). The development of infrastructure associated with holding an event can provide significant one-time economic benefits (Hodur and Leistritz, 2006). However, these only occur if the funding for the construction comes from outside of the community (usually from government funds, rather than local funds, that could have been spent elsewhere), and provides even greater benefit if the commission for construction goes to those within the community rather than outside contractors (Hodur and Leistritz, 2006). Inbound incomes, such as rent and supplies, arise from the event itself (Davidson and Schaffer, 1980). Further benefit flows arise from the operation of the event, such as improved income for those working at the event and also from the expenditures of those attending the event, such as participation fees (Davidson and Schaffer, 1980; Hodur and Leistritz, 2006).

However, there are ways that the economic impacts of event tourism can be exaggerated. Benefits such as revenue from visitor spending will appear larger than they are when money would have been spent from those people visiting the area anyway, that is the overall revenue has not increased, it has just accrued during the event rather than at another time (Hodur and Leistritz, 2006). The flow-on effects of business spending within a community following an event can also be over-estimated. Businesses that visit just for the festival do not create on-flow spending within the community after they leave (Hodur and Leistritz, 2006). The time of individuals who volunteer is often not counted when balancing costs and benefits (Davidson and Schaffer, 1980). Tangible positive economic impacts (income and employment) are relatively easy to measure compared to their negative counterparts (congestion and pollution) (Kim and Uysal, 2003). The community
may benefit in more than simple economic ways (such as the exposure to other cultures and increased shopping variety) (Kim and Uysal, 2003). The main difficulty with this type of study is in trying to compare what did happen with what would have happened without the event, as it is impossible to know what would otherwise have happened (Davidson and Schaffer, 1980). There is a need to examine the benefits of festival tourism beyond income generation, especially how much they contribute to sustainable local economic development and their contribution to the sustainability of a locality (O'Sullivan and Jackson, 2002).

Economic Impact Assessment can provide a valuable tool for decision makers in interpreting the benefits of an event (Hodur and Leistritz, 2006). Davidson and Schaffer (1980) discuss important characteristics that must be defined, such as what is ‘the region’, who is the visitor (separating visitors that are unique to the festival from those that would have visited at another time anyway), and whether the community inputs, outputs and benefits should be separated from outsider inputs. It is also important to be aware of flow-on spending: the multiplier effect, as some of the profits made within the community are spent again within the community in the form of wages, or supply purchases (Davidson and Schaffer, 1980). Economic impact assessment in itself does not account for all of the costs and benefits for host community (Hodur and Leistritz, 2006). Social Impact Assessment and Health Impact Assessments are examples of other frameworks which could be used for assessment.

One important long term economic impact of festivals is that the promotion of a festival also promotes the town in which it is taking place (Brennan-Horley, *et al.*, 2007; Higham and Ritchie, 2001). Creating a visitor industry is often more important than one-off money making as it will encourage future visitors and generate longer term benefits (O'Sullivan and Jackson, 2002). The inflow of visitors and income stream in a single event is short lived; but by promoting a town and creating a visitor industry the economic benefits are sustained over a longer period of time. Tourism complements an area’s traditional economic base, and short term historical events can add to an area’s portfolio of tourism attractions (Chhabra, *et al.*, 2003). However residents may disagree on marketing techniques and the image the town is creating for itself (Brennan-Horley, *et al.*, 2007). Festivals must balance attracting large numbers of visitors (to increase economic benefits)
with the potential to create a "tourist trap" where the authenticity of the original community is lost (Kim and Uysal, 2003).

Even a successful festival can face difficulties translating the success into long term outcomes for the community (Brennan-Horley, et al., 2007). One-off events have the potential to draw industries and the community together (Mackellar, 2007). But this is unlikely to support a long term increase in tourism infrastructure or in community wealth because general visitation will not increase over the year. Communities may be reluctant to expand facilities because the festival was not guaranteed to continue in the future (Brennan-Horley, et al., 2007). If existing facilities are not adequate for events then the creation of new facilities can come at large public cost without lasting benefit, particularly in the case of one-off events (Carlsen, et al., 2000).

### 2.4.4.2 Social Impacts of Festivals

Tourism is not the only goal for festival organisers; other benefits that are sought include both the physical and social development of the community (Higham and Ritchie, 2001). There is little literature that specifically addresses the socio-cultural impact of events rather than of tourism in general. Analysis of social capacity building, in relation to festivals, has largely been avoided as it is diverse, difficult to quantify, and there is a lack of understanding as to how festivals impact on the social capital of a community (Arcodia and Whitford, 2006). Impacts of sponsorship, volunteerism and community involvement in the running of festivals have also not been widely explored (Kim and Uysal, 2003). Social impacts of festivals are generally regarded as positive and the negative impacts, such as disruption, congestion, vandalism, overcrowding, and crime, are dismissed as easily avoided with consultation and participation prior to hosting events (Arcodia and Whitford, 2006; Yolal, et al., 2009).

Social capital, such as that created by festivals, is not a resource in itself but a means to facilitate the efficient use of resources within a community (Arcodia and Whitford, 2006). Social capital can be developed through increasing interaction within the community during the organisation of the festival, and this interaction also increases awareness within the community of community resources (Arcodia and Whitford, 2006). Volunteers at
festivals are also often given training and develop new partnerships and skills (Arcodia and Whitford, 2006).

Festivals are an instrument for developing social cohesion (Yolal, et al., 2009). Social networks and connections are developed and strengthened on the basis of success - and successful festivals can lead to strong social connections and enhanced social capital (Arcodia and Whitford, 2006). Festivals have the ability to contribute to the cultural portfolio of the host community and to create an atmosphere for socialising, and for improving the quality of life for residents (Yolal, et al., 2009).

Festivals also provide a catalyst for forming new groups within a community. Groups unite over the organisation and the running of a festival, where members of the group may not have otherwise had a reason to interact (Arcodia and Whitford, 2006). New subgroups within the community can mix existing subgroups and provide for increased cooperation, or enhance the voices of minority subgroups that become involved (Arcodia and Whitford, 2006). However, there is the potential for the festival subgroup to be heterogeneous and further alienate other groups within the community (Arcodia and Whitford, 2006).

Festivals in small places can lack leadership skills and community support (Brennan-Horley, et al., 2007). Kim and Uysal (2003) maintain that festivals and events rely on the host community’s spirit and support far more than on physical developments. Festival development can arise from a community whim rather than being driven by outside support, such as from local government (Brennan-Horley, et al., 2007). Packaging events with other tourism activities, event management, and resource generation are key issues commonly faced by local communities in developing festivals and events (Higham and Ritchie, 2001).

There are recognised positive environmental impacts from festivals such as infrastructure development, and issue awareness (Arcodia and Whitford, 2006). However, the most suitable physical environments for festivals are often those at risk of negative social impacts. For example, locating festivals close to or within urban areas for ease of access means that effects such as noise also occur close to large groups of people (Arcodia and Whitford, 2006). Environmental degradation associated with festival tourism is likely to
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occur only within a short time frame and positive environmental outcomes can often be established and last for a longer time frame (O'Sullivan and Jackson, 2002). Festivals have also been used to promote environmental awareness by taking measures such as utilising solar power to run the festival and then providing educational leaflets that explain how such measures reduced the environmental footprint (Peters, 2008).

2.4.4.3 Tourism Festivals in the New Zealand Context

A number of changes in New Zealand between 1980 and 2001 including economic restructuring, climatic changes and product devaluation led to farmers in New Zealand diversifying their income base into services, especially into tourism, although festivals and tourism activity were taking place to some degree prior to these changes (Higham and Ritchie, 2001). Economic activity, as a driver for festival development, emerged after the 1970s and other goals such as community development, heritage, and tourism grew in the late 1980s (Higham and Ritchie, 2001). Southern festivals have followed a wide range of themes including agricultural practices, such as shearing; harvest-oriented festivals, such as food and wine, garden, arts, and heritage festivals (Higham and Ritchie, 2001).

The Queenstown Winter Festival, which began in 1973, was the first festival to specifically focus on attracting tourists. It was followed by a number of festivals which aimed to attract outside participants. Event organisation changed in the 1980s from being predominantly community driven to involving the skills and backing of local government (Higham and Ritchie, 2001). Little research into visitor patterns was conducted by organisers prior to festival development and the strategic development of festivals was significantly assisted by the involvement of local councils, especially in terms of providing a package tourism product (Higham and Ritchie, 2001).

2.4.5 Heritage as a Tourism Resource

The Lawrence 150th anniversary celebrations strongly focused on heritage. The event was held in Gabriel’s Gully which became a recognised historic place during the event. Heritage was the key tourism resource. Heritage tourism is growing due to tourists becoming increasingly interested in their roots (Nuryanti, 1996; Prideaux and Kininmont,
The development of heritage sites differs from festival development in that it creates an ongoing resource that can provide benefits throughout the year. Historic sites have the potential to provide a significant resource for tourism and recreation (Taylor, et al., 1993). However the leisure industry has taken over many cultural and historical elements of locations and there is concern that in many cases the push for tourism is creating inauthentic representations of a culture or of history (Chang, 1997).

Literature on heritage tourism conveys widely different opinions and there is debate as to whether it aids development or is destructive to local communities, provides economic advantages, destroys culture and lifestyle, or simply provides modernisation (Cipollari, 2010). It is likely that these different perceptions are dependent on the context and the people involved (Cipollari, 2010). There has been a shift internationally in ideologies surrounding heritage management from conservation and protection to promoting their use for consumer benefits (Svensson, 2009). The shift fundamentally revolves around the idea that while it is vitally important that heritage sites should be preserved for future generations they can also provide benefits such as a resources for use both by local residents and by tourists (Svensson, 2009). There is an awareness of a responsibility to ‘present’ heritage to the public, especially for those who see heritage as part of their cultural identity (Cossons, 1989). Historic site visitors are an increasingly important part of tourism and could be an attractive market (Taylor, et al., 1993). Heritage is irreplaceable and its use must be carefully considered to avoid negative outcomes (Cossons, 1989). The problems of “reconciling conservation with access, and the use of history with its survival” are not new (Cossons, 1989:1).

Nuryanti (1996) identifies six steps of planning for heritage tourism: Conservation (preserving what is there); gentrification (developing vitality); rehabilitation (improving the condition); renovation (adaption to establish a new function); restoration (re-establishing what existed); and reconstruction (establishing the original condition of a specific era). The scale of heritage attractions can influence factors including length of stay, tourism products, seasonality of visitors and marketing and management (Nuryanti, 1996). Other important factors for historic site visitors are the opportunities to view natural attractions, scenery and wildlife (Taylor, et al., 1993).
Cossons (1989) reviewed heritage tourism in the United Kingdom and stated the following lessons for the United Kingdom: that the government must have specific policies and provide funding for heritage conservation, as well as creating a public awareness of conservation values, including conservation of more recent heritage, and that the industry must focus on increasing revenue by increasing the quality of what is presented rather than just increasing numbers (Cossons, 1989).

2.4.5.1 Economic Impacts of Heritage Tourism

It is difficult to maintain authentic heritage tourism without some form of support, as sites including museums often do not make a profit and usually run at a loss (Svensson, 2009). Exploring heritage should be one of a number of activities that visitors are encouraged to undertake in any area (Frost and Carlsen, 2009). A study by Taylor et al. (1993) in America found that those visiting historic sites were more likely to be passing through on their way to another destination, and therefore to spend less on lodging that other summer recreational visitors (Taylor, et al., 1993). However, historic site visitors were more likely to spend money on eating, drinking, retail and other expenditures as compared to recreational visitors (Taylor, et al., 1993).

Heritage tourism can provide economic benefit to rural communities (Fisher, 2006). Industrial heritage sites and buildings can be revived through their new use in the tourist market rather than by establishing their traditional use in goods production (Fisher, 2006). In some cases the survival of local heritage, its physical maintenance and recognition are, to some extent, dependent on the tourist market (Cipollari, 2010). Rural heritage tourism can also provide a new link for rural communities with their hinterlands (Fisher, 2006).

2.4.5.2 Social Impacts of Heritage Tourism

The commodification of heritage and culture can reduce its value and meaning for local residents as well as it authenticity for tourists (Chang, 1997). However, it would be wrong to assume that the promotion of culture and heritage is purely driven by the tourism industry or focused on tourists; it can be driven from within a community for the appreciation of locals (Chang, 1997). The fact that in so many communities the volunteers
are the only ones maintaining heritage resources shows that it has other benefits to the community including empowerment, community cooperation and community pride (Svensson, 2009). For example, the development of heritage sites may convert run-down and underused areas or buildings into attractive and useful spaces for locals to use and be proud of (Chang, 1997).

Heritage tourism has the potential to cause dissonance. Heritage sites are often presented from one point of view and excludes minorities, which can alienate certain groups (Frost, 2005). Development of a heritage location may be restricted to prevent detriment to heritage values but this may also be necessary for the wellbeing of the local community (Chang, 1997). Who owns the heritage is an important question that is not easily answered (Hampton, 2005). For example a heritage site that is bought by a private investor could be considered to be entirely owned by the investor, while the community in which it is located may also feel some level of ownership, as well as members of the culture in which the heritage site was developed could also perceive ownership. Chang (1997) argues that any differences between the needs of tourists and locals must be overcome for heritage development to be successful. Planners need to ensure that local needs are met as well those of tourists to reduce dissatisfaction within the community (Chang, 1997).

2.4.5.3 Heritage Tourism in the New Zealand context
Heritage tourism in New Zealand is likely to be quite different from in Europe, where the majority of studies have been carried out (Balcar and Pearce, 1996). New Zealand has only 1000 years of Maori occupation, and less than 200 years of European activity (Balcar and Pearce, 1996). Balcar and Pearce (1996) reviewed heritage tourism in sites on the west coast of New Zealand. They found that heritage sites are rarely privately owned and are instead held by community groups or the Department of Conservation (DOC). DOC has the responsibility of conserving natural and historical resources, but also of developing their use where it does not affect conservation (Balcar and Pearce, 1996). This is similar to the management of community group owned sites, except that often the conservation of the sites is for its use as a tourism attraction (Balcar and Pearce, 1996). Heritage tourism in New Zealand, especially goldfields heritage sites, differs from Australia in that in New Zealand these sites are backed up by a large range of other tourist activities such as
adventure tourism in Queenstown, to the extent that the gold rush heritage is often not the prime focus for most visitors (Frost, 2005). Heritage tourism is seen as a ‘sight-seeing and general interest’ activity, and is one of a number of activities that a tourist will carry out on any one day (Balcar and Pearce, 1996).

2.4.6 Rail Trails as a Tourism Resource

Planning for a bike trail was underway prior to the anniversary event in Lawrence, and is a planned future tourism resource in Lawrence which could be linked with the Otago Central Rail Trail in the future. Rail trails are a tourism resource that is specifically associated with strong community outcomes and has the potential to be developed in Lawrence. The New Zealand Ministry of Tourism (2007) states that the New Zealand Rail Trail strategy is an important example of cooperation between the tourism industry and communities, which leads to significant community benefits. One key benefit of the rail trail in Central Otago was in providing for local economic development in small communities (Blackwell, 2002). This section will explore the development of recreational rail trails, the economic and social benefits as well as discussing the Otago Central Rail Trail in New Zealand.

Rail trails are the conversion of disused railway lines into multi-user recreational trails. Like heritage tourism, rail trail conversions are lasting rather than one-off cases like festivals. Economic benefits for local communities also arise in servicing the trail and by proximity increasing housing prices (Bowen, 2009). Initial development of trails requires converting the track (removing rail lines and re-surfacing areas), promotion of the trail, and developing signage (directions, maps, interpretive). This is often undertaken by regional development organisations (Beeton, 2003).

2.4.6.1 Economic Impacts of Rail Trails

The economic contribution of a Rail Trail, like many other forms of tourism, is difficult to separate from other forms of tourism and expenditure in a community; however a study by Beeton (2003) in Victoria, Australia, demonstrated that the average economic contribution of Rail Trails in Victoria was AUD$51.10 per visitor day. Bowker et al. (2007) show that the Virginia Creeper Rail Trail in America is an asset that provides benefits to users and to
the local community, especially by bringing 'new money' into the community. Business proximity to rail trails, and a listing in a coordinated guidebook or website, were factors that increased traffic and revenues for the businesses (Stewart and Barr, 2005). Overnight stays bring the most money into a community and development that encourages this type of visit will be the most economically beneficial (Bowker, et al., 2007). Siderelis and Moore (1995) explored the use and value of three American rail trails and found the determinants for demand were travel cost (to the rail trail), size of the group, and associated recreation activities. Bowker et al. (2007) suggest that a higher proportion of government resources should be directed towards rail trail development as they provide a higher aggregate net economic value than other government development policies.

2.4.6.2 Social impacts of Rail Trails

International studies investigating the benefits associated with rail trails have focused on visitor benefits and neighbouring land owners views rather than investigating the impact on a community of a specific rail trail (Blackwell, 2002; Bowen, 2009). However, adjacent residents have been shown to be more positive about the trails after they were established than their initial views were, which demonstrates that there may be social benefits (Bowen, 2009). Rail Trails provide benefits to users and to local communities including recreation, exercise, and attracting tourists (Blackwell, 2002; Bowker, et al., 2007; Siderelis and Moore, 1995). Social interaction was seen as a key benefit, where those living in small communities were able to interact with a diverse group of tourists using the trail (Blackwell, 2002). In New Zealand, research on the Otago Central Rail Trail has focused on social benefits and these are discussed below.

2.4.6.3 Rail Trails in the New Zealand Context: the Otago Central Rail Trail

The Otago Central Rail Trail is a key tourism resource for small communities in Central Otago, New Zealand (Ministry of Tourism, 2007). It was developed on the old Otago Central Rail line which was established to carry goods and passengers between rural centres focused on farming and fruit picking (Blackwell, 2002). Blackwell (2002) explored the benefits of the Otago Central Rail Trail and found that community benefits include
local economic development and increased community identity, as well as providing significant benefits for visitors related to health and wellbeing. The study also indicated that visitor’s historical knowledge increased (Blackwell, 2002). A study conducted as part of a Department of Conservation assessment of conservation found that the Otago Central Rail Trail had significant social effects (Cosslett, et al., 2004). Firstly, the trail provided a market for tourism accommodation which has led to the development of new businesses as well as the diversification of current business and farms (for example home-stays). The trail has also encouraged social revitalisation, upgraded facilities and improved infrastructure, cohesion within and between communities on the trail, and increased heritage appreciation (Cosslett, et al., 2004). Two causes of tension have arisen with neighbouring landowners. The owners presumed they could use and own the land after the railway closure and with the trail development there is competition for the space with recreational users and some users (trail bikes) were a nuisance to the neighbouring landowners (Cosslett, et al., 2004).

2.5 Summary
The theories of post-productivism, multifunctionalism, local economic development and community development have all been discussed and established in the New Zealand context in this chapter. Post-productivism is a theory encompassing a wide range of changes in rural environments that fundamentally show a reduced reliance on on-farm yields to generate rural income streams. The changes to small towns in New Zealand were explored.

The theory of post-productivism was explored in the New Zealand context but had only limited applicability. The general trend away from an on-farm production focus can be seen but the specific characteristics of United Kingdom post-productivism are not evident. Local economic development theory provides a framework for exploring how a local area is creating and maintaining businesses to create community wealth. Exogenous and endogenous local economic development theories were also explored. The endogenous focus on the community led to a discussion of community development theory. Community development theory looks beyond economic factors and considers how
development can generate social benefits including skills buildings which will support the community in the future.

The final section addressed the use of tourism as a development driver in small towns. Tourism development can be seen as a driver for local economic development and, to some extent, community development. Festival, heritage, and rail trail tourism were investigated in both a general and the New Zealand context. All three tourism activities can provide for economic and social benefits to a community. The economic benefits of festival tourism are limited by the one-off nature of events. Heritage and rail trail tourism can provide sustained economic benefits. Social and environmental benefits from all three tourism activities can be maintained. The implementation of tourism activity is the key determinant of the benefits and impacts of all three types of tourism. Festivals, heritage tourism, and rail trails can all provide economic and social benefits by attracting visitors to a community. There is a trade off with these forms of development in terms of risking negative effects on the community. This section has also discussed each tourism activity in the New Zealand context, and this study will explore these activities in the context of Lawrence.

This chapter provided a framework for the research by summarising current, relevant trends and theories within academic literature. The following chapter will explain, in detail, the methods used to undertake the research.
3. Methodology

3.1 Introduction
The previous chapters have outlined the theoretical basis for this research and the context in which it takes place. This chapter will discuss, in detail, the methods used to undertake the research. The research design and the choice of a qualitative approach will be discussed first. A qualitative approach, rather than a quantitative approach, was utilised because of the flexibility and appropriateness of quantitative techniques when investigating complex relationships. Ethical considerations and the possible bias of the researcher will also be discussed. This discussion will be followed by a justification for the adoption of a case study approach, and the choice of the particular case studied (Lawrence, Otago, New Zealand). The specific methods of data collection and analysis will then be set out. These include observation, key informant interviews, and triangulation of the data. Finally the limitations of the approach will be explored.

3.2 Research Design
The design of any research should relate directly to the questions that are being asked. In this study the research questions, as justified in Chapter 1, were:

1. In what context did Lawrence begin to develop tourism activities?
2. How does the implementation of tourism development in Lawrence provide for local economic development?
3. What roles do local government and local stakeholders play in the planning of tourism development?
4. What is the local stakeholder’s perception of the effects of tourism development?
3.2.1 A Qualitative Approach

Qualitative research is the study of variables and interactions in their natural setting, as opposed to quantitative research which relies on measurable outcomes and statistical analysis. This study used a qualitative, rather than quantitative, approach to allow for examination of the interactions that occur within local communities as they seek to promote tourism as a means of reversing rural decline. “Quantitative researchers have pressed for explanation and control; qualitative researchers have pressed for understanding the complex interrelationships among all that exists” (Stake, 1995:37). Qualitative research is more fluid and adaptive than quantitative research (Stake, 1995). The focus of qualitative research is on discovering and understanding relationships rather than focusing on explaining the cause and effect of specific known phenomena (Stake, 1995). Its findings are about concepts and relationships; and it sorts variables into a theoretical framework based on interpretation, rather than quantification (Strauss and Corbin, 1998).

Qualitative techniques are especially valuable when the natural, uncontrolled world, rather than an artificial controlled situation, is the object of the study (Corbetta, 2003). They attempt to determine what would have happened if the researcher had not been present and they look to documents and interviews with others to gain an understanding of the processes involved (Stake, 1995). However, the complexity of the real-world situation means it is more difficult to determine the credibility of the findings than in an artificial, controlled experiment.

Qualitative research was selected for the present study as being most relevant for the study of peoples’ thoughts, opinions, and actions (Strauss and Corbin, 1998). It therefore requires the active collaboration of participants; as opposed to quantitative research where the participants are seen as a mere object of study. This active involvement is often a key benefit of qualitative research (Corbetta, 2003). The scope of qualitative work is usually wide and holistic because, in order to understand relationships, it is important to see the extent of all the factors that determine and influence the nature of the relationships (Stake, 1995). Qualitative research is, therefore, flexible – unlike the set pathway of quantitative research, different forms of data collection must interact and overlap (Corbetta, 2003).
When conducting qualitative research it is sometimes difficult to outline a specific research path with set stages, and instead it is often better to determine approaches to data collection rather than a linear research path. (Corbetta, 2003). The approaches undertaken in the present research are outlined below. They were: a review of literature; observation; key informant interviews; document analysis and data analysis.

The advantages of qualitative research are partially offset by problems including its expense, ethical issues, subjectivity, questionable validity and the uncovering of problems rather than solutions (Stake, 1995). Some of these issues can be mitigated, while others will limit the research. Limitations of this qualitative approach will be addressed at the end of the chapter.

### 3.2.1.1 Triangulation

It is important in any research to assign to the findings a level of credibility. In quantitative research this can be expressed as a probability value but such assignment can be especially difficult in qualitative research (Marshall and Rossman, 2011). Triangulation is a process of confirming qualitative findings through multiple sources. When the same qualitative finding is obtained in a range of quite distinct sources, it is more likely that the finding is in fact the case. The use of more than one method to ascertain the fact allows the researcher to overcome deficiencies, such as bias, that can arise when only one method is used (Denzin, 2009). In the present study, three major data sources were used: observation, interviews and document analysis and these did triangulate for some findings, while for other findings the different sources produced opposing data. Some information, within a single source, was also cross-checked between, for example different interviewees.

### 3.2.1.2 Ethical Considerations

Ethical issues are a key consideration when designing research, especially in terms of how the research is conducted. Protection of participants willing to be involved in research is the foremost goal (Flick, 2009). Ethics committees have been established for a number of areas with the focus on assessing research and ensuring informed consent and avoidance of harm (Flick, 2009). In this study ethical approval was gained through the University of
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Otago Geography Department on behalf of the University of Otago Human Ethics Committee. Due to the use of semi-structured interview techniques the precise nature of the questions which were asked were not determined in advance, and depended on the way in which the interview developed. Therefore the Ethics Committee was not able to approve the precise questions to be used in the interview. In accordance with this approval, participants were provided with an information sheet and consent form (see Appendix 1) which made clear that their involvement was entirely voluntary and that they could choose not to answer any or all of the questions asked. They were also asked for permission to record the interview and participants were able to withdraw or change any of the information gained in interviews and they were ensured anonymity.

Maintaining participant anonymity posed a significant ethical issue in this research due to the small nature of the community. An attempt to disclose the position of individual participants, for example their job title or specific business type, to inform those reading the research meant that each participant was easily identifiable from within the community. Instead, the participants were categorised in six groups (Local Council Staff, Local Business-retail, Local Business-hospitality, Local Business-other, External Business, and Local Organisation), which are listed in Appendix 2. Despite this attempt to ensure anonymity the content and style of the participant’s responses was potentially identifiable to others in the community, even when their specific name or job title was not given. Further precautions were taken, for example reducing the number of direct quotes, and grouping responses, to reduce the likelihood of identification.

3.2.1.3 Positionality

Positionality refers to the stance of the researcher in relation to the research being undertaken (Smith and Bowers-Brown, 2009). This can include factors such as the age, race or gender of the researcher, or even their position within the research or subject community. It is important to highlight the researcher’s position on the topic rather than pretend that the research is undertaken in an entirely neutral fashion (Smith and Bowers-Brown, 2009).
It is also important to consider why the research is being undertaken. Often research is undertaken because it is of particular interest to the researcher or because the researcher has predetermined ideas about the research topic (Smith and Bowers-Brown, 2009). The knowledge is therefore vulnerable to being shaped by the researcher’s perception and understanding of the topic. The researcher should attempt to remain neutral and should proceed without a desired outcome in mind, even when the researcher has made their position clear (Smith and Bowers-Brown, 2009). Research should not be undertaken following a personal agenda, or with any influence on the research participants.

In this research it is therefore important to highlight that the research was undertaken by a student, rather than a seasoned researcher and this could have influenced the key informants’ perception of the study as well as the quality of the research. The research emerged from a predetermined interest in economics and small towns, as well as an awareness of the case study area. I had visited Lawrence a number of times throughout her life, as well as using services such as the cafes in the town. I also have an interest in small town development, and is interested in the promotion and maintenance of small towns. Despite this, I endeavoured to maintain a neutral approach and an open mind at all times.

3.3 A Case Study

It is necessary to limit the extent of research because not every aspect of every incident can be studied (Marshall and Rossman, 2011). One way of doing this is through a case study.

The case study is a necessary and sufficient method for certain important research tasks in the social sciences, and it is a method that holds up well when compared to other methods in the gamut of social science methodology (Flyvbjerg, 2006: 241). The advantage of using a case study lies in the depth of knowledge that can be gained about a situation (Flyvbjerg, 2006; Marczyk, et al., 2008). Case studies provide a comprehensive analysis of what is the case (Marczyk, et al., 2008). “We study a case when it itself is of very special interest” (Stake, 1995 :xi). However, because of this specificity, case studies are often limited in their generalisability (Flyvbjerg, 2006; Marczyk, et al., 2008).

It is important to recognise that a specific case should be chosen on the basis of the specific research aims, and to recognise that the findings are limited to the case in question.
(Marshall and Rossman, 2011). The case study of Lawrence, a small rural town in Otago, New Zealand was chosen to reflect the study’s primary aim: to investigate through a case study local economic development in small towns in New Zealand. Lawrence has adopted significant tourism promotion measures in an attempt to create economic development, and in March 2011 further promoted their town through a 150th anniversary celebration. The community believed this celebration would be a catalyst for town promotion and future development (Business Owner pers.comm, 2010a). The first payable gold in New Zealand was discovered in Lawrence, which now has a number of heritage resources suitable for tourism development. Lawrence also has many unique assets including free wireless internet and a large manufacturing firm unusual in such a small rural township. The 150th anniversary festival, key resources, and significant town promotion measures provide a unique case study opportunity as all three factors are key trends in tourism promotion literature.

A study by Wilson (1995) focused on the impact of agricultural restructuring on the wider rural economy in Gore, another town in the Clutha district in the South Island of New Zealand. Wilson (1995:418) states “there has been altogether a lack of studies focusing on changing agricultural-economy linkages”. She also contended that these studies should be done at a local scale and should attempt to discover the “impacts of restructuring, local response, and address the human dimensions of macro-economic change” (Wilson, 1995:419). In concluding her study she noted that there were specific local factors, including the community members themselves, that influenced Gore’s response to rural decline and that, therefore, further comparative research is needed to understand responses by other communities that are affected by different factors (Wilson, 1995). Johnsen (1999) discusses the large body of literature on the effects of agricultural changes at a family level, and explores the ‘inter-relatedness’ of these changes (Johnsen, 1999). A more recent study by Keen (2003) found that while agricultural restructuring has been seen as predominantly negative, it has nonetheless allowed some small New Zealand towns to re-invent themselves under local leadership. Farmers have diversified their products and rural tourism has grown (Keen, 2003). This study’s focus is on the specific local factors in the Lawrence community, as suggested by Wilson (1995), as well as exploring the extent to which Lawrence has been re-invented through rural tourism, as suggested by Keen (2003).
The studies by Wilson (1995) and Keen (2003) have provided a background in which Lawrence is an interesting locality in which to understand both a locality’s reaction to rural decline and the role of tourism in small town local economic development. Lawrence has faced both post-gold rush decline, and later rural decline but has, in the last ten years, started recovery and redevelopment of its central business area, especially through the introduction of a free wireless internet network. The 150th anniversary celebration was hoped to further this development and provide a catalyst for revival. Lawrence is reinventing itself as a heritage tourism destination, and this study seeks to examine the changes in Lawrence to explore the impact of these changes on a small rural community.

3.4 The Literature Review

A review of the literature must show the researcher’s assumptions, knowledge of traditions and of the gaps in previous research; and it must embed the research questions in a logical line of inquiry (Marshall and Rossman, 2011). Critiques of the basic assumptions of previous work, or of the gaps in its framework, are common areas where a need for new research can be identified (Marshall and Rossman, 2011). The literature review can also establish the significance of the research question and justify the need for the research to be undertaken (Marshall and Rossman, 2011). In qualitative research there is a reciprocal interaction between research and theory; and often the research is conducted to try and understand novel events rather than to support or reject predetermined theories (Corbetta, 2003).

It follows that as qualitative research focuses more on understanding a natural phenomenon, rather than supporting or rejecting theories, the role of literature and previous research plays a somewhat smaller role than in quantitative research (Corbetta, 2003). The literature informs the study and shapes the research questions. A theoretical framework, in which new research can add to debate and understanding, can provide a guide but it is important that any new research relying on a theoretical framework identifies the assumptions held within that framework and accepts or critiques these (Marshall and Rossman, 2011).
In the present research, a literature review was conducted to provide the background and context for the research problem. The key themes covered in the literature review are the impact of rural restructuring on communities, productivism, post-productivism, multifunctionalism, the impacts of local and community economic development, and of tourism development including festival and heritage tourism (see Chapter 2). These themes were reflected in the question topics in the interviews (see Appendix 3) as well as providing guiding themes in the documentary analysis included in the results.

3.5 Data Collection

3.5.1 Observation

An awareness of the world can be developed through observation of regularities, at which point the need for an explanation of the world can be established (Marczyk, et al., 2008). Informal and formal observation techniques are seldom relied on as a sole source of information; however observation is a fundamental element of qualitative research (Marshall and Rossman, 2011). It can be used both as a way of establishing specific points of interest under a broad research aim and as a way of discovering complex relationships in natural environments that cannot easily be experimentally manipulated (Marshall and Rossman, 2011). Observation should usually be used to discover or narrow the questions that should be asked, rather than to definitively answer them (Marczyk, et al., 2008).

Observation of festival participants was a key area of initial enquiry for the present research. Attending the festival and interacting with visitors, hosts, and activities, increased the understanding of the case. Observation of festival participants differs from other forms of observation in a key element: the researcher does not have any direct control over the situation being observed, and the technique therefore remains interpretative rather than becoming positivist (Corbetta, 2003). Observation is conducted by the researcher in person, not from secondary sources (Corbetta, 2003); however this also causes problems. Key reasons why observation cannot be used as a sole information source include not only the researcher’s bias and misinterpretations, but also ethical issues in relation to those being observed (Marshall and Rossman, 2011). Description naturally contains within it the bias of the researcher, but the underlying process driving the ‘hows’ and ‘whys’ of what is being described may not be immediately obvious and can be missed.
(Strauss and Corbin, 1998). However, when supported by other data, observation is a useful starting point and it is important as a seed for theorizing (Strauss and Corbin, 1998).

In this study I undertook observation before, during and after the festival. I gained an initial understanding of the layout and size of the town as well as discovering a number of heritage and tourism resources and exploring the festival site from field trips prior to the festival. During the festival I attended events on three of the four days (18, 19 and 21 March 2011), including the opening theatrical production and the closing ceremony. I used observation to investigate, in general, what was happening at the festival; for instance, the presence of out-of-town business owners with stalls at the festival, and the lack of sufficient seating at the drama production. Following the festival, I made a number of trips to visit key informants who had also been involved in observation of the town post-festival.

3.5.2 Informant Guided Observation

Two preparatory field trips occurred in 2010. These field trips were based on a blend of observation and an interview/conversation structure. In May 2010, I visited Lawrence as part of a class field trip. On this field trip there was a discussion led by a local business owner about the economic development of the town, and a locally-led guided tour of Lawrence’s heritage sites. One of these sites, Gabriel’s Gully (see Figure 3.1), was the planned venue for the festival. We were also told about plans for the festival. In December 2010 a second trip field trip to Lawrence was conducted to ascertain the viability of the study. This field trip involved a second meeting with a key local business owner. This discussion focused around the festival and other tourism resources in the area, as well as the needs of businesses and the promotion of the town.

Figure 3.1 Gabriel's Gully, the Festival Site (personal collection)
3.5.3 **Key Informant Interviews**

Interviews of key informants can provide the details of the hows and whys of what was observed. Interviews allow the researcher to understand day to day activities, gather large amounts of data, and develop follow up questions (Marshall and Rossman, 2011). The benefit received from an interview depends on its structure and the ability of the researcher to gather information useful to the study (Marczyk, *et al.*, 2008). The follow-up and elaboration of questions are key to the usefulness and extent of data gathered in informant interviews (Marshall and Rossman, 2011). Problems can occur with the interviewee being unwilling to be open or honest, or the interviewer being unable to ask the best questions, and all data gathered must be acknowledged as being the personal opinion or perspective (Marshall and Rossman, 2011). Semi-structured interviews allow discussion of a wide range of topics and the expansion of subject lines about which the interviewee shows expertise and which were not necessarily anticipated (Marczyk, *et al.*, 2008). By not enforcing a strict question set but instead following a framework of relevant topics the discussion can vary with different participants, and be very in-depth in areas where the participant shows the greatest knowledge. Question frameworks however allow the researcher to stay on-track with questioning, and to ensure that all major topic areas are explored with each interviewee.

Key Informant interviews were a critical component of this study. The breadth of possible topics, as well as the relatively small size of the community, meant that interviews were favoured over surveys as a form of data collection. The key themes of the interviews were business trends in the community, the role of the community in tourism development, the festival event including the impacts of the festival, the perception of tourism development and the future for Lawrence (see Appendix 3).

The study sought the views of organisations and therefore focused on participants in management roles. Out of town businesses that attended the festival were approached at the festival; local businesses were approached in their workplaces in the weeks following the festival; and the Clutha District Council, Department of Conservation, and the festival Organising Committee were contacted via email. Each organisation was provided with a
brief description of the research proposed and asked whether they would like to be involved in the research. If they agreed to be involved the most appropriate participant for interview was selected by the organisation independently of the researcher and an interview was arranged.

Interviews were conducted either in person or by phone based on the availability of the participant. At the start of the interview the participant was given an Ethics Information Sheet and a Consent Form (Appendix 1). Where the interview was conducted by phone the information sheet and consent form were emailed to the participant. The information sheet outlined the aim of the research, the type of participant being sought, the extent of the participants’ involvement, and the potential use of the information gathered.

Interview length ranged from seven to 74 minutes in duration. A prearranged semi-structured question framework was followed (see Appendix 3) but the line of questioning was flexible and more in-depth in areas where the participant showed the greatest knowledge. Businesses with stalls at the festival were asked both about their involvement in the festival, and the impacts of tourism events, such as the festival on their business and the community. Local businesses and council were asked about the economic trends, the impact of the festival, the role of tourism in development, the impacts of tourism, the future of the area and the role of planning in the future of development. The interviews were recorded and transcribed verbatim.

3.5.4 Document Analysis

Document analysis is often an essential part of case study development (Marshall and Rossman, 2011). Document analysis provides a source of information which exists independently of the researcher’s actions (Corbetta, 2003). The information contained in a document does not contain the same social bias as information collected in key informant interviews (Corbetta, 2003). However it is still important to consider the social and political context of the document and the author.

Several important documents aided this research: the New Zealand Tourism Strategy 2015, local planning documents such as the district plan, and national legislation such as the
Resource Management Act 1991, all of which provided information on the current and future context for development of Lawrence and of the role of tourism in this development. The plans, policy statement and strategies were systematically assessed and findings coded thematically based on the research objectives and themes from the theoretical framework established in Chapter 2.

### 3.6 Data Interpretation

Data collection in itself does not provide answers to research questions. The content of interview transcriptions, observation and document analysis was sorted in relation to the research questions. Identifying common themes in the data was a key aspect of the interpretation, and this analysis was largely descriptive. The data were triangulated through this process, where general accepted views and facts became evident and outlying information could be identified as such. The themes in the data were compared to the key themes within the literature. Common ideas and contentious issues within the research questions then became clear.

### 3.7 Limitations

A number of limitations of this study were identified prior to it being undertaken, these included limited time and resources, the inherent specificity of a case study, and possible data collection bias in the selection of participants with available time, or through only seeking business organisation and council views.

The scope and extent of any research was restricted by the time and resources available to the researcher. In this study the time and resources available were restricted by university policy and requirements. Due, to some extent, to these requirements the study focused on businesses and organisations. The views of residents were not included due to the limited time associated with the set university year and the large amount of time that would have been required to talk to residents in the community. The choice to concentrate on businesses and organisations was made because the focus of the study was on the economic development of businesses in the area.
Chapter 3. Methodology

The specificity of a case study means one cannot generalise the findings (Flyvbjerg, 2006; Marczyk, et al., 2008). The results of case studies are valid only for the case studied and will have limited utility for other areas. The in-depth nature of case study research also means that it is likely to uncover location-specific problems and expose differences rather than providing a general theoretical background. Case study research is also vulnerable to ethical and subjectivity issues. As discussed in the research design section, the ethical issues of maintaining anonymity were particularly difficult in this case. This is especially the case in the study of a small community such as Lawrence.

Observation, as a technique, is limited by researcher bias and positionality. Positionality, as discussed above, involves the predetermined nature of the researcher in relation to the subject of the research. In this research the choice of case study was influenced by existing knowledge of the area and its development. While the researcher attempted to keep an open mind and remain neutral the content of what was observed had the potential to be biased because of the researcher’s dominant role in this technique.

Interviewing approaches also have some limitations. The interviewee may be unwilling to be open or honest. The interviewer may also be unable to ask the best questions to obtain all the relevant information the interviewee holds. All data gathered must be acknowledged as a personal opinion or perspective rather than necessarily as fact.

One way in which the limitations of the observation and interview techniques were mitigated was through the use of triangulation. Data about a topic were gathered from more than one source.

3.8 Summary

This research aimed to investigate how small rural towns can use tourism as a means of economic development. A case study of the 150th anniversary festival and general aspects of tourism development in Lawrence was undertaken through interviews with businesses and organisations, observation, and document analysis. A literature review was used to frame the research and focus the case study. These techniques were used as part of an overall qualitative approach which was chosen due to the flexibility of the techniques in
providing an understanding of complex relationships that occur in the real world. Ethical and positionality considerations have been discussed, as well as other limitations of this research.
4. Context for Development

4.1 Introduction

This chapter contains the results from key informant interviews, as well as data gathered from literature on the history and current context in Lawrence. This chapter attempts to explore aspects of the first three research questions by addressing not only the history and context of Lawrence but also the implementation of past tourism development and the roles of local council and local stakeholders in that development.

Lawrence is a small rural town in Otago, New Zealand. In 1861 gold was discovered in a gully in the Tuapeka District (Gabriel’s Gully), this discovery led to the formation of the Lawrence township. Lawrence has a number of heritage resources suitable for tourism development as a consequence of being the site of the first discovery of payable gold in New Zealand (CDC, 2011b). Lawrence developed from a mining service centre, to an agricultural service centre, and is now becoming a unique tourist destination and stop-over point. Lawrence has several other unique assets including free wireless internet, a cafe culture and a manufacturing firm unusual in such a small rural township (Business Owner pers.comm, 2010b).

This chapter will outline the location and geography of Lawrence and the community demographics before exploring the history of the town and the current context. The legislative context for tourism development in Lawrence will also be explored. Guiding documents that provide insight into the planning framework are explored and the community’s perception of tourism planning is outlined.
4.2 Location and Geography

Lawrence (see Figure 4.1) is located in the South Island of New Zealand, on State Highway 8, 92 kilometres south-west of the main regional centre Dunedin (Lawrence.co.nz). The local landscape is characterised by attractive rolling hills and gullies, and the town is located at the junction of Gabriel’s Gully and Weatherston’s Gully, both sites of the 1860s gold rush. The Tuapeka River, a tributary of the Clutha River, has its origins in the hills around Lawrence and runs in a south-west direction (Waite, 1977).

Lawrence is situated in the Tuapeka basin between Waitahuna and Evan’s Flat. Geographically, the Lawrence area statistical unit is within the boundaries of the Tuapeka area unit, and both are within the Clutha territorial unit (Stats NZ, 2006). Lawrence is administered by the Clutha District Council. Key Informant 2 stated that Lawrence can be perceived to be separate from the rest of the Clutha District, as other centres in the district tend to be on a coastal strip. State Highway 8 runs through Lawrence towards Central Otago, a key tourism area, and Lawrence is regarded as the gateway to Central Otago. The physical size of Lawrence is relatively small with most businesses located on a single main street.

4.3 Community Demographics

At the last census, in 2006, the population of Lawrence was 435 and had declined since the 2001 census (Stats NZ, 2006). The population was predominantly European (81.8%). Maori made up a larger proportion of the population of Lawrence than of the Otago Region (12.6% and 6.6% respectively), although this was still slightly below the proportion for New Zealand as a whole (14.6%). The median annual income for Lawrence
was $19,900 which was less than the Otago Regional median of $21,600 and the national median of $24,000. A relatively large proportion of its population does not hold a formal qualification (40.4%) compared with Otago (23.7%) and New Zealand (25%) (Stats NZ, 2006). The Lawrence community consists of 435 residents, 37 local businesses, and at least 40 community groups (Stats NZ, 2006; Tuapeka Lawrence Community Company online, 2011).

4.4 History of Lawrence 1860-1980

The history of Lawrence is important to this study as it provides the background to the heritage resources which exist in Lawrence now and are being used to promote tourism. The creation of Lawrence is associated with the discovery of gold in Gabriel’s Gully in 1861 and the subsequent establishment of the Tuapeka gold fields (Mayhew, 1949). When mining alone could no longer support the local population many of the miners left, while others established farms (Forrest, 1961).

4.4.1 Pre-gold

In 1848 20 million acres of land, which included the Tuapeka region, where Lawrence was later established, was bought by Europeans from Maori for £2000, a sum significantly below the value of the land (Mayhew, 1949). The Tuapeka region did not contain any permanent Maori settlements, but was used for through-travel from the coast to the interior in summer (Mayhew, 1949). The region was surveyed in 1858; and the survey report noted the discovery of small amounts of gold in streams and the potential of the land for pasture (Mayhew, 1949). In 1860 Otago was still in an early development phase and was populated by as little as 2000 sheep and 300 people (Forrest, 1961). Sheep runs had been established in the region as early as 1854(Mayhew, 1949). The land in Gabriel’s Gully was part of a sheep run from 1859 until it was declared a goldfield (Waite, 1977).

4.4.2 The Gold Rush

In 1861 Thomas Gabriel Read discovered gold in the gully that now bears his name (Gilchrist, 2011; Mayhew, 1949). Read is credited with the discovery of gold because of the notification of his find to the Otago Provincial Council (Gilchrist, 2011). Others found
gold in the Clutha River possibly as early as 1852 without making any recognised claims, and when shown examples of gold, local Maori indicated that they knew the mineral was present in the area (Waite, 1977). Edward Peters (Black Peter) is believed to have been the first person to discover gold in Tuapeka in 1858, while working on a sheep run, and it was news of this discovery that drew Read to the area (Gilchrist, 2011; Waite, 1977). Late in 1861 Read also discovered gold at Weatherston’s Gully (Mayhew, 1949). The entire Tuapeka basin was then declared a goldfield in August 1861 (von Hochstetter, 1867).

News of Read’s discovery had spread to the goldfields in Victoria, Australia, where the gold was largely exhausted (von Hochstetter, 1867). Miners began arriving at the end of 1861 and the population of Tuapeka reached 11,472 in July 1862 (Marks, 1977; Mayhew; von Hochstetter, 1867). The population boom was supported by the arrival of bakers, butchers, drapers, grocers, saw-millers, manufacturers and merchants, all of whom benefitted from supplying the mining population (Gilchrist, 2011). They established themselves in village centres located in Gabriel’s Gully, Blue Spur, and in the Waitahuna District (Forrest, 1961). These centres were quickly established and just as quickly deserted (Forrest, 1961).

A more permanent settlement initially called ‘The Junction’ was established where the Gabriel’s and Weatherston’s streams met (Mayhew, 1949). This formed the beginnings of Lawrence. The location was favourable because it was less susceptible to swampy conditions, tailings and flooding than early settlements located on valley floors (Forrest, 1961; Pownall, 1956). It was also easily accessible to a large number of the miners in different gullies (Pownall, 1956). The population density supported a school, which began as a tent on Peel Street in 1862 (Mayhew, 1949). A sense of community and order were quickly established and included churches, progress committees and open air, democratic town meetings (Gilchrist, 2011). In 1862 residents of ‘The Junction’ petitioned to have their properties recognised, and a sale of town sections followed (Mayhew, 1949).

4.4.3 The Post-gold rush

News of other gold sites both within New Zealand and overseas led to a dramatic decrease in the number of European miners in Tuapeka as they spread over the various fields. In
less than a year from June 1864 to March 1865 the mining population in Tuapeka decreased by 23% (Forrest, 1961). By contrast the population of women in Tuapeka increased from 146 in 1861 to 2,375 in 1864, as the remaining miners’ wives joined their husbands (Forrest, 1961). By mid-1864 land cultivation was underway and town sections were available for purchase in Lawrence and Waitahuna (Forrest, 1961). The early shanty towns gave way to more permanent building near goldfield sites, and Lawrence led this shift (Forrest, 1961). In 1866 Lawrence became a municipality (Mayhew, 1949).

Chinese miners began arriving in Tuapeka goldfields in 1862 (Business Owner pers.comm, 2010a). In 1866 there were more than 500 Chinese miners in Tuapeka (Forrest, 1961). The European population regarded the Chinese with suspicion (Business Owner pers.comm, 2010a). A bylaw passed in 1867 prevented the Chinese settling in town and led to the establishment of the Chinese Camp on the outskirts of Lawrence (Mayhew, 1949). The camp was established around a hotel and was officially surveyed, allowing the Chinese miners to buy the land which, in turn, meant the quality of housing and the environment in the camp was generally good (Business Owner pers.comm, 2010a).

Despite the Chinese influx, population decline continued. In 1867 the total population in the Tuapeka region was just 2,865 of whom 33% were miners, and 48% were women and children (Forrest, 1961). In the years following 1867 the population of the Tuapeka basin remained relatively stable due to the favourable agricultural conditions (Forrest, 1961). The Gabriel’s Gully township was however deserted by 1869 while the settlements at Blue Spur and Lawrence had grown significantly (Forrest, 1961). Blue Spur opened a school in 1867 (Mayhew, 1949). The growth and stability of the Lawrence population supported two steady newspapers in 1868: the Tuapeka Press and the Tuapeka Times (Mayhew, 1949).

A railway line to Lawrence was opened in March 1877 (Marks, 1977; Mayhew, 1949). The railway line could have reached Roxburgh through Heriot, but the support of the Dunedin public gave Lawrence the advantage (Marks, 1977). The Lawrence railway line was extended in 1904 to Beaumont, and reached Roxburgh in 1928 (Marks, 1977). Use of the Railway ceased in 1968 and the land was sold to farmers (Business Owner pers.comm, 2010a).
4.4.4 Agriculture

As the mineral wealth dried up in the 1870s Lawrence entered a depression and miners drifted towards agriculture to support themselves (Marks, 1977). This began on a small scale on easily accessible lots around the Lawrence township and in 1870 there were 74 holdings of greater than one acre (Mayhew, 1949). Sections were generally too small to be sustainable and intensive cropping led to soil exhaustion (Mayhew, 1949). Farms were then consolidated and the creation of the meat freezing industry in the early 1880s changed the farming practices around Lawrence from intensive cropping to sheep farming. The first frozen meat shipment left Port Chalmers in 1882 (Mayhew, 1949). Dairying began around 1895 and a creamery was established in Lawrence in 1905 (Mayhew, 1949). Agriculture became the new dominant industry in Lawrence (Marks, 1977). This was supported by engineers and roadmen who maintained transport routes, and the drivers transporting goods through the area (Marks, 1977). Lawrence survived by servicing the farming community rather than the mining community (Business Owner pers.comm, 2010a). Farming and Forestry were the dominant industries, as well as servicing those working for them, throughout the twentieth century and the situation in Lawrence was relatively stable (Business Owner pers.comm, 2010b).

4.5 The Current Context 1980-2011

Agriculture was dependent on the market price of production goods and was subjected to booms and busts. The next major economic shift occurred in Lawrence in the 1980s as farming and forestry faced a significant downturn (Business Owner pers.comm, 2010b). The most recent 31 years of Lawrence’s history are particularly relevant in that they detail the specific circumstances that led to development of tourism. Government restructuring of the agricultural sector in the 1980s (removal of import licences, price controls, subsidies and tax incentives, along with floating exchange rates, falling world commodity prices, rising interest rates and inflation (Wilson, 1995)) affected many small rural towns, and has forced a shift in rural economies away from a purely production focus.
4.5.1 **Crisis**

Key informants noted that, in Lawrence, government restructuring in the 1980s coincided with privatisation of the forestry industry and there were a lot of jobs lost leading to a downward economic spiral in Lawrence (Key Informant 1, Key Informant 2, Key Informant 3). “Lawrence was like just so many rural townships in New Zealand during that time. Post offices and banks and all sorts of things closed ... as well as the schools that were the glue that held the community together so Lawrence became very depressed” (Key Informant 4). The reduction in on-farm employment was cited as a key reason that there is less money for the businesses that serviced farm workers (Key Informant 5). “As soon as petrol stations and banks and post offices leave the community and people have to drive to do those things then that rural community is in deep trouble because the local money is no longer circling[sic] locally” (Key Informant 4).

Key informants praised members of the community who fought to keep a bank, policeman and medical services (Key Informant 2, Key Informant 3, Key Informant 6). “It was about making sure that the basic infrastructure was there that ... people stayed and wanted to stay” (Key Informant 2). There was a recognition that if those services were lost small towns are ‘doomed’ and people in the community are grateful to those who fought to keep them (Key Informant 7). Lawrence now services a wide rural area, because it managed to retain or re-establish many of these services, and its primary economic base is in servicing the farming community (Key Informant 1, Key Informant 7, Key Informant 8). “That [service retention] came a lot from within the community” (Key Informant 2). The Community Company (discussed below) and key individuals were cited as the key players in achieving service retention.

4.5.2 **Recovery**

Two key informants stated that the Lawrence community is looking internally and reinventing itself, and that this is necessary for small town survival after the 1980s downturn (Key Informant 2, Key Informant 11). “We think of what we need, it’s coming from the community, it’s generated from the community” (Key Informant 18). The Lawrence community see a need to be proactive (Key Informant 2, Key Informant 13). “In
this community we are great at raising money for the things we need, we don’t always need council support to get things done” (Key Informant 13). Key Informant 4 expanded:

What is special in communities is driven by the people who live in them and I guess it’s about the right place the right time and the right people. Strategic planning is really important and there’s no doubting that, but if you don’t have the people in the place and you don’t have the energy then often it’s really really hard to make things happen. (Key Informant 4).

Services available in Lawrence in 2011 include a bank, service and petrol station, pharmacy, and police and fire services. The existence of these services is largely due efforts by the Community Company.

4.5.2.1 The Community Company and Community Board

The Community Company, which is a non-governmental organisation, was mentioned as the driving community force to retain or establish services (Key Informant 1, Key Informant 4). The Community Company was established in 1980s as an independent business that aimed to benefit the community as a whole and its main achievement was getting people to work together to face the downturn (Business Owner pers.comm, 2010a). As Key Informant 9 stated “its mission statement is really to promote business and commercial activities in the area to attract tourists as well as other people to start up business in the Lawrence township and the local area”. The Community Company is responsible for the information centre, the Tuapeka Times, the Lawrence website, and also plays a key role in providing the internet and free international phone calls to visitors and locals (Tuapeka Lawrence Community Company online, 2011).

The Community Company differs from the Community Board in that it is a private, non-government enterprise. Lawrence is seen by many people in the rest of the district as ‘over the hill’ and separate, and there may be a lack of connection and communication between coastal centres and Lawrence (Key Informant 2). Key Informant 2 suggested “I think sometimes people in Lawrence do feel like they are isolated and being ignored”. The separation is stated as one of the reasons Lawrence has a Community Board (Key Informant 2). The Community Board is part of the Clutha District Council and has democratically elected members. It not only provides information and advice about the community, but also advocates on behalf of the community to the council and establishes relationships between the council and community groups (CDC online, 2010). Both the
Community Company and the Community Board work towards providing economic and social benefits in Lawrence, through development. At a broader level there is recognition that in recent years farming is starting to pick up and again provide benefits to the community (Key Informant 4).

### 4.5.2.2 The Individuals

Several key informants stated that the key to the survival of Lawrence are individuals (Key Informant 3, Key Informant 10, Key Informant 11, Key Informant 12).

You’ve got to look at what’s happened here and the successes it has had, it punches above its weight. We are just lucky we have got a lot of people here that punch above their weight to make it much more successful than perhaps a lot of similar communities. (Key Informant 10)

Key Informant 3 and Key Informant 6 both noted that the reason for the success in Lawrence is that the passion for community development is much higher than other areas. “There is a lot of good positive people here and there is a strong community spirit and those things drive it they make a difference, people care passionately about this community, and about the young people” (Key Informant 11). Key Informant 6 stated that generational support is also important, and in Lawrence “the older generation have got the time and the money to put into the community organisation and that’s what makes a difference” (Key Informant 6). However, one key informant notes that succession in farming families and community organisations has not always been handled well and rural communities are losing key leaders because of this (Key Informant 4).

### 4.5.2.3 The Businesses

Business in Lawrence has grown from only a few traders to ‘steady long term traders and new enterprise’ (Key Informant 7). Key Informant 10 stated that there is no single big business investor in tourism in Lawrence, but many of the businesses contribute to an overall destination. Key Informant 10 expanded and suggested the growth is ‘organic’ and feeds off the opportunities available when more people are in Lawrence (Key Informant 10). Key Informant 10 stated a key area for business growth was in new accommodation. Newly established accommodation is perceived to have raised the standard of accommodation to match the kind of people already coming on day trips for coffees and cakes, which will encourage longer stays (Key Informant 10). Key Informant 8 and Key
Informant 3 stated that, at present, new accommodation is being built. A key focus for businesses in Lawrence, which was identified by Key Informant 7, was an attempt to source supplies locally and put money back into the community through fundraising for initiatives, such as the planned new community swimming pool, which will make Lawrence more attractive to future investors (Key Informant 7).

4.5.2.4 Manufacturing

Manufacturing has also developed, and is very important to Lawrence in terms of employment generation and diversity (Business Owner pers.comm, 2010b). A large employment base means that the town can support more residents and therefore more services than other small rural centres without this base (Business Owner pers.comm, 2010b). Manufacturing is discussed by key informants as playing a key economic role in Lawrence; Tuapeka Print provides diverse employment opportunities that are not available in many small towns (Key Informant 8, Key Informant 10, Key Informant 12, Key Informant 13). They stated that it is unique to Lawrence as most small towns do not have manufacturing anymore and therefore have a more limited range of employment, as well as less available employment overall (Key Informant 10, Key Informant 13).

Small New Zealand towns do need more industry and its one of the big reasons that New Zealand is struggling and way behind Australia at the moment is the fact that all our industry has gone to the main centres (Key Informant 10).

The presence of manufacturing is cited as crucial to the town (Key Informant 3, Key Informant 8). The combination of farming, manufacturing, and tourism gives Lawrence a more reliable economic base because the markets for each industry are quite independent (Key Informant 4, Key Informant 13). One suggested barrier to future expansion of manufacturing is the lack of high level skills in the town (Key Informant 10).

4.5.3 The Recovery Outcome

While there is a declining town population of only 435 there are a number of local businesses, services and organisations in Lawrence. In essence the 1980s government restructuring necessitated community-driven development and allowed Lawrence to develop according to its own needs and resources. There are 37 local businesses including a four-square shop, pharmacy, service station and bank. Many of these businesses are
related to hospitality and tourism including a number of cafes on the main street and a small variety of accommodation establishments. Other businesses directly service the agricultural sector as it is still the dominant industry. Key informants identified that the businesses servicing the agricultural sector are more stable, while many of the hospitality business are struggling (Key Informant 6, Key Informant 12). There is also a volunteer fire brigade and a resident police officer. There are at least 40 community groups within the Lawrence area and a number more in the surrounding Tuapeka District (Tuapeka Lawrence Community Company online, 2011). Lawrence is seen as safe and secure, and as a lifestyle location. However the level of infrastructure in Lawrence was a concern to some informants (Key Informant 7, Key Informant 14). Sewerage and water upgrades have been investigated by the council, and a community-run swimming pool is also proposed (CDC, 2009)

4.6 Tourism Development

Business in Lawrence, according to Key Informant 13, is largely dependent on tourism. Key Informant 16 agreed stating “If we didn’t have it [tourism] the businesses around here wouldn’t be running”. Nationally, tourism attracts the largest proportion of international currency and provides jobs to one in ten people (Quality Planning online, 2006c). Several key informants stated that tourism and the events in Lawrence, such as the Annual Rodeo and the anniversary festival, support the cafes and are good for maintaining business (Key Informant 5, Key Informant 11, Key Informant 20). Key Informant 17 suggested that by attracting tourists to rural areas, rural wealth is more equitably distributed around the country, and especially reaches the areas that really need it (Key Informant 17).

4.6.1 Location Utilisation and Cafe Culture

As well as its agricultural servicing role, Lawrence is a stop-over point on State Highway 8 between the Otago coast and Central Otago (CDC, 2009). The location of Lawrence on the main route to Central Otago was noted by key informants as providing opportunities in Lawrence that are not available in other places (Key Informant 7, Key Informant 13). The establishment of the information centre in the 1980s was stated as the first step towards tourism development as it created a reason for people travelling on State Highway 8 to stop (Key Informant 10). Among other things, a key role of the Community Company is
Key Informant 3 stated that people travelling on the highway are also encouraged to stop because of the cafes and shops. Cafe’s and boutique shops were developed incrementally by residents following the establishment of the information centre (Key Informant 12). Key Informant 2 stated that Lawrence has developed a name for itself because of its cafe culture. It is renowned for its coffees and boutique shops and people in Dunedin, Otago and Southland see Lawrence as a good place for a day trip or stopover on the way into Central Otago (Key Informant 2, Key Informant 3, Key Informant 12).

People come to Lawrence for the drive, they come to Lawrence for the shops and maybe to have a look around Gabriel’s Gully...have a coffee and lunch so that there’s a whole package there and they can bring the kids along (Key Informant 4). Several key informants stated that the cafes have played a big role in maintaining Lawrence, and in creating jobs for the community (Key Informant 1, Key Informant 2, Key Informant 12, Key Informant 16). Non-hospitality businesses are also expanding especially boutique shops (Business Owner pers.comm, 2010a). “The cafes...and boutique shops, they definitely draw the crowds” (Key Informant 3). The symbiotic nature of the cafe and boutique shop businesses was identified by Key Informant 8 and Key Informant 10: when visitors stop for a coffee they are also attracted to the shops and vice versa. Key Informant 16 stated that the businesses also play a key role in providing information to those in their shops about the tourism opportunities in Lawrence (Key Informant 16).

4.6.2 Heritage Resources

A number of key heritage resources exist in Lawrence. Within the township there are significant heritage buildings on two roads, namely Ross place and Colonsay Street as well as other heritage buildings including the Anthem house (where the composer of the national anthem lived) and the Holy Trinity Church. Heritage buildings on Ross Place include the Athenaeum, Former Bank of New Zealand, and Former Bank of New South Wales. Heritage buildings on Colonsay Street include St Patricks Church, a Presbyterian Church, the former court house and the former post office. Other less significant heritage buildings are scattered throughout the township.
Nearby heritage resources include the Chinese Camp, located two kilometres from Lawrence, where plots were surveyed for Chinese miners who were segregated from the main townships, Gabriel’s Gully, located four-five kilometres from Lawrence, where gold was initially discovered, Weatherston’s Gully, three kilometres from Lawrence, another goldfield site and also the location of the historic Black Horse Brewery and a 10 acre Daffodil field. All of these sites, while separate from the Lawrence township, show areas of land that are set aside for heritage resources rather than agricultural use.

Despite the existence of these resources many of them remain underdeveloped. Resources in Lawrence that key informants identified as under developed and therefore not used by tourists include the heritage buildings, goldfield sites and the Chinese Camp (Key Informant 3, Key Informant 6, Key Informant 12, Key Informant 16).

4.6.3 Place Marketing

Place marketing has also become an important aspect to Lawrence’s development. Free wireless internet provision (see Figure 4.2) is described as 90% marketing and 10% service because of the importance of attracting the transit tourist to stay in Lawrence for a few hours (Business Owner pers.comm, 2010b). Key Informant 4 and Key Informant 7 suggest that the promotion of free internet and international phone calls and of freedom camping sites has increased tourism, especially campervans. Free wireless internet has been provided in the town since early 2009 and, more recently, computers have been installed in a number of cafes for visitor use (Tuapeka Lawrence Community Company online, 2011). The information centre also provides a phone where free international calls can be made to 44 countries (Tuapeka Lawrence Community Company online, 2011). The scheme was initiated as a local couple was frustrated with the slow internet that was available and also

Figure 4.2 Sign as you enter Lawrence on State Highway 8. Free Wireless Internet is one aspect Lawrence uses for Town Promotion (personal collection)
believed it would be a good promotion tool (Tuapeka Lawrence Community Company online, 2011). They gained financial backing from a local business owner, who also covers the monthly access fee. Key Informant 4 expanded on this saying that the free internet and international phone call service is an example of the community fighting to maintain its vibrancy. The community was not necessarily supportive of the wireless internet development until it was established and they began to receive the benefits (Key Informant 4). “We are starting to get two strings to our bow now, one we have got farming and the other we have got tourism” (Key Informant 10). Key Informant 10 expanded saying that small increases in development attract investment which leads to more development.

4.6.4 Event Tourism

A number of events throughout the year, including an Arts Festival, Gymkhana, and ‘Duathlon’, attract a variety of audiences and provide support for the hospitality businesses (Business Owner pers.comm, 2010b). Key Informant 14 stated that event tourism has developed incrementally; with community groups managing and promoting events that cater to different groups throughout the year. Events include an Arts Festival, Duathalon, Rodeo, and Farmarama (LB.pers.comm, 2010b, Key Informant 5, Key Informant 14). “Event tourism is the way to go here; it’s the thing that keeps us afloat” (Key Informant 14).

Local recent and upcoming events include the Summer Arts Festival and Lawrence Markets, County Fair, Quarter Mile Sprint, Spring Duathalon, Tuapeka Trots, Horse Trek and Gymkhana, Daffodil Day, Otago Western Riding Club Show, Otago Museum ‘Dive into Science’ show, Lawrence Fashion Parade, Plunket Christmas Market Day and Lawrence Lions Trail Bike Ride (Tuapeka Lawrence Community Company online, 2011). Key informants stated that the different interests of the community mean that a number of different events are held every year that attract quite different crowds, for example the Arts Festival and the Quarter Mile Sprint (Key Informant 10, Key Informant 18). Most people in the community are seen as supportive of all of the events, even when they have no direct interest, because they are seen as beneficial to the community as a whole (Key Informant 10, Key Informant 13).
Chapter 4. Context for Development

If you had asked me five years ago I wouldn’t have cared about Daffodils or seen the value in them but last year I took an interest, I can see that it gets people to the town for about six weeks of the year and that’s great for business (Key Informant 13).

Key Informant 18 stated that the events are about sharing the variety of interests within the community with the wider public. “Our number one aim is to be in the paper for one reason or another” (Key Informant 18). However one key informant noted that the different interests of the community highlights “an undercurrent of dysfunction” and many of the groups do not cooperate (Key Informant 14). For example the Community Company and Community Board often fail to communicate development plans with each other (Key Informant 9). Key Informant 10 and Key Informant 13 stated that the cafes and boutique shops all have an interest in all of the events because of the spin-off financial benefit. The businesses feed off the opportunities that are created by increased revenue from increased patronage (Key Informant 10).

4.6.5 Tourism Barriers

Key Informant 6 and Key Informant 10 suggested that businesses are not attracting enough customers to make them really successful, and the owners have to put the hours in themselves (Key Informant 6, Key Informant 10). Key Informant 8 stated that businesses rely on day-trip tourists from Dunedin and on bus companies (Key Informant 8). However, as Key Informant 10 stated, “You can’t build a tourism industry on day trippers because your businesses just can’t get over the line” (Key Informant 10).

Several key informants also identified the unreliability of the tourism market, especially the international tourism market (Key Informant 3, Key Informant 8, Key Informant 12, Key Informant 19). Global factors such as flooding in Queensland, the global recession, the earthquake in Japan and the Chilean ash cloud have been identified as reducing tourist numbers in Lawrence in the 2010-2011 season (Key Informant 3, Key Informant 12, Key Informant 19). Key Informant 4 and Key Informant 11 stated that tourism may not provide as much support as is expected because it is seasonal in nature and Lawrence already has a seasonal agricultural market, which means some businesses close in winter (Key Informant 8, Key Informant 11). In 2011, for example, the Lemon Tree Cafe closed for the winter months.
4.7 Tourism Planning

Tourism development must be, to some extent, planned. Formal planning for tourism development is undertaken by the local government, in this case the Clutha District Council, through plans and policy. The functions of Local Government are largely determined by the legislative context, especially the Local Government Act 2002. The purpose of Local Government is:

“ (a) to enable democratic local decision-making and action by, and on behalf of, communities; and (b) to promote the social, economic, environmental, and cultural well-being of communities, in the present and for the future” (LGA, 2002: s10).

The Local Government therefore plays a key role in Lawrence and in tourism development in Lawrence.

4.7.1.1 Legislative Context Determining the Role of Council

The Resource Management Act 1991 and Local Government Act 2002 establish responsibilities for local authorities to have a role in both enabling tourism and in managing its effects (Quality Planning online, 2006c). The purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 is set out in section 5 and states “The purpose of this Act is to promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources” (RMA, 1991, s5). Tourism development should be considered under the Resource Management Act 1991 both in terms of effects of tourism on the environment as well as the effects on tourism of other activities (Quality Planning online, 2006c). The role of local council in managing tourism development is set out in section 31 of the Act and the sections relevant to this case study are included below:

section 31
(1) Every territorial authority shall have the following functions for the purpose of giving effect to this Act in its district
(a) the establishment, implementation, and review of objectives, policies, and methods to achieve integrated management of the effects of the use, development or protections of land and associated natural and physical resources
(b) the control of any actual or potential effects of the use, development, or protection of land...

(RMA, 1991, s31)

Given a council’s responsibilities under section 31, local councils also have responsibilities under Sections 6-8 of the Resource Management Act (Matters of
National Importance, Other Matters, and Treaty of Waitangi). This means that the effects of tourism on other activities can be managed indirectly through other chapters of the District Plan. Of particular relevance for this research are:

section 6 ...shall recognise and provide for...
... (f) the protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use and development

Section 7...shall have particular regard to
...(b) the efficient use and development of natural and physical resources
...(c) the maintenance and enhancement of amenity values
...(f) the maintenance and enhancement of the quality of the environment
(g) any finite characteristics of natural and physical resources

(RMA, 1991, s6-7)

While the above section outlines the legislative context in which tourism management can take place, it also shows that the management of tourism is largely determined by the council involved. Key informants had considerably different views about the Clutha District Council’s management of tourism development.

4.7.1.2 Statutory Planning for Tourism in Lawrence

A key informant from the community stated that the council’s role in tourism development is seen as allowing development, rather than financially supporting it (Key Informant 8). Staff from the council stated that they have focused on creating an attractive business environment through the district plan (Key Informant 4). The council also focuses on reducing barriers for new business (Key Informant 4, Key Informant 1). An example of this is the council allowing the Community Company to lease a council owned building when they needed a site for the new bank (Key Informant 2). The council also fosters relationships between businesses and business support groups that provide infrastructure and capital (Key Informant 4). “We will give them every opportunity to help them start” (Key Informant 1). Key Informant 4 stated that the small size of the area, and low population means that financial support is not always available and instead the council attempts to ensure a good “working relationship” with businesses to provide support (such as mentoring) (Key Informant 4). The council also attempts to provide cohesive tourism information where pamphlets and signs are coordinated so that they are more easily identified by tourists (Key Informant 1). However, there is a feeling in the Lawrence community that the council focuses on other areas for tourism promotion in the district (Key Informant 12). Key Informant 8 suggested that the council does however play an
important role in providing a structure for tourism development through planning documents.

### 4.7.1.2.1 Council Plans and Policy

The ‘Clutha District Council Long-Term Council Community Plan 2009-2019’ addresses tourism in a number of ways. In particular tourism, tourists and visitors are considered in individual town summaries. In the Lawrence town summary developed in 2009 it is recognised that Lawrence is interesting to visitors as a ‘stopover point’. The community summary also specifies the Lawrence 150th anniversary celebrations but does not acknowledge that there will be visitors or set out planning for visitors or the benefits in the future of the upgrades associated with the celebrations.

In the community summaries in the ‘Clutha District Council Long-Term Council Community Plan 2009-2019’, ‘tourism’ is specifically addressed in Owaka (Catlins) Ward, and the West Otago Ward and ‘tourists’ are recognised in the Kaka point and Bruce Ward summaries; while Lawrence is acknowledged merely as ‘a destination and stop over point’ (see Volume One, Section Four) (CDC, 2009). Community members felt that there is competition for tourism with the Catlins area (Key Informant 6, Key Informant 7). However, the council stated that “we don’t have too much competition between towns” (Key Informant 2). The council also recognised that the Catlins and Lawrence provide different tourism markets; tourism in the Catlins is focused on wildlife and scenery, while Lawrence has a focus on heritage (Key Informant 1).

In the ‘Clutha District Council Annual Plan 2011/2012’ addresses council’s activities. For example, the activity of district development involved, among other things, “Building pride in our district, and telling the world about it. Not only promoting the district as a tourism destination, but also promoting ourselves to ourselves” (CDC, 2011a: 35). This aspect of district development directly relates to the promotion of tourism within the district.

Tourism can also be addressed outside of Council plans. For example, the Clutha District Council Policy (number 06-03-003) on Freedom Camping prohibits camping in certain
areas, and sets out dump points where campers can dispose of toilet waste and grey water (CDC, 2007).

4.7.1.2.2 District Plans
Tourism can be managed directly as a complete chapter in a district plan, with issues, objectives and policies set out directly managing tourism (Quality Planning online, 2006c). In the Clutha District Council District Plan tourism is not separated into a distinct chapter (CDC, 1998). While the Clutha District Plan has no specific tourism chapter it does incorporate tourism in a number of ways. One way that tourism can be managed through other chapters in a District Plan is, for example, issues in a heritage chapter related to the effects on heritage development of tourists (Quality Planning online, 2006c). The effects of tourism can also be managed through general chapters of the District Plan taking an effects-based rather than activity-based approach (Quality Planning online, 2006c).

The Clutha District Plan incorporates tourism considerations in a number of sections. The plan considers the effects of tourism development on Maori ancestral land (Policy MAO.4) as well as recognising the issue of managing increasing tourism numbers on transport routes (3.3.2 Issues) (CDC, 1998). The plan also considers the effects on tourism of appropriate signage for tourists and effects of heritage management on tourism (Policy SIGN.2, Policy HER.5, Method HER.6) (CDC, 1998).

4.7.1.3 The New Zealand Tourism Strategy
Since 1997, a range of non-regulatory documents have suggested a larger and more vital role for local councils in tourism planning. This section reviews the development of these documents with specific reference to the role of local council in tourism planning. It is important to understand national guidance on the role of local government in tourism development to understand how the role of the Clutha District Council in tourism development in Lawrence.

The ‘Management of the Environmental Effects Associated with the Tourism Sector 1997’ report, which was produced by the office of the Parliamentary Commissioner for the
Environment explores the “effects associated with the tourism sector” and the “allocation of functions...implementation...[and] effectiveness of public authority management of environmental effects associated with the tourism sector” (Office of the Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment, 1997: 3). Recommendations from the report included increasing research, providing standards, and understanding the cumulative effects of such development. The key recommendation of the report was the need for “a strategy for sustainable tourism for New Zealand” (Office of the Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment, 1997: 7). This strategy directly guides the tourism sector in relation to development in Lawrence, and is therefore important to this case study.

The New Zealand Tourism Strategy was produced to manage the development of tourism destinations with a particular focus on sustainable development (Connell, et al., 2009). The strategy recognises both the need for development but also the damage that development can cause, especially to natural and cultural resources (Connell, et al., 2009). The ‘New Zealand Tourism Strategy 2010’ recommended that local government should be required to actively participate in the tourism sector (Beca Carter Holdings & Ferner Ltd and Tourism Resource Consultants Ltd, 2004). As many informants identified that the council does not play a role in tourism planning it is important to address how/if the Clutha District Council is planning for tourism, and demonstrate this to the local community. Key Informant 2, from the District Council, stated “Tourism isn’t a big part of what Clutha District does; we support it but we don’t necessarily promote it heavily”. One reason for this that was noted by Key Informant 4 was the largely rural nature of the district means that the inhabitants are mostly farmers, and often they do not see value in tourism investment over other priorities. Community members felt that tourism attractions in the District lack signage and promotion (Key Informant 6, Key Informant 7). One community member suggested the lack of tourism promotion may be due to the high investment costs (Key Informant 16).

The second strategic aim of the ‘New Zealand Tourism Strategy 2010’ centred on local government involving communities in tourism planning (Beca Carter Holdings & Ferner Ltd and Tourism Resource Consultants Ltd, 2004). The updated tourism strategy (‘New Zealand Tourism Strategy 2015’) continues this idea by including a fourth outcome, namely “The tourism sector and communities work together for mutual benefit” (Ministry
of Tourism, 2007: 7). It is clear that Lawrence has the potential to benefit from tourism development, and that this strategy could provide guidance on how best to identify benefit streams. The New Zealand Tourism Strategy has led to the production of a number of government documents to guide tourism planning by local government, as well as instigating the development of a number of local tourism strategies (Connell, et al., 2009). These guiding documents will be used to identify appropriate tools for the Clutha District Council, and also to assess their role in tourism planning. In addition to considering the role of local government, the strategy has a ‘uniquely New Zealand’ approach and addresses the environmental protection that tourism development can encourage (Connell, et al., 2009).


‘Post cards from home’ is a local government initiative that arose from the first New Zealand Tourism Strategy (2010) (Local Government New Zealand and Ministry of Tourism, 2003). In particular it addresses the “local government response to the recommendations of the New Zealand Tourism Strategy 2010” (Local Government New Zealand and Ministry of Tourism, 2003: 2). It also explores, in relation to tourism development, issues and opportunities for local governments, the role of local government, and provides a framework for action. This framework for action is a starting point for the Clutha District Council to be more involved in tourism planning, should they choose to do so. In particular the guide addresses how local government should be involved in tourism planning.

The ‘Tourism Planning Toolkit’ sets out the role of local government in tourism stating “Local government manages the natural and cultural resources that tourism relies on, provides core infrastructure, attractions and facilities, and often funds regional marketing and visitor information” (Lincoln University, et al., 2006: 10). It explains not only why tourism might be important to local authorities but also how tourism planning can be incorporated in local council functions. The toolkit also discusses the benefits and challenges of tourism development for local government.
Both of these documents are particularly useful for establishing the responsibilities of the Clutha District Council in planning for tourism. The documents recognise that local government manages the natural and physical resources which tourism relies on and invests in key infrastructure, services and facilities (roads, museums, information centres) which cater to the needs of tourists (Local Government New Zealand and Ministry of Tourism, 2003). The Clutha District Council funds information centres, which are linked with local museums in the district including in Lawrence (Key Informant 2).

Some members of the Lawrence community feel that the infrastructure provision and development support in Lawrence is less than in other areas in the district (Key Informant 14). “I know a lot of people with the same idea that it would have been great if we had kept our own borough” and that given the high rates people in community pay, they feel they deserve more services and opportunities (Key Informant 7, Key Informant 14). However another community member, Key Informant 13, pointed out that “Lawrence is one of the smaller centres in the Clutha District, you’ve got Milton and Balclutha, people can’t expect the council to do everything everywhere”. The Council stated that its focus for development is on creating better towns for the people living in them rather than catering for outside tourists. “Rather than promoting tourism it’s about promoting ourselves, which will attract people” (Key Informant 2).

The ‘Tourism Planning toolkit’ focuses on supporting councils’ attempting to plan for tourism by identifying the information the council will require and the means of finding the information (Beca Carter Holdings & Ferner Ltd and Tourism Resource Consultants Ltd, 2004). The Toolkit as a whole incorporates four key, separate toolkits with a number of toolboxes associated. The toolkits are:

- Situation Analysis toolkit
- Strategic planning toolkit
- Implementation toolkit
- Monitoring toolkit (Lincoln University, et al., 2006)

These toolkits aim to provide necessary guidance to a range of decision makers about how to undertake tourism planning, whether it is planning a tourism strategy or incorporating tourism into existing planning structures. The ‘Tourism Planning Toolkit’ is directly linked
to the Good Practice guide (Beca Carter Holdings & Ferner Ltd and Tourism Resource Consultants Ltd, 2004).

4.7.1.4 Tourism and the RMA Good Practice Guide 2004

The ‘Tourism and the RMA Good Practice Guide’ addresses the responsibilities local government has in the tourism sector under the Resource Management Act 1991. It provides a framework for exploring the role of the Clutha District Council in planning for tourism in Lawrence. The guide was required as a direct outcome of the first tourism strategy. In particular it focuses on providing ‘tools’ for local governments to use when undertaking planning for the tourism sector (Beca Carter Holdings & Ferner Ltd and Tourism Resource Consultants Ltd, 2004). The key sections of the guide discuss:

- tourism planning,
- the roles of organisations,
- planning responses
- planning under the Resource Management Act (1991)
- how tourism planning practice can be improved (Beca Carter Holdings & Ferner Ltd and Tourism Resource Consultants Ltd, 2004)

The final sections of the guide use case law and other publications to illustrate key aspects of the guide.

The ‘Tourism and the RMA Good Practice Guide’ states that all councils should consider tourism, even when tourists are just passing through, because of, among other things, the extra use of infrastructure. This is a particularly important aspect to consider in Lawrence because of the dominant through-traffic tourism market. The use of infrastructure, such as public toilets, as well as signage and promotion of Lawrence should be considered despite the relatively small tourism market because of the potential to expand and also because of the impact of service provision in determining whether tourists will make another visit or choose to stop.
4.7.1.4.1 Tourism and the RMA Good Practice Guide: Tourism Planning

Planning for tourism is outlined in the guide as necessary because “the tourism sector is important and steadily growing” and the impacts of the development on social and economic wellbeing, and the environment need to be managed (Beca Carter Holdings & Ferner Ltd and Tourism Resource Consultants Ltd, 2004: 4). Integration of the promotion of tourism (“destination marketing”) and developing relationships within the sector (“destination management”) are seen as vital to encourage sustainable development of tourism (Beca Carter Holdings & Ferner Ltd and Tourism Resource Consultants Ltd, 2004).

The Guide suggests two main reasons for tourism planning being important to a district. Firstly, tourism may be important because a community sees the economic potential in tourism development (Beca Carter Holdings & Ferner Ltd and Tourism Resource Consultants Ltd, 2004). In Lawrence this is the key consideration. The economic potential of future tourism development needs to be maximised to ensure economic wealth in the town.

The second key reason that tourism planning may be important to a district is the impact of growing tourist numbers in a community that needs to be managed (Beca Carter Holdings & Ferner Ltd and Tourism Resource Consultants Ltd, 2004). In Lawrence this is particularly important because of the number of tourists who are passing through. Adequate planning to manage growth in tourist numbers, especially in providing adequate infrastructure for tourism growth is important to manage the impacts of tourism. The Guide addresses how sections of the Resource Management Act 1991 are important to tourism even when tourism is not specifically mentioned in the section (Beca Carter Holdings & Ferner Ltd and Tourism Resource Consultants Ltd, 2004). The guide links key sections of the Act (specifically section 6 and section 7) to resources also utilised and valued by tourists as well as to amenity, character, cultural and heritage values. Further the guide discusses how tourism must be considered under the Act in two ways. Firstly the effects of new developments on tourism, for example on landscapes with tourism values, must be considered. In Lawrence this could be relevant in terms of incremental development of Gabriel’s Gully. Housing or other developments may impact on the viability of the Gully as a future tourism resource. Second, the effects of tourism on
existing developments and communities, for example increased congestion, must also be considered. Growing tourist numbers in Lawrence could affect the community in terms of the amenity values, and noise and congestion on the main street.

4.7.1.4.2 Tourism and the RMA Good Practice Guide: Planning Responses

The way in which the Clutha District Council could manage tourism is set out in the guide. The guide states planning tools available to local governments include:

- The Local Government Act 2002, including long-term council community plans and council funded projects that address tourism.
- The Resource Management Act 1991, including district and regional plans which specifically address effects of/on tourism or tourism values (such as water quality)
- Tourism Strategies, including mission statements, objectives and monitoring
- Economic Development Strategies which recognise tourism as an economic driver
- Other Strategies, particularly those involving community participation in planning processes, transport strategies, bylaws and working parties (Beca Carter Holdings & Ferner Ltd and Tourism Resource Consultants Ltd, 2004)

The Guide also addresses the role of other agencies and the planning tools available to them, such as conservation management plans which are available to the Department of Conservation.

4.7.1.4.3 Tourism and the RMA Good Practice Guide: Tourism Planning under the Resource Management Act (1991)

The Guide sets out, in detail, those methods a local council can undertake to establish the appropriate response to tourism effects under the Resource Management Act (1991) (Beca Carter Holdings & Ferner Ltd and Tourism Resource Consultants Ltd, 2004). In particular the Guide notes that many councils with low levels of tourism, particularly councils where tourists ‘pass through’, often fail to respond to the effects of tourism; and that this can detrimentally affect not only the resources in the district/region but also the tourism values in a wider New Zealand context. This is the case in Lawrence, where there is a low level of tourism activity, but there are a large number of tourists utilising existing infrastructure, such as the road and sewerage system (public toilets). The Guide clearly states that tourism
as an activity should not necessarily be singled out, but the effects of the activity must be considered and incorporated, either generally into plans or under a specific section.

The Guide states that, in general, councils with the most success at managing tourism were those that had “some form of an integrated tourism strategy and a suite of Resource Management Act and non Resource Management Act tools for managing tourism” (Beca Carter Holdings & Ferner Ltd and Tourism Resource Consultants Ltd, 2004: 43). The Clutha District Council could consider a tourism strategy for the district, or one that is specific to Lawrence. Any tourism development, that requires consent, will need to be considered under the Resource Management Act planning system (Connell, et al., 2009)

4.7.1.4.4 Tourism and the RMA Good Practice Guide: Improving Practice

Key suggestions for improving practice centre on the day-to-day functions of council staff, in particular ensuring consistency in decision making (Beca Carter Holdings & Ferner Ltd and Tourism Resource Consultants Ltd, 2004). One way to improve practice, as suggested in the Guide, is through improving relationships and communication between various interested parties such as tourism operators, other councils, regional tourism organisations and the Department of Conservation. One community key informant was dissatisfied with the introduction of Enterprise Clutha, a council group that focuses on business development, youth support, and other services. They stated that the original Clutha Tourism Network, a group which focused on cohesion between different communities tourism developments in the district and was replaced, provided better information to communities in the district about tourism developments in the district and provided cohesion (Key Informant 14). Key Informant 14 expanded on this stating that Clutha Enterprise has treated each community separately and there is no longer that communication, cohesion or support for tourism activities between different communities.

Monitoring plan provisions, the affect of land uses on tourism and tourism on other land uses, and the cumulative effects of tourism are further key improvements suggested in the guide because of the need to modify decisions based on what is occurring (Beca Carter Holdings & Ferner Ltd and Tourism Resource Consultants Ltd, 2004).
4.8 Summary: Key Findings

The first key finding was that, despite its diminishing role as an agricultural service centre, Lawrence has not only retained a number of key services but has also diversified its income base to include tourism. There is no longer a solely production focus. Lawrence’s foundations were based on the gold-rush in Gabriel’s Gully. After the gold-rush the location provided good pastoral land, and transport routes to support agriculture development. Retaining a number of key services in Lawrence was seen by most informants as important for the future vitality and stability of Lawrence. Manufacturing in particular is seen as a key factor for economic stability and a key advantage over other small towns.

Tourism has developed due to Lawrence’s location on a state-highway commonly used by tourists which provides a source of external funds; and key informants stated that businesses rely heavily on through traffic for business. Linked to this, Lawrence has actively developed a name for itself as a good place to stop for a coffee, especially with the recent development of free internet and international phone calls. Event tourism is still developing, for example the 150th anniversary celebration was a new event that attracted a new group of tourists, particularly an older group and those with links to the area (Key Informant 12). This celebration is the focus of the next chapter.

The second key finding is that, in different ways, local government and local stakeholders have both played a key role in tourism development. While the Clutha District Council does not focus on tourism, planning documents allow for tourism development in the district. In particular the District Plan is relatively permissive and provides a good base for any new development. Guiding documents such as the New Zealand Tourism Strategy and the Local Government Tourism Strategy have value in that they suggest there could be a more influential role for the Clutha District Council in tourism planning. These documents are particularly useful in that they outline not only how to explore the need for tourism planning in a district but also in how to achieve effective tourism planning based on local needs. Future planning in the Clutha District could have a stronger focus on both the effects of tourism development on local resources, and also the effects on tourism of other activities, such as alterations to heritage buildings. Local stakeholders also played a key
role not only in retaining services that support tourists but also in establishing cafes that became the catalyst for incremental and endogenous tourism development.
5. The Festival

5.1 Introduction

This chapter contains the results from key informant interviews about the Lawrence 150\textsuperscript{th} anniversary celebrations. This chapter attempts to explore aspects of the three relevant research questions in relation to a single development, the festival. The implementation of the festival as well as the roles of local stakeholders and the council will be explored followed by the informants’ perceptions of the impacts of the development.

Key Informant 1 identified the anniversary festival as a celebration of 150 years since Gabriel Read discovered the first payable gold in New Zealand and Lawrence was built. An Organising Committee was established that planned the festival event. Through this planning relationships were established that led to infrastructure development in Lawrence. This development upgraded a number of features in Lawrence in time for the festival event. The festival itself was seen as a success and attracted tourists both from within and from outside the district. It was a successful weekend in that it provided for significant business turnover as well as creating a ‘feel-good factor’ within the community.

5.2 A ‘Local’ Event

The event was perceived by stakeholders as solely a celebration of the 150\textsuperscript{th} anniversary and as something special to Lawrence, Otago, and New Zealand, and there was no economic motivation behind the planning (Key Informant 1, Key Informant 2, Key Informant 18). “In a small town people get involved a lot they have a passion for the community so they felt it was time that something should be done to recognise the 150 years” (Key Informant 6). Key informants stated it was a family event for people from Dunedin and Lawrence and local school children (Key Informant 4, Key Informant 18).
The festival “was more of a local thing for local people” (Key Informant 20). Those attending the festival were identified by Key Informant 10 as mainly elderly people with some emotional tie to the area, or with ancestors who mined in the Gully. Despite the local focus the event attracted a number of ‘outsiders’, in particular tourists from around the region and New Zealand (Key Informant 6, Key Informant 7).

5.3 Planning the Festival

5.3.1 The Organising Committee

According to Key Informant 6 a public meeting was held to identify those that were interested in being involved with planning the festival and those people became the festival Organising Committee. Key Informant 7 suggested that the festival coming from within the community was really important: “residents want to come up with the ideas themselves”. Key Informant 2 stated that the festival was largely run by the Organising Committee through volunteer hours. The festival planning was done by an Organising Committee over a three to four year period (Key Informant 6). The Organising Committee had two groups, an executive of ten people who met monthly from March 2010 until December 2010, and a working group which included the executive and 10-15 extra people which also met monthly; during 2011 the groups met weekly (Key Informant 4, Key Informant 6).

5.3.2 Developing Plans

The festival was developed as a 150th anniversary celebration and was therefore largely focused on heritage resources in the town. The Organising Committee created a ‘wish-list’ of activities, but Key Informant 4 stated that this was reduced through funding constraints, and in the end the choice of activities that occurred was influenced by whether community members were willing to take on running them. The Organising Committee also arranged a liquor ban through the main street (Key Informant 6). Key Informant 12 noted that the celebration focused on history and there were no activities that were not related to history and it lacked interactive activities (Key Informant 12).
The length of the festival and the scale of the planning required were described by Key Informant 6 as barriers to the success of the festival.

The planning was too big, a four day celebration was really too big. It should’ve been a day and half. We had the drama Friday night and that was really well supported, Saturday was really busy, we had the ball [on Sunday] we probably could’ve ended there. (Key Informant 6)

Key Informant 6 does admit that limiting the time could have slightly impacted on the number of people coming from the North Island but suggested it would have been a better event (Key Informant 6). Key Informant 16 was also concerned that it was done as a one-off and there was no planning for attracting long term benefits, “once it is done they forget about it” (Key Informant 16). Key Informant 16 stated that there was also a lack of future vision. Key Informant 6 suggested that the Organising Committee’s focus for much of the planning was on getting funding, to the detriment of relationships with the businesses and community (Key Informant 6).

5.3.3 Funding the Festival

Several key informants stated a visit by then Prime Minister Helen Clarke in 2008 had indicated that government funding would be available for the festival (Key Informant 1, Key Informant 2, Key Informant 6). However the change in government, the upcoming Rugby World Cup, the earthquake in Christchurch, the Pike River mining disaster, and the global recession, and difficulties meeting the criteria for grants from the Lotteries Commission were all cited as reasons that the festival was no longer a funding priority (Key Informant 1, Key Informant 2, Key Informant 4, Key Informant 6, Key Informant 10). “We had in the budget $100,000 sponsorship and we got $5,000” (Key Informant 6). Other proposed developments within the Clutha District, such as a new recreation centre, also reduced funding (Key Informant 1, Key Informant 4, Key Informant 6). Key Informant 6 suggested that business sponsorship was less than was expected because, as a result of the global recession, businesses were favouring long term investments rather than investing in a four day event (Key Informant 6). “For all other reasons I think it was incredibly successful but financially it wasn’t” (Key Informant 6).
5.3.4 Relationship Building

Throughout the planning of the festival the Organising Committee established relationships to manage aspects of the festival development.

5.3.4.1 Relationship with the Clutha District Council

The Council provided initial financial support to the festival committee of around thirty to thirty-five-thousand dollars and this served as an initial base of the relationship (Key Informant 1, Key Informant 2). The money came from the district development fund and so was paid for by all of the rate-payers in the Clutha District (Key Informant 2). Key informants stated that council support was focused on providing the opportunity to work with the district development manager and also to appoint a consultant during the planning of the festival (Key Informant 1, Key Informant 2). Key Informant 4 stated that the District Development Manager ensured that key government departments and community groups were aware of the festival, for example the New Zealand Transport Authority and the Department of Conservation (Key Informant 4). Once the funding issues were identified the Council also agreed to underwrite the festival (Key Informant 1). Key Informant 2 stated that the Council underwrote the festival because they wanted to ensure the event would go ahead despite the lack of funding.

5.3.4.2 Relationship with the Businesses

There was a perception among businesses that the Organising Committee did not try to get businesses involved in the festival, but also that the businesses did not see value in being involved (Key Informant 6, Key Informant 12, Key Informant 16). Some businesses perceived a good relationship with the Organising Committee, others felt they were not involved at all, and some did not get on board when given the opportunity (Key Informant 6, Key Informant 12, Key Informant 16).

Key Informant 6 stated that businesses, with the exception of a few, were not initially very supportive “they didn’t know it was going to be big and how much business it would bring”. There were difficulties for businesses to becoming actively involved in the festival, because any time they spent organising the festival was time that had to be taken out of
running the business (Key Informant 18). Key Informant 4 stated that support from outside businesses was also less than expected. Key Informant 6 expanded:

Most business are run out of Auckland they don’t care about Otago and they certainly don’t care about Lawrence, and even in Dunedin I think it’s the same, Lawrence is too far out in the country and they don’t really care (Key Informant 6).

Businesses that were first established in Lawrence, such as the rural BNZ bank, were not supportive when the Organising Committee had expected them to be (Key Informant 6).

5.3.4.3 Other Relationships

Event managers were employed by the Organising Committee to draw up plans and the budget as well as to run the events and put together the resource consents (Key Informant 6). The event managers were necessary because of the size of the project. The main resource planning issues were the marquees, traffic management (on the Gully road and managing traffic for the Chinese Camp on a State Highway), and parking at the Gully and these were handled by the event managers (Key Informant 6). Key Informant 6 and Key Informant 2 agreed that the festival planning was too big for just the community.

The Department of Conservation was also involved as the event took place on their land (Key Informant 6). Key Informant 6 stated that their role was predominantly in providing a concession to use the land and in ensuring the land was used in an appropriate way. The Department of Conservation also managed the relationship with the Historic Places Trust (recognising the site as a category 4 historic place at the festival) (Key Informant 6).

Table 5.1 demonstrates the relationships which the Organising Committee established, the focus of the relationships, and the development outcomes of these relationships.

**Table 5.1 Festival Organising Committee's Relationships with Other Stakeholders**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship with</th>
<th>Key focus</th>
<th>Key Development Achievements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department of Conservation (DOC)</td>
<td>Use of DOC land</td>
<td>• Upgrade of walking tracks on DOC land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• New Walking Track linking Lawrence to heritage resources at Gabriel’s Gully</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Businesses

#### Festival Participation
- Large turnover for many businesses, that would not have otherwise occurred to the same extent, that can be reinvested in the business

### Local organisations

(Brewery, Chinese Camp, Lions football club)

#### Festival Participation
- Large attendance and recognition for organisations that would not have otherwise occurred to the same extent and donations that can be reinvested in the developing the organisation
- Fundraising opportunity for activities during the festival

### Local Government

#### Festival Funding
- Funding for running the festival which provided direct economic benefits to local business as well as social benefits
- Council also invested in infrastructure upgrades, particularly a main street upgrade

---

Table 5.1 demonstrates that the relationships developed because of the festival and that there were direct development outcomes associated with establishing these relationships. While the Organising Committee themselves were largely Lawrence residents the committee’s relationship with the community in general was not seen as positive. The one-off nature of this event, and in particular the fact that the Organising Committee no longer exists, means that these relationships will not be maintained in the future.

#### 5.3.5 Communication Breakdown

Several key informants noted that the planning of the festival created a gap between the Organising Committee and the community, possibly due to a lack of communication (Key Informant 1, Key Informant 4, Key Informant 6). Key Informant 14 stated that “you need super human effective communication and that’s what failed with the 150th”. Key Informant 4 stated that an attempt was made to include representation for all members in
the community in the working party but this failed due to a lack of support at an early stage. Key Informant 6 suggested that the distance might have been created by the long planning process, three years out from the event few people wanted to be involved but the felt distanced when they weren’t involved at later stages (Key Informant 6). Even within the committee there was a perception that “executive committee decisions were made behind closed doors” (Key Informant 14) without consultation or accountability. Key Informant 10 stated that, after the initial public meeting, the Organising Committee tried to get more of the community involved by having two public meetings but there was poor attendance.

A key cause of tension in the community that was identified by Key Informant 1 was differing opinions about how the festival should be organised. Another cause of tension with the community was hiring event managers when the community wanted it to be locally organised and to keep the money within the community (Key Informant 6). The event managers were seen as necessary because of the scale of the event (Key Informant 6). Key Informant 6 stated that “even in the week before people out there in the community were quite negative about what was going on” (Key Informant 6).

You’ll get people that are negative in any community and I don’t think that’s the general rule: most people here are good people and they’re interested in the town and as I say it’s very easy to get a bit of negativity going amongst a few (Key Informant 10). Key Informant 6 suggested that more public meetings, and at different times, might have been helpful.

A council staff member stated that information about the festival was available through the chair of the Organising Committee, the district development manager, and the information centre (Key Informant 4). They suggested that often the perceived lack of information was due to community members failing to be proactive about accessing this information (Key Informant 4). Key Informant 10 stated that even a small amount of negativity in a small town threatened to ‘derail’ the planning, but it was a perception of bad planning rather than being unorganised. A key example of where the community believed incorrect information was members of the community suggesting a boycott of the Sesquicentennial Ball because of the presumption that the New Zealand Army Band was being paid to attend the festival,
when in reality the New Zealand Army Band was volunteering their services (Key Informant 4).

5.3.6 Role of Volunteers

Everyone, except for the event managers, were volunteers, they did not receive any training but gained skills associated with their tasks by doing them. “They learnt along the way” (Key Informant 6). Key Informant 4 expanded on the value of the volunteers:

I think that probably the greatest resource that Lawrence, the Clutha District and New Zealand as a whole has is the people that live within the communities and I just don’t think that they are recognised enough for what they do or supported enough for what they do (Key Informant 4).

Key Informant 4 noted that some funding was received and directed at compensating volunteers for costs such as petrol. However, Key Informant 18 stressed that many of those working as volunteers lost money because they had to take time away from their businesses to do it.

5.4 A Catalyst for Development

A key impact of the festival was that festival-related developments, which will have long-term benefits, occurred as a direct result of the festival (Key Informant 2). “The 150th did provide a catalyst for things to be done in Lawrence” (Key Informant 9). Both the community and the council undertook development in and around Lawrence because of the festival, and ensured that the work was completed in time for the event. This development includes a main-street upgrade, a new walking track, erecting new information boards on existing walking tracks, signage around Lawrence, information plaques on buildings, and installing a historic stamping battery at the mouth of Gabriel’s Gully. The development of facilities for the festival, such as the new walking track, will have long term benefits for the community.

5.4.1 Main Street Upgrade

A concept plan for an upgrade of the main street in Lawrence was developed between 2002 and 2004, but due to budget restrictions the work could not be funded (Shaw, 2011). Key Informant 2 stated that the festival was an incentive to explore the concept plan and,
with more available funding, provided a catalyst for the development. The upgrade included stone work for a bridge, new planter boxes, upgrading the entrance and signage to Gabriel’s Gully and new car parking (Shaw, 2011). According to Key Informant 2 the power cables were moved underground and a type of lamp posts were installed that were more in line with the historic feel of the main street.

The Community Board, a subgroup of the Clutha District Council, and the Community Company, a private, non-governmental, community-established enterprise, were both involved in the main-street upgrade. The Community Board was the driver of the project, and met with community groups in Lawrence and also undertook consultation with the community (Shaw, 2011). The Community Company was a key supporter of the upgrade and they assisted the Community Board with aspects of the upgrade including restoring and installing a historic stamping battery (see Figure 5.1) (Shaw, 2011).

Despite their ability to work together to finish the project, the two groups initially failed to communicate with each other and wasted resources. The Community Company decided to replace wine barrels, which were used as planter boxes, on the main street but did not communicate their plan with the Community Board (Key Informant 9). The Community
Board was, at the same time, applying to the Council to undertake the significant main-street upgrade but did not initially communicate this with the Community Company, and so had to take out the wine barrels only months after they were installed (Key Informant 9).

Key Informant 2 stated that the Council became involved in running the main street upgrade through the Community Board. “The Council sort of saw [the 150th celebration] as an opportunity to pull some work streams together that would hopefully leave some sort of legacy for Lawrence” (Key Informant 2). According to Key Informant 2, sixty-three percent of the main-street upgrade was funded by District rates. Funding the main-street development was also a significant commitment for the community. Submissions from the community on whether to undertake the underground lighting upgrade, for which they would have to contribute financially, were 60% in favour of the upgrade (Shaw, 2011). The development imposes an estimated rates increase of $4.85 per property, per year, over a 25 year period on home owners (Shaw, 2011)

An application to the New Zealand Community Board Conference 2011 Best Practice Awards, written on behalf of the Lawrence/Tuapeka Community Board and the Clutha District Council, cited a range of key factors for the success of the main street upgrade project (Shaw, 2011). A well developed relationship was established between the Community Board and the New Zealand Transport Authority (Shaw, 2011). Other factors listed by Shaw (2011) in the success were establishing a clear budget and available funding, and having committed staff at the Council.

Key Informant 1 thought that the street upgrade has had a big impact on the look of the town. Key Informant 8 expanded saying “It was lovely to see the town painted up and dressed up and looking beautiful, and that in itself makes people feel more confident and happy”. Initially there was some support for more radical changes, for example taking the stock trucks off the main road, shifting the road or having a shared user zone on the main street but these ideas were not viable because they ignored the primary function of the town, which is to serve farming (Key Informant 1). Key informants believe that the development provided new resources, and a new look for the town (Key Informant 2, Key Informant 6).
5.4.2 Walking Track

A walking track that connected Gabriel’s Gully to the Lawrence town centre was also created in time for the festival (Key Informant 2). Key Informant 1 stated that the idea was developed as a spin-off from clearing the site where Gabriel Read first discovered gold because a walking track added value to the proposal to tidy the area and encouraged the Otago Regional Council to be involved. The walking track was in place for the festival, but signage, a permanent bridge, and final tidying and flattening was still needed. The walking track was funded by both the Clutha District Council and the Otago Regional Council (Key Informant 2). Community volunteers undertook the work for the walking track, and it was a community and Community Board decision to go ahead with the project (Key Informant 2). Key informants believe that the development of the walking track provides a new resource for Lawrence that can be used by locals and visitors in the future (Key Informant 1, Key Informant 2, Key Informant 12, Key Informant 18).

5.4.3 Other Upgrades

Existing walking tracks were cleared and interpretative information was upgraded in Gabriel’s Gully (see Figure 5.2). Further related development was expected to be carried out by the Department of Conservation and the national government (Key Informant 6). Key informants believed that Helen Clarke had indicated that there would be a lot of support for the festival related development through the Department of Conservation because of the historic importance of Lawrence to the growth of New Zealand as a whole (Key Informant 2, Key Informant 6). There was an expectation in the community that the Department of Conservation would budget three million dollars to enhance Gabriel’s Gully and instead they only got one million (Key Informant 6).
Key Informant 6 also discussed the importance of the festival in providing financial support for Heritage sites in Lawrence that would benefit the sites in future. The Chinese Camp had 1200-2000 people through over the weekend, and the Brewery had its biggest turnover ever for a weekend (Key Informant 6). The Chinese Camp, Brewery and Heritage Centre raised money over the festival weekend that Key Informant 6 believes will have generated revenue that can be put back into looking after the heritage resources in Lawrence.

The Community Company was also involved in advertising, signage, and information boards on heritage buildings (Key Informant 9). There are a number of little heritage projects that continued throughout the festival (Key Informant 2).
5.5 The Festival Event

5.5.1 A Success

Key informants saw the event as a successful four-day weekend (Key Informants 1, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, and 13). It met the expectations of both the Council and the community. The site was very busy, especially the Heritage Centre (see Figure 5.3) (Key Informant 6). In particular, Key Informants 5 and 6 stated that the event attracted a largely older group of tourists, and they were wealthier and had less negative impacts than might have been expected. Key Informants 8, 10 and 16 stated that it was well organised, the event managers put it together professionally, and advertising reached further than local promoters might have been able to. However, one key informant noted that the advertising did not reach some nearby communities, and stated that some people visiting from these communities in weekends after the event had not known about the festival (Key Informant 12). A problem Key Informant 7 identified with the endogenous nature of the event was the inability to see issues from an outsider’s perspective such as the need for adequate signage to find their way around (Key Informant 7). However, Key Informant 2 stated that the celebrations will continue through Central Otago for three years, following the movement of miners in discovering gold, and the Lawrence celebration “set the bar really high” for the following celebrations to live up to (Key Informant 2).
5.5.2 Festival Events

The festival lasted for four days from Friday March 18\textsuperscript{th} until Monday March 21\textsuperscript{st} (see CDC, 2011b). It began with a production called “The Drama of Tuapeka” (see Figure 5.4) which was held outside in Gabriel’s Gully. It re-created the history of Lawrence from its mythical and geological beginnings through to the current agricultural practice.

This was followed by a performance by the Roxburgh Silver Band on the main street of Lawrence, and festival attendees were encouraged to get drinks or dinner at local bars and cafes. The official opening was held on the morning of Saturday March 19\textsuperscript{th}. Several key speakers introduced the reasons for the events, as well as addressing the Category One Historic Place status of the Gully, and launching a newly published book on the history of the area. Following the ceremony the general activities began.

Marquees were erected in Gabriel’s Gully and several of the festival events were held at the site (see Figure 5.3). General activities were available on Saturday, Sunday and Monday. These activities are listed in Table 5.2.

Table 5.2 Available Activities during the Lawrence 150\textsuperscript{th} Anniversary Celebrations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>What it involved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activities held in Gabriel’s Gully</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold Rush Heritage Centre</td>
<td>Large display of memorabilia (photographs and artefacts) associated with the Tuapeka Goldfields, commercial stalls selling items, other minor stalls all housed in a large marquee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock Cairn Memorial Time Capsule</td>
<td>Opportunity to contribute to a time capsule that will be opened in 2061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victorian Bicycle Camp</td>
<td>Opportunity to ride and receive lessons on penny farthings among other bicycles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretive Track</td>
<td>Walking track with interpretive information about the goldfield that overlooks the gully (open outside of the festival).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children’s activities including Merry-Go-Round and Otago Museum’s Great Gold Science Show and Gold Mask Making Workshop</td>
<td>A fundraiser Merry-Go-Round. Informative presentation on how gold is geologically created, and then mined and turned into jewellery. Mask making activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Stalls</td>
<td>A number of food stalls, both local and external businesses. Items include burgers chips and coffee. Other stall advertising local businesses in town.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pioneer Stories</td>
<td>Tales about the goldfields that have been passed down through families are told.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Old Time Games</td>
<td>Lawrence school children demonstrate 19th century games.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vintage Venture</td>
<td>Display of vintage cars (not held in Gabriel’s Gully)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold Panning Competition</td>
<td>Gold Panning Competition, using a pan in a barrel that has gold flakes in it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Stars of Orion’ Book Launch</td>
<td>A historic book focused on Gabriel’s gully is launched in association with the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities held in the surrounding area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tuapeka Vintage Club</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tuapeka Goldfields Museum</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hart’s Black Horse Brewery</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chinese Camp</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Historic Tour</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lawrence Cemetery Tour</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Glendhu Forest Tour</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One key informant questioned the significant promotion of the Chinese Camp in association with the festival (Key Informant 14). The Chinese arrival in Lawrence was significantly later than the initial gold rush (see section 4.4), and the informant felt that it may have led to a misrepresentation of the Chinese role in Lawrence, as well as reducing the role of other key sites such as Blue Spur and Weatherston’s Gully.

Two evening events were also held on Saturday and Sunday nights. The Swaggers Dance was held in the main marquee (See Figure 5.1) in Gabriel’s Gully and included dinner and drinks. The more formal Sesquicentennial Ball was also held in the marquee and the New Zealand Army Band performed. A three course dinner was provided.

The two final activities were held on Monday afternoon. Lawrence school children presented a dramatised version of Otago Gold Rush. This was directly followed by the Closing Ceremony. These events were held earlier than their scheduled time, possibly due to the somewhat dwindling crowd.
5.5.3 Festival Impacts

Environmental: Ensuring there was no negative lasting impact in the area was important to the organisers, and after the event there was very little evidence that it had taken place (Key Informant 6). Marquees had to be erected, and in order for the largest marquee to be erected an area of land was flattened (see Figure 5.3 and Figure 5.5) however this was done under the guidance of the Department of Conservation to ensure that there was no detriment to heritage resources (Key Informant 6). The main street upgrade increased amenity values in the town, and due to permanent information plaques on heritage buildings and other small upgrades in the town also increased the educational and promotion resources of the town (Key Informant 9). The upgrades to the walking tracks made them not only more accessible but also more enjoyable (Key Informant 1).

![Figure 5.5 Festival Site May 2011 showing Flattened Area (personal collection)](image)

Business Turnover: Key Informant 6 stated that the festival was not developed as an economic driver. However, many of the businesses had a large turnover, especially the cafes (Key Informants 1, 5, 6, 13 and 16). “We quadrupled the normal business we did it was unbelievable” (Key Informant 16). Some businesses also erected stalls at the festival site to encourage visitors to stop by their in-town shops. Key Informant 8 stated that
accommodation in Lawrence was full for the weekend, and that some businesses experienced increased turnover for a full week (Key Informant 8). The boutique shops also did well over the weekend, but in general weekends are the busiest time anyway (Key Informant 18). Key Informant 10 and Key Informant 11 stated that the festival was not particularly beneficial to businesses that were not related to hospitality or retail, except that it raised the town’s profile. The event was also a one-off and Key Informant 20 suggested that it might not have been very beneficial beyond the weekend turnover (Key Informant 20).

Social Cohesion: Key informants stated that the festival brought the community together (Key Informant 6, Key Informant 10) “I think the biggest outcome from the weekend itself is that Lawrence is feeling really good about itself its had a really successful event people have enjoyed it” (Key Informant 2). Key Informant 11 stated a key benefit of the festival was that it provided a lot of ‘community fun’. The community worked together during the festival to ensure the event was a success, and to promote the impression of a cohesive and successful community to outsiders, despite the underlying issues that still existed (Key Informant 14).

Town promotion: Key Informant 10 stated that the festival gained local and national media attention which focused on the unique heritage resources in Lawrence. According to Key informants it was successful in promoting the town to people who had not been to Lawrence before (Key Informant 1, Key Informant 2, Key Informant 15). Key informants thought the festival was good for promoting the resources Lawrence has to offer, especially the Brewery, Chinese Camp and other heritage resources (Key Informant 6, Key Informant 10, Key Informant 12). For those attending the festival, Key Informant 7 believed it encouraged them to venture off the main street and explore the wider area, as well as making them aware of the shopping opportunities (Key Informant 7). Several key informants stressed the importance of word-of-mouth promotion for a small town without a marketing budget (Key Informant 5, Key Informant 7, Key Informant 10). “It was really successful for raising the profile for Lawrence, we only got positive feedback from people that came to the weekend” (Key Informant 6). Key Informant 10 stated that Lawrence is good at sending people away with a good impression and the event was good at attracting people in the first place. However, Key Informant 10 was concerned that businesses,
especially the cafes, were unable to expand their facilities to provide for the large crowds, and that this created negative perceptions of the available services to visitors.

5.6 Summary: Key Findings
A key finding in this chapter is that the festival, despite being aimed at locals, attracted a large number of tourists from outside of the district. Festival attendees were also older and wealthier than at other events. A second key finding is that while the festival was not undertaken as an economic development measure, it contributed to economic development both in terms of direct benefit to businesses and also in terms of providing a catalyst for infrastructure development in the town and as a promotional tool. The festival highlighted the heritage resources available in Lawrence. A third key finding is that due to the large scale nature of the event, it was not entirely community driven. External event managers, as well as businesses, were involved in the event and this meant that some benefit streams were lost. It was also a cause of social tension. It is impossible to determine, in this study, whether the event could have been entirely internally run or whether a smaller event would have been more beneficial. Reliance on external funding also caused concern and placed an increased pressure on local government funding. The final key finding is that a lack of communication and cohesion threatened to derail the event.
6. Future Tourism Opportunities

6.1 Introduction

This chapter contains speculation by key informants on the future of tourism development in Lawrence. This chapter addresses aspects of the fourth research question: What is the local stakeholder’s perception of the effects of tourism development? Tourism is seen by many businesses as the future for Lawrence, particularly after the success of the festival (Key Informant 6, Key Informant 13, Key Informant 15). “I think that’s where the future lies, in tourism” (Key Informant 15). The perceptions of future tourism and the barriers to the implementation of future tourism are outlined in this chapter. The perception of those interviewed towards future tourism development is positive in a similar way to the perceived positive impacts of the festival. The planned bike trail development is predicted to attract families, whom are seen as the ‘right’ kind of tourists. However, there are significant barriers to the future development of tourism in Lawrence including lack of appropriate accommodation, missing opportunities and lack of cohesion. The festival has demonstrated the ability for the Lawrence community to attract tourists, and this provides a base of explore future tourism options.

6.1.1 Perceptions of Future tourism opportunities

The perceived impacts of tourism are positive and increasingly tourist numbers are seen as valuable (Key Informant 15, Key Informant 16). Socially, tourism can provide a platform for developing understanding between people and for protection of culture such, as heritage (Quality Planning online, 2006c). Tourism can provide for environmental
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protection, as many of the values associated with environmental protection can generate income through tourists visiting environmentally protected areas (Quality Planning online, 2006c). However, as Key Informant 4 stated, tourism cannot be seen as a reliable or stable industry.

Tourism is a fickle beast and I’m not all together sure that all developments for a place like Lawrence should be based on tourism because tourists come and go and actually tourism businesses and tourism employment tends to be quite low paid (Key Informant 4).

In Lawrence, there is some recognition of the negative impacts related to some tourism activities, but due to the type of tourism in Lawrence (attracting a relatively old and wealthy group of tourists) the benefits and ease of mitigation of negative impacts are seen to outweigh these (Key Informant 11, Key Informant 20). Tourism can detrimentally affect areas through increased visitation and the demand placed on resources (Quality Planning online, 2006c). Key Informant 18 stated “I wouldn’t like to see this place like Arrowtown. It will get busier, but it’s a lifestyle place”. Key Informant 5 agreed stating that keeping Lawrence ‘quaint’ was important and that sprawl and development have ruined other areas like Arrowtown and Clyde, both of which are small towns in Central Otago. Arrowtown is a gold-heritage tourism destination which has potentially been ‘over-developed’.

Key Informant 4 suggested that the nature of event tourism means that several key weekends (those with events) accrue the majority of the tourism income in Lawrence. It is argued that the community would however benefit from more regular visitors (Key Informant 4). Key Informant 4 was also concerned that many towns on State-Highway 8 attempt to claim that they are the gateway to Central Otago, and instead Lawrence needed to differentiate itself by advertising its unique assets (Key Informant 4). According to Key Informant 14, Lawrence has the potential to be recognised “as the foundation for all that New Zealand is today”, especially in terms of being the foundation for the wealth that allowed New Zealand to develop.

Key Informant 2 stated that the key role for the Clutha District Council in future development is in supporting community led initiatives. Key Informant 7 also believes that there is a role for the Council to provide financial support for future development initiatives. Neither of these two Key informants suggested that the Council should initiate
or drive initiatives (Key Informant 2, Key Informant 7). However Key Informant 4 believed that the gold heritage should have a central place in future planning by the Council because of the potential for recreational development. The Council’s Development Committee is cited as a key source of support for new tourism development (Key Informant 17).

Private enterprise investments from outsiders are important for the future development of tourism in the town (Key Informant 7, Key Informant 10). “People from outside coming in with funds is kind of how this town does survive” (Key Informant 7). Key Informant 10 stated that one large investment could establish a strong tourism base, but this is unlikely to happen because few projects with large investment costs create a payoff. The uncertain nature of business in Lawrence is another factor identified by Key Informant 10 that may be preventing outside business investment. The planned bike trail is identified as one project that would provide more certainty for business development, especially as the funding for the development is available from national government (Key Informant 10).

6.1.2 Bike Trail Development

Many of the businesses believe the future of Lawrence relies on connecting Lawrence to Roxburgh through an extensive bike trail development (Key Informant 6, Key Informant 10, Key Informant 12, Key Informant 15). Funding for the bike trail was approved on July 6, 2010 and resource consents were approved on September 16th, 2011 (de Reus and Van Kempen, 2011; NZ cycle trail online, 2011). The planned bike trail has two day-long stages and is a total of 75 kilometres (NZ cycle trail online, 2011). It is identified as one project that would provide more certainty for business development, especially as the funding for the development is available from national government (Key Informant 10). Key Informant 10 stated that the bike trail would be similar to the Otago Central Rail Trail, and would have the possibility of connecting to the Otago Central Rail Trail through Alexandra in the future (NZ cycle trail online, 2011). “The Lawrence community see it as essential to the economic wellbeing of the main street” (Key Informant 4). Many confuse this bike trail with a rail trail because of the connection and similarities to the Otago Central Rail Trail. Key Informant 10 believes that the bike trail development is a key decision that will shape the development of Lawrence over the next 20-50 years. The
businesses in the community are all in favour of the bike trail, and seem dependent on its development:

We are so so hoping for the rail trail and that will definitely be the making of Lawrence again, that’s just got to happen (Key Informant 3)

If the rail trail doesn’t come through we will stagnate a bit and businesses will really struggle (Key Informant 5)

The rail trail is really vital because without it the town will go backwards...without that we are in for a pretty rough time (Key Informant 10)

We’re all hanging out for that rail trail...if we don’t get it there will be some people here who won’t hang around (Key Informant 11)

The bike trail is vital. I believe firmly that that is vital (Key Informant 12)

For the rail trail we’re thinking that’s good, that’s the tourists you do want ‘cause its families and all age people that do it, but you might not want a rock festival or something here I don’t think all tourism is good definitely not (Key Informant 11).

Key informants believe the bike trail will attract investment, prompt development and create jobs and therefore change the future for Lawrence (Key Informant 1, Key Informant 10, Key Informant 11, Key Informant 12)

At the time this research was conducted there was very little preventing the development of the bike trail. After the research was conducted the resource consent for the trail was approved (September 16, 2011), further reducing the barriers. Key informants noted difficulties determining the route for the trail because of the need to obtain 100m of land to connect the trail where land owners refused access and that planning for the trail stopped while the organisers were forced to find a way around the land (Key Informant 1, Key Informant 10, Key Informant 12). Key Informant 12 and Key Informant 13 specified that the key difficulty for this trail, as opposed to the Central Otago trail and other trails, is that it is dealing with accessing private land rather than public land. In an article publicising the approval of resource consents, it was made clear that “The trail will be built on public road reserve in areas where there were issues over use of private land” (de Reus and Van Kempen, 2011: 11). Key Informant 12 expanded saying:

The farmers are stopping it because they don’t want to give up their land and because they believe the rate payers will have to pay a lot of money for it, but the bike trail group is working around that and so there is hope for it to still happen (Key Informant 12).
However, this barrier appears, to some extent, to be overcome as one key informant stated that the route has now been finalised with the New Zealand Transport Agency and that this meant that national government funding was in place (Key Informant 4). The article suggests that there may still be an issue with the width of the road reserve in one area (de Reus and Van Kempen, 2011). Key Informant 10 stated that there is national government funding available, and the Central Otago District Council and the local council have, in partnership, funded a feasibility study. “The Clutha District Council is really clear that it’s got enormous potential for the district, and have put a lot of time and effort into providing expertise” (Key Informant 4).

Key informants believed the bike trail could be developed and functional within three years of obtaining resource consent, but it will possibly to take longer than this (Key Informant 4, Key Informant 10). However Key Informant 4 expanded saying “there is still a lot of money to be raised from philanthropic sources to make it happen it is a huge project and I honestly don’t know how long it is going to take” (Key Informant 4). As with many development projects in Lawrence, Key Informant 4 stated that the trail is being developed by a trust that is comprised of volunteers and expertise can only be brought in on a limited basis when enough money is raised.

6.1.2.1 Impacts of Bike Trail Development Connecting with the Otago Central Rail Trail

The tourism potential associated with the bike trail is seen as “the perfect kind of tourism because there is no impact on the environment” and because the tourists “have money to spend” (Key Informant 5). The increase in business will also create new business opportunities that can feed off each other (Key Informant 4). It will attract people to stay overnight, at which point the Chinese Camp, Gabriel’s Gully and historic buildings become more viable as tourism ventures (Key Informant 10, Key Informant 17). Key Informant 10 stated “If there is another activity that will deliver the number of visitors that the rail trail will for the price I don’t know about it”.
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The Otago Central Rail Trail has shown economic and social benefits for the communities connected by it (Blackwell, 2002). Key Informant 1 stated that the bike trail will also provide a new transport industry, as at the end of the line there will need to be a way for users to get back to their cars at Middlemarch, and there are opportunities to see other goldfield sites on that transport route. However, Key Informant 4 stated that as with the festival development, the benefit to the community will largely be determined by their support and involvement in the development. “It depends a lot on how the residents of Lawrence choose to pick up on what happens” (Key Informant 4).

6.1.3 Barriers to Future Tourism Development

6.1.3.1 Missing opportunities

Key Informant 16 was concerned that the community is missing opportunities for tourism by sitting back and ‘letting it happen’. Some advertising misses the opportunity to market more of the town, such as listing information centre open hours in the Otago Daily Times newspaper but not identifying other attractions (Key Informant 8). Key Informant 12 stated that only a few people in the town are actively promoting the town and tourism, rather than the whole community getting behind it at the start to get better outcomes (Key Informant 12). Several key informants mentioned that development and new ideas are hindered by ‘small town thinking’ and ‘small town attitudes’ (Key Informant 12, Key Informant 7).

6.1.3.1.1 Outdoor Recreation

Key informants discussed the potential for developing existing resources into a tourism industry (Key Informant 6, Key Informant 12, Key Informant 14, Key Informant 16). The goldfields, historic buildings and Chinese Camp were all cited as resources in Lawrence that are not being actively promoted or used by tourists (Key Informant 3, Key Informant 6, Key Informant 12, Key Informant 16). Key Informant 8 suggested that “If there was a bit more on offer here they would possibly stay longer”. According to Key Informant 4 the Chinese Camp “has the potential to be enormously beneficial to Lawrence” but requires investment and expertise from the Chinese community to be developed. Adequate information was a key barrier to their current use as suggested by Key Informant 16. A lack of information about the heritage and tourism resources was evident at the festival
6. Future Tourism Opportunities

(Key Informant 16). Outdoor tourism activities suggested by Key informants include scenic tours, walking tracks and biking tracks (Key Informant 8, Key Informant 17). It was recognised that the town has a base in middle-aged and campervan tourism but does not attract younger people due to the lack of “adventure activities” (Key Informant 7).

6.1.3.1.2 Heritage Buildings

Key informants were concerned that the heritage buildings are not being taken care of. As they are a significant tourism resource they feel the buildings should be maintained and looked after but they also understand that the buildings are privately owned (Key Informant 5, Key Informant 9, Key Informant 11). “This is such a historical little town and we should be capitalising on that” (Key Informant 5). The Clutha District Plan recognises the economic potential, in terms of tourism, of heritage buildings and heritage features in its explanation of Policy HER.5 (CDC, 1998). Key informants believe the opportunity for utilising the resources is being wasted by lack of development and promotion (Key Informant 11, Key Informant 16).

6.1.3.2 Accommodation Provision

Key Informant 10 stated that attracting people to stay for longer, especially overnight, is the next step after the cafe and shops development and is achievable through tourism development, such as the planned bike trail (Key Informant 10). At present many tourists would simply pass through Lawrence because of the small distance to other centres (Dunedin and Queenstown), but new development such as the bike trail may change this. A barrier to this development, commonly referred to by the key informants, was a lack of appropriate accommodation (Key Informants 7, 10, 12, 13, 19). Key Informant 10 stated that a lot of the accommodation in town has fallen below the standard that the current day-trip, cafe-culture, tourists would want and used Jafas Motel (in Lawrence) as an example of the level the other accommodation needs to be at in terms of service and aesthetic appeal. Lawrence also needs more accommodation if they are going to be a tourism destination (Key Informant 13, Key Informant 19). Key Informant 7 expanded this idea saying there is also a limited variety of accommodation options, and a lack of self-contained accommodation. “We really lack accommodation, our biggest problem is
accommodation” (Key Informant 7). Key Informant 3 stated that new accommodation development will not happen instantly, but will grow to meet the number of people visiting Lawrence, and that there is already new accommodation going in. Key Informant 8 suggested that the large investment cost is a key barrier to internal businesses establishing new tourism activities or accommodation. Newly established accommodation is perceived to have raised the standard of accommodation to match the kind of people already coming on day trips for coffees and cakes, which will encourage longer stays (Key Informant 10). Key Informant 8 and Key Informant 3 stated that, at present, new accommodation is being built.

6.1.3.3 Cohesion

Lack of community cohesion was identified, by key informants, as another barrier to future tourism development (Key Informant 4, Key Informant 14).

One of the things that Lawrence has really struggled with is having a combined vision that everyone can buy into and while that’s not the be all and end all I think it would stop a lot of the bickering and a lot of the groups heading off in their own direction (Key Informant 4).

Key Informant 9 and Key Informant 14 stated that the community does not work together towards a single goal and instead focuses on achieving development on an individual basis. “Too many people are going and doing the good of Lawrence in their own way and not listening or being open to listen either” (Key Informant 14). Key Informant 14 expanded by explaining that there is a lack of recognition that farming and tourism work together to support the community.

Key Informant 11 and Key Informant 5 state that it is difficult for businesses to coordinate through meetings because most are owned and operated by only one or two people. To participate in meetings the owners must reduce leisure time with family or business operating hours (Key Informant 11). Key Informant 13 stated that Lawrence businesses lack a cohesive business strategy for the whole community and often fail to work together. Key Informant 13 suggested that a business strategy could provide opportunities such as managing the seasonal decrease in visitors over winter by a rotational closure (each cafe closes for one day a week) and instead all of the cafes remain open and loose money. New businesses stated that there is conflict with families that have been in the town for many
years face in terms of agreeing how best to achieve their goals (Key Informant 14). Some community members will not accept suggestions for change (Key Informant 14).

Key Informant 9 stated that the lack of cohesion is particularly evident in the lack of coordination between the many community groups in Lawrence. Key Informant 9, rather controversially, suggested that the groups have “small minded amateurs that bumble along and don’t really achieve a lot collectively and I think a lot of that is because we don’t have the political expertise to achieve it”. A community coordinator, or a strategy that indicates how different groups can work together, was identified as a possible driver of future development in Lawrence (Key Informant 4, Key Informant 14). As Key Informant 9 explained

I think that people really do need to work together I think that there needs to be communication and cooperation between the many different groups that exist in this relatively small town and if there was debate and discussion collectively amongst those groups there may be more constructive progress achieved.

Key Informant 14 indicated the importance of presenting a unified community voice to the Council to ensure that the most important or most beneficial ideas are addressed within the community and then presented. However Key Informant 4 suggested:

New Zealand’s tall poppy syndrome indicates that really someone needs to come in from outside who has some sort of reputation and makes everyone sit up and say that this is the person to come in and say yes this is the type of person to sort Lawrence out because there is a lot of people in that community perfectly capable of doing it but it will never be accepted because there is always agendas (Key Informant 4).

Key Informant 9 suggested a committee should be established because there would be resentment of a single person, because of personal tension, or the social or financial position of the person, agendas and egos. “You probably would really need another committee with members from all of these organisations and do it that way” (Key Informant 9). Key Informant 4 also recognised that this is not a problem that is unique to Lawrence, but is present in many small towns.

### 6.2 Summary: Key Findings

The first key finding is that there is potential for future tourism development in Lawrence. If the planned bike trail does go ahead there is expected to be an influx of tourists. The opportunities for utilising the economic benefits need to be capitalised on. In particular
information need to be provided to tourists (a pamphlet) and existing businesses need to work together to meet the demands of the new tourism group. The second key finding is that key informants can identify barriers to development. These barriers are the lack of appropriate accommodation, missing opportunities and lack of cohesion. Key informants expect accommodation provision to grow to meet demand in the event there is a tourist influx. The reality that the community misses opportunities and the lack of community cohesion are key aspects that the community as a whole needs to address and key informants suggest these could be addressed through business or community strategies.
7. Discussion

7.1 Introduction
The aim of this research was, through a case study, to assess the role of tourism as a driver for local economic development in small towns in New Zealand, and the impact which tourism has on local communities. This study found that tourism may be a viable driver for current local economic development in Lawrence providing a substitute for the decreasing agricultural income. In particular the anniversary festival, held in March 2011, not only provided significant short term economic benefits to businesses in Lawrence but also provided a level of infrastructure investment that, although modest, will benefit tourism in Lawrence in the future. A number of underutilised heritage resources were also identified by local stakeholders.

Specific methods for achieving local economic development are rarely equally applicable in different contexts because of the local nature of unique local contexts and the situational appropriateness of local economic development strategies (Blakely, 1989). The results of this study have two related limitations. First, they are only applicable in the context of Lawrence and further research would be required to establish the relevance of these findings for other small towns in New Zealand. Specific characteristics that are important for these findings in Lawrence that may differ from other small towns are the location of the town on a State Highway, its available heritage resources, the motivated community, and the presence of manufacturing industry in the town. Second, the study focused on organisations and businesses and so the findings exclude a key group in the community, namely the residents. Throughout this study tourism is considered both in a general sense, and with specific reference to tourism resources.
Chapter 7. Discussion

The focus of this chapter is exploring the results of the Lawrence experience relative to previous literature, and broader frameworks. This chapter discusses the research objectives, which directly relate to the research questions, by applying the Lawrence experience to the wider theoretical framework. The chapter is structured around discussion of the key findings in each research objective in relation to relevant literature.

The first research objective is to ‘explore the context of tourism development in Lawrence’. Key contextual factors that contributed to the development of tourism in Lawrence are that in the face of the 1980s downturn Lawrence has diversified income streams into both manufacturing and, largely due to the location on state-highway 8, hospitality. Lawrence has also retained a number of key services. Planning documents and the local council are largely permissive, and are supportive of new business development.

The second research objective is to ‘discuss the implementation of tourism development in Lawrence’. The key concern surrounding further implementation of tourism development is a lack of cohesion, communication and cooperation within the Lawrence community, coupled with a lack of immediate financial support. A secondary concern is that the negative impacts of development, such as congestion, lifestyle and environment changes, may not be fully anticipated or understood by those in Lawrence.

The third research objective is to ‘understand the roles of different groups in tourism development in Lawrence’. Various groups were identified as playing a key role in the implementation of tourism development. However these groups did not always work together or understand the role of other groups.

The final research objective is to ‘consider the local stakeholder’s perception of tourism development in Lawrence’. The Lawrence business community perceived the effects of tourism development on the community as positive, with no negative impacts identified. However, business owners indicated that high levels of tourism, like those in Arrowtown, would not be desirable.
7.2 Objective One: Explore the Context of Tourism Development in Lawrence

7.2.1 Introduction

The context in which Lawrence began to develop tourism was endogenous and as a replacement activity for declining agricultural wealth. Lawrence has only recently begun to develop tourism activities. This study demonstrates that tourism developments, such as cafes, have provided for local economic development following agricultural decline. This section discusses how reduced government support for agriculture created a need for new business. This section will also address links between reduced government support, based on neoliberal policy, and endogenous, community-driven development. Location specific resources that aided the development of tourism in Lawrence, such as the festival, location on State Highway 8, heritage resources and the future bike trail resource, are then explored. Finally, general tourism development is explored.

7.2.2 Reduced Government Support

Previous studies have indicated that reduced government support for agriculture led to rural decline in New Zealand (Higham and Ritchie, 2001; Wilson, 1995) (see section 2.2.2). The New Zealand government floated exchange rates, removed import licences, significantly reduced agricultural subsidies, tax incentives and price controls, and deregulated the agricultural sector (Wilson, 1995). Deregulation of the agricultural sector, in combination with rising interest rates and inflation and falling global commodity prices meant farmers received significantly less income (Wilson, 1995). Previously identified changes in rural communities include out-migration, increased unemployment, reduced services and economic decline (Higham and Ritchie, 2001). These general changes were paralleled in Lawrence (see section 4.5.1). In particular the combination of reduced support for agriculture and a reduction in forestry jobs meant that there was not only less money for those sector-specific workers but also a reduction in flow-on spending to local businesses and services. This has affected the entire community because of the historically strong reliance on agricultural and forestry wealth (see sections 4.4.4 and 4.5).

Rural communities faced reduced investment as the outflow of government resources was
not matched by an inflow of private investment (Scott and Pawson, 1999; Wilson, 1995). Despite this general trend, Lawrence has managed to maintain many of its services and, as well as this, has had large private investment in community activities such as providing free wireless internet and international phone calls (see section 4.5.2). In this sense, Lawrence has a clear advantage over other small rural communities.

As discussed in previous studies, between 1984 and 1999 government restructuring, a belief in free-market economics, and a reliance on local government to support communities underpinned the growth of strong community driven development (Willis, 2008). Communities that were suffering the most from the reduced support were forced to develop systems for self-reliance and self-promotion (Willis, 2008). In Lawrence the Community Company was established and along with other members of the community fought to maintain services, such as a police officer, through fundraising and by taking a united voice to the local government (see section 4.5.3). The community-based initiation of local economic development policies can be beneficial in that the strategies rely on the resources, skills and target needs of the community (Eversole, 2003). Lawrence demonstrates the ability of a community to develop self-reliance in the face of agricultural decline. However, community driven developments often have less capital, skills, and planning than government driven initiatives (Davis and Morals, 2004; Eversole, 2003).

7.2.3 Exogenous and Endogenous Development

Jones (2008) states that exogenous local economic development policies, which focus on attracting outside businesses to a new area through measures such as providing incentives, reducing barriers to development or offering tax reductions, are often less successful in the long term than endogenous policies because businesses are happy to move on when they get a better offer. Tourism development in Lawrence has been led by the community, and thus, is largely endogenous (see section 4.5 and 4.6). Endogenous policies suggest supporting already established local businesses which are less likely to move on (Courtney and Errington, 2001). The Clutha District Council appears to be out of step with this general trend in that its main goal is that of creating an attractive business environment (see section 4.7). In particular the Council is focused on supporting business initiation, which centres on attracting new business (usually from outside the community) rather than
long term business support which would focus on businesses with established links to the community. Key informants only mentioned council support for establishing business, such as leasing council buildings to new businesses, and did not mention ongoing business support. However it is important to recognise that the Clutha District differs from other areas because of the dominant agriculture industry. Support for farmers, rather than in-town businesses, is seen as the appropriate form of economic support required for the district due to this difference. This may be the reason for a perceived lack of endogenous support in the district.

It is accepted that local economic development policies should focus on the resources, skills and needs of the specific community discussed (Blakely, 1989). Lawrence possesses key resources that could be used to enhance economic development such as its heritage resources. Many of the heritage resources are significant on a national scale (for example Lawrence was the location of both the first discovery of payable gold in New Zealand and the site where the national anthem was written), as well as having resources that are significant to an international community (for example the Chinese Camp) (see section 4.6).

Scott and Pawson (1999) suggest that the basis for changes to government support in the 1980s was a belief that local communities should develop according to their local resources and potential. Similarly, economic location theory states that an area must have some advantage over other areas in order to attract business. This is demonstrated by Lawrence’s new cafe market which relies on traffic from State Highway 8 (see section 4.6.1). The location on State Highway 8 gives Lawrence an advantage that is especially evident with the number of cafes and boutique shops available in what is a small, largely rural, community. Without the volume of traffic through the main street that is created by its location, many of these businesses would not have a large enough market to be viable. This is part of the contextual situation that led Lawrence to begin to develop tourism.

7.2.4 Location-Specific Local Economic Development Resources

Lawrence possesses a number of location-specific resources that can be utilised for tourism and as drivers for local economic development. The 150th anniversary festival was
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a key example of a local economic development resource. Heritage, which was the focus of the festival, is another resource that can provide for tourism-led local economic development (see section 5.5.3). The development of these resources is explored in this section, and the potential benefits of the associated, planned bike trail development are also discussed.

7.2.4.1 Festival’s as a Local Economic Development Resource

Local economic development can be seen as the use of local resources, managed through relationships between local government, the community, and private business, to achieve the development of a community (Blakely, 1989; Kolo and Watson, 1992; Rogerson, 2002b). In the case of Lawrence the festival Organising Committee established relationships with businesses, local government and the Department of Conservation that directly led to investment in Lawrence (see section 5.3.4). The relationships that were developed by the Organising Committee led to infrastructure investment in Lawrence, as well as attracting a new tourism market for the local businesses. The one-off nature of this event, and in particular the fact that the Organising Committee no longer exists, means that these relationships will not be maintained in the future. Successful local economic development relies on long-term capacity building rather than on a “quick fix” (Blakely, 1989; Eversole, 2003; Gorin, 2008). In this case the relationships built during the running of the festival will not be maintained in the future to allow for collaboration on future development, demonstrating that long-term capacity building is vital for sustaining local economic development.

Infrastructure development has been documented as being a long term positive environmental outcome of festivals (Arcodia and Whitford, 2006; Hodur and Leistritz, 2006; O’Sullivan and Jackson, 2002). While infrastructure investment was a key element for the festival the infrastructure development was focused on providing activities for tourists, and on enhancing the amenity of the main street (sees section 5.4). This investment will aid in attracting tourists to Lawrence in the long-term and may benefit the hospitality related business but it does so in an indirect manner as opposed to providing infrastructure investment directly related to running, managing or maintaining the
One example of this latter form of investment could have been in insulating buildings to reduce heating costs.

Town promotion is another key long term benefit of festivals (Brennan-Horley, et al., 2007; Higham and Ritchie, 2001). In this case town promotion was perceived as a significant outcome, although a local ‘feel-good’ factor was also seen as important (see section 5.5.3). Many of the businesses did identify that the festival raised the profile of Lawrence and was in many media news stories. The festival attracted new visitors, as well as demonstrating the infrastructure upgrades to people who had visited before.

Hodur and Leistritz (2006) have demonstrated that benefit streams may not be fully utilised when outside businesses are invited to operate at a festival as their flow-on spending will not be within the community. Outside businesses were allowed to operate at the festival, including in roles that could potentially be undertaken by local business, such as supplying coffee (see section 5.5.2). However, local businesses may not have had the equipment needed to operate at the festival site, and so outside businesses may have been necessary.

Davidson and Schaffer (1980) found that volunteers’ time and expenses are often not recognised when assessing the costs and benefits of a festival. A key concern is the lack of recognition of volunteers’ time associated with running the festival event in Lawrence (see section 5.3.6). The time and effort of volunteers involved in the festival was recognised by local businesses, and some of their expenses, such as petrol, were partially funded through lottery grants. However the time of the volunteers was not paid for. Their efforts were seen as some-what expected, rather than valued necessarily, especially as it was their choice to participate. Without volunteers the festival would not have been a success or provided benefits to the local businesses.

Negative noise effects and environmental degradation are recognised as common short term effects of festivals (O’Sullivan and Jackson, 2002). No key informants identified negative noise effects. Some environmental change occurred as a result of needing to flatten an area in the gully to hold the large marquee (see section 5.5.3). However this change was closely managed by the Department of Conservation, and was not an extensive
change. The festival site was returned to the original state after the festival, except for the flattened land. The implementation of walking tracks and the upgrade of information signage available can be seen as positive environmental effects. Other negative effects such as overcrowding and crime, which have been documented in association with the holding of festivals (Yolal, et al., 2009), were not reported by any of the key informants.

7.2.4.2 Heritage as a Local Economic Development Resource

Heritage resources can provide significant tourism and recreation resources that are of long term benefit and under increasing demand (Nuryanti, 1996; Prideaux and Kininmont, 1999; Taylor, et al., 1993). Studies by Svensson (2009) and Chang (1997) identify cases where the development of heritage tourism is undertaken by a local community and suggest that this shows benefits to local communities from heritage tourism development including empowerment, community cooperation, community pride and an appreciation of their heritage and culture. Key informants in Lawrence were concerned with the lack of heritage development as a resource for the town (see sections 4.6.2 and 6.1.3.1). This shows both appreciation and pride in heritage resources but also demonstrates a lack of cooperation and empowerment locally.

Heritage ownership is identified in the literature as a factor that may cause dissonance. Hampton (2005) stated that while a heritage site may be privately owned, often the local community or the general public still perceive some level of ownership. Similar concerns were raised in this study (see section 6.1.3.1.2). Key informants identified privately owned heritage buildings that were not being maintained. They felt powerless to do anything that would result in the buildings being maintained, and made available as heritage resources, because they were not public buildings.

There are significant concerns that the development of heritage tourism has led to inauthentic representations of history and culture (Chang, 1997; Cossons, 1989). One key informant suggested the role of the Chinese in the early development of Lawrence may have been misrepresented by the significant promotion of the Chinese Camp in association with the 150th celebration festival (see section 5.5.2).
Visitors to heritage sites have been suggested as a particularly attractive tourism market (Taylor, et al., 1993). In Lawrence the tourism market, especially associated with the festival, was identified as being an attractive market because relatively old visitors are seen to generate greater expenditure and less disruptive behaviour (see section 5.5.1).

7.2.4.3 The Planned Bike Trail as a Future Local Economic Development Resource

The Lawrence bike trail is not specifically a rail trail but many aspects of the planned development are similar. The bike trail may be connected to the well-established Otago Central Rail Trail in the future, and there is no reason to believe it would not be used in a similar way. The planned bike trail was not developed or operational during this study and therefore only limited concrete statements can be drawn from this study.

The most important aspect to note was that the Lawrence community firmly believes that the bike trail will provide significant benefits (see section 6.1.2). The benefits to local communities from rail trails and other similar bike trails that have been identified by the community and in previous studies include: recreation/wellbeing, exercise/health, attracting tourists and business creation and development, social interaction (with tourists), heritage education and appreciation, social revitalisation and public facilities upgrades, and cohesion with other communities on the trail (Blackwell, 2002; Bowker, et al., 2007; Cosslett, et al., 2004; Siderelis and Moore, 1995). Many of these benefits were received during the festival event, particularly attracting tourists, and heritage education and appreciation (see section 5.5). These previously demonstrated benefits in other cases indicate that the Lawrence community does not have unrealistic expectations about benefit potential. Studies showed that these benefits were increased when businesses were proximate to the trail, businesses were listed in a guide book associated with the trail, and when local communities could attract overnight stays (Bowker, et al., 2007; Stewart and Barr, 2005). If the bike trail is developed it is important that the opportunity for the benefits is utilised, especially in terms of taking on board lessons from previous developments.

It will also be vitally important for both the community and planners to understand
possible negative impacts. Negative impacts associated with rail trails are competition between users (walkers and trail bikes), disturbance caused to neighbouring land owners (noise), and competition for space between local land owners and tourists (Cosslett, et al., 2004). Negative impacts on neighbouring landowners have already caused issues with the Lawrence bike trail development (see section 6.1.2). Competition for space has impacted on the planned bike route, has led to delays in its development, and caused tension in the community.

This section has demonstrated that a key aspect that has led to tourism development in Lawrence is the existence of location-specific resources that can be utilised for tourism. The heritage resources remain relatively underdeveloped and the bike trail has not yet been implemented, demonstrating that, in terms of available resources, there is still a large potential for further tourism development. However with all of these resources there is the potential for dissonance. In particular the bike trail faced issues of competition for space, and heritage resources have been to some extent misrepresented.

### 7.2.5 Tourism as a Local Economic Development Resource

The previous section explored how location specific resources are being utilised in Lawrence and the potential effects of using these resources for tourism-led local economic development. In this section the broader principles of tourism, as a general local economic development resource, is discussed.

A study by Lawson (et al. 1998) stated that while there was a belief that, in general, tourism was good for New Zealand’s economy there was little evidence of tourism providing direct benefits to individuals (Lawson, et al., 1998). In Lawrence many business owners identified a direct financial benefit from tourists passing through Lawrence and visiting their shops (see section 4.6). They also suggested that there would be far fewer businesses without the tourism trade. These businesses benefit the community in Lawrence in terms of customer choice as well as in providing jobs. In Lawrence the promotion of tourism is largely a community operation for local business benefit.
Activities for tourists are a key area that must be expanded to attract longer stays. A study by Taylor et al. (1993) found that tourists visiting heritage sites were more likely to be passing through than to be undertaking overnight stays. A range of activities will attract tourists to stay longer, especially a range of activities for those within a group that have different interests. At present Lawrence offers walking tracks, boutique shops, a museum and a key heritage site (see section 4.6). Developing the heritage site could provide significant benefits in attracting longer stays, at present display boards at the site provide some information about the Gully and the miners experience in the Gully. More information, direction to key features, direction to neighbouring sites (Blue Spur and Weatherston’s Gully), and a description of the interaction of these sites could mean that tourists choose to spend more time in the area.

Many of the business in Lawrence struggle (see section 4.5.3) and it is suggested that this is because the tourism market is focused on day-trippers rather than overnight guests who have been shown to have a larger economic impact. Transferring day-trip tourists to an overnight market is a key area that could provide significant benefits to Lawrence. In particular it is important to recognise that many key informants identified a lack of appropriate accommodation, or of choice in accommodation.

A key drawback of utilising tourism activity for development is in the seasonal nature of tourism business (Duval, 2004). A study by Duval (2004) found that in Central Otago tourism businesses anticipated and managed the seasonal trading fluctuations. Seasonal business is already a key issue in Lawrence, with at least one tourism related business closing over winter and many others stating that profits need to be made in summer to cover the winter months (see section 4.6.5). Further developing the tourism industry is likely to amplify rather than remedy this issue.

Tourism development has the potential to dramatically alter a location and can make an area less attractive to the original community (Walmsley, 2003). Many key informants stated that while they see tourism development as a positive thing in Lawrence, they did not want to see Lawrence become ‘like Arrowtown’ (see section 6.1.1). This shows that those informants understand the ability of tourism to change a small town and also that significant change would not be desirable to them.
7.2.6 **Objective One: Summary**

The key contextual factors that led Lawrence to begin to develop tourism activities were the decline in support for agriculture and the availability of location-specific development resources. Decline in agricultural support has led to the need for small towns to become self-reliant, and often to reinvent themselves. Lawrence has chosen to utilise local resources to achieve a new source of economic activity. In particular, the 150th anniversary festival, with a focus on the heritage resources, was a key driver for local economic development despite not being planned as such. The one-off nature of the festival means that some of the benefits will not be long term. Objective One is to explore the context of tourism development in Lawrence. In combination with the findings from chapter four, this discussion establishes the context in which one small New Zealand town began to develop tourism activities, completing the first objective.

### 7.3 Objective Two: Discuss the Implementation of Tourism Development in Lawrence

#### 7.3.1 Introduction

Previous studies have noted that planners and developers are implementing tourism developments as a replacement for traditional economic activities and as a means of local economic development (Harril, 2004; Rogerson, 2002a). Tourism development is evaluated below against principles already defined by Rogerson (2002a) and Wilson (2010). Rogerson (2002a) provides a ‘tick-the-box’ framework for assessing the potential success of tourism-led local economic development in a given location. It is important to note that Rogerson’s framework was based on contextually different experience in South Africa. Wilson (2010) provides a framework for discussing, in depth, the resilience (and therefore potential survival) of a community on the assumption that multifunctionality provides resilience. The Lawrence case study is placed within these two main frameworks to assess the development of tourism, to identify successes and barriers, and to explore principles for overcoming these barriers. In both cases the frameworks are not a definitive ‘solution’, but simply a means of structuring the exploration of current development in Lawrence.
7.3.2 Application of Rogerson’s (2002a) Principles for Tourism-led Local Economic Development to Lawrence

The ability for tourism activity to provide for local economic development in Lawrence will be explored through a comparison with Rogerson’s (2002a) ‘ten key principles for successful tourism-led local economic development’. Many of the characteristics of the context in Lawrence vary greatly from Rogerson’s (2002a) study. However the principles provide a valuable framework for exploring the prospect of tourism-led local economic development. In the first half of this section the findings from Lawrence will be explored in relation to Rogerson’s principles to explore whether implementation of tourism development in Lawrence aligns with literature.

7.3.2.1 Policy Makers must be Realistic

Rogerson’s first key principle is “a need for realism by policy-makers as to whether tourism is a viable option”. Rogerson (2002a) suggests several key elements in determining the viability of tourism in a destination (Rogerson, 2002a). One element of viability is an adequate portfolio of tourism products. Lawrence has both a range of developed events and a cafe culture and undeveloped heritage resources and a planned bike trail (see sections 4.6 and 6.1.2). Without investment in these undeveloped resources it may lack an ‘adequate total tourism product’. However if the heritage resources are developed then a sufficient portfolio could be available in Lawrence. A second element of viability is the intrinsic attractiveness of a place (Rogerson, 2002a). Several elements of the Lawrence environment were identified in the results as being attractive (see section 4.2). Key informants described Lawrence as being set in ‘rolling green hills’ and as being an ‘appealing’ size. Lawrence is also safe and secure and easily accessible by road, meeting other key elements Rogerson (2002a) suggests are needed for viability. The major concern for tourism viability in Lawrence is the lack of infrastructure. There was disagreement in the findings about the adequacy of infrastructure provision, although accommodation provision was continually suggested as needing improvement (see sections 4.5.3 and 4.7.1.3.1). Accommodation provision in Lawrence is increasing, with a new development currently underway. This factor is also likely to respond to market forces.
and expand to meet tourist demand, unlike other forms of infrastructure provision, such as roads.

7.3.2.2 The Need for Holistic Development

The second key principle outlined by Rogerson (2002a) centres on the need for a holistic view towards different forms of development, in particular the need to recognise whether there is the social platform (education, health and wellbeing of the community) to support tourism development. While this study has not explored, in depth, the stability, health, education or safety of the Lawrence community, several key findings relate to the town’s ability to meet this principle. In Lawrence the presence of the manufacturing firm, Tuapeka Gold, provides a degree of employment and economic stability that is unusual in small New Zealand towns. This provides off-farm employment that is not directly related to farm servicing and is therefore not affected by the same industry fluctuations. For tourism, the manufacturing and farming sectors each play a similar role in reducing the impacts of seasonality and industry specific fluctuation. However, the median income and education level of Lawrence were both below the Otago and New Zealand levels (see section 4.3) (Stats NZ, 2006). Therefore the criterion of having a ‘well trained and educated workforce’ is not met. The skills in Lawrence are largely focused on the agricultural sector, and many residents have limited education. The lack of high level skills may pose problems for the continued expansion of manufacturing.

7.3.2.3 Tangible Benefits must be distributed to Poor Communities

Rogerson’s (2002a) third principle states that “successful local economic development means bringing tangible benefits to poor communities”. The Lawrence community has been identified as having a lower education level and lower incomes than Otago and New Zealand in general (see section 4.3). In this sense, supporting local economic development in Lawrence, is supporting a lower income community. Within Lawrence, tourism development is also supporting hospitality businesses that key informants identified as being the ‘worst off’ of the businesses in Lawrence. The businesses in Lawrence specifically identified as the most stable were those that service the farming community. The least stable businesses were those that were hospitality related. Supporting these
businesses aims to create better opportunities for the businesses that are struggling the most. Rogerson (2002a) states that, in addition, successful local economic development policies should use spin-offs to enhance schools, health facilities or community development projects. In Lawrence, tangible benefits to the community have been established in keeping businesses running in the community that support such services. The Lawrence businesses financially support a range of community activities. In particular businesses are currently raising funds to develop new community swimming pool facilities (see section 4.5.2.3). These facilities are predicted to be beneficial for the local community as well as an attractive resource to tourists.

### 7.3.2.4 Economic Activities should be Diverse

Rogerson’s fourth principle is that other economic activities should be considered alongside tourism. This differs from the second principle in that it refers specifically to the economic networks of different activities. One important finding of this research was the role of manufacturing in Lawrence, and its ability to provide economic stability. This was of particular note because market fluctuations are, to some extent, different for the farming, manufacturing and the tourism sectors. In the context of Lawrence tourism was seen as viable because, despite the recognised seasonality, the existence of manufacturing created diverse employment opportunities that were not seasonal in the same way. Therefore, when considering Rogerson’s fourth principle the other economic activities in Lawrence can be seen to be supportive of tourism development. However, local economic development should also focus on ensuring that these activities remain. If the manufacturing company closed down or moved from Lawrence there would no longer be any form of manufacturing. To maintain the stability provided by the manufacturing, locally-led local economic development should also focus on ensuring this company remains, and on attracting supporting companies. Support for farming must also be considered.

### 7.3.2.5 Prevent a ‘Tourist Oasis’

Rogerson’s fifth principle is that one should ensure that tourists are not separated from the community, and instead actively participate in the community. The small physical size of
Lawrence can be seen as an advantage when considering principle five (see section 4.2). It would be difficult for tourists in Lawrence to avoid contact with local residents. However, many of the heritage sites, such as Gabriel’s Gully, are located a few kilometres from the Lawrence town centre. Separation of tourists from the town could occur if some forms of development, such as cafes, were allowed to occur at the Gully site. It is also important to consider enhancing links between the Gully and the town, and ensuring that developments in the Gully enhance, rather than distract from town.

7.3.2.6 Keep Developments Small and Organic

Rogerson’s sixth principle states that small scale projects should be the focus of local economic development policy. Key informants suggested that one large investment could upgrade the facilities and heritage resources in Lawrence to attract more tourists; however this is unlikely to happen because of the limited available funds for development (see section 6.1.1). The planned bike trail, especially if linked with the Otago Central Rail Trail, is likely to go against Rogerson’s sixth principle as it is one large-scale development. There were concerns that the community would not take advantage of the opportunities that such a large development would provide (see section 6.1.3.1). It would provide a market for new businesses directly related to the trail to be established by people living outside of the community and for the benefits that a bike trail would provide to be siphoned away from the area.

However, the limited income flows in Lawrence that can be directed towards investment may limit the scale of development projects in such a way as to align with the principle outlined by Rogerson. Incremental development, such as the new walking track, is more likely to occur than a single large investment. Business growth is also likely to be relatively slow. As indicated by several key informants, the need for new accommodation is likely to be met with incremental supply (see section 6.1.3.2). Connell, Page and Bentley (2009) indicate concerns with incremental tourism development in New Zealand. In particular, the nature of resources consents under the Resource Management Act means that the effects of each development are considered independently rather than adopting a holistic approach to the overall effects of tourism development on a community (Connell,
et al., 2009). Past tourism development in Lawrence has been incremental and cumulative effects may not have been considered.

7.3.2.7 Encourage Local Networks

Rogerson’s seventh principle encourages using “local networks and networking” to reduce economic leakages. Cooperation and communication were seen by key informants as the most significant barriers to getting the best out of the current opportunities (see section 6.1.3.3). However, the large number of services available in Lawrence ensures that tourists can meet their needs within the community, for example banking and petrol. This means that key demands can be met within the community and leakage is reduced. An effective business strategy, as suggested by key informants, could develop symbiotic business relationships that further ensure that the tourism industry requirements are met (see section 6.1.3.3). A business strategy could also allow for businesses to network in order to utilise new businesses resources that are developed, such as the bike trail or heritage resources in the Gully. Keen (2003) stated that for tourism to be successful in small towns, there must be a network of businesses that are symbiotic. A business strategy could also ensure that new business development efficiently utilises resources rather than competes with other businesses. Not only does a community need to provide for tourism activities but these must also be supported by accommodation, food and service provision (Keen, 2003).

7.3.2.8 Monitor Development

Rogerson’s eighth principle addresses the need for monitoring. Monitoring is important in assessing the effectiveness of a development in providing benefits. If benefit streams are not being accrued then changes to the development should be considered, or in the case of funded initiatives, funding should be withdrawn. The existence of monitoring, and its effectiveness, were not mentioned by key informants. Monitoring could be included in a business strategy, like that suggested by key informants (see section 6.1.3.3), or by community groups to assess the acceptance and nature of new tourism development.
7.3.2.9 Maximise Community Participation

Rogerson’s ninth principle is that one should encourage community involvement in local economic development policies while accepting the limits of community participation. Key benefits of community involvement include the ability for the community to identify their needs and also their skills to ensure that local economic development strategies are efficient and achievable, however community driven strategies often lack resources and skills (Davis and Morals, 2004; Eversole, 2003). In Lawrence the festival was initially community driven and the Organising Committee largely consisted of local residents (see section 5.3.1). Council staff supported the festival and played a key role in the organisation and eventually encouraged the hiring of and funded event managers. This demonstrates a possible inability on the part of the community to undertake the festival with their skill-set. Some members of the community felt that it could have been achieved by those within the community, but it is not clear if this is realistic (see section 5.3.5).

The wider social and political context of community participation must also be considered under Rogerson’s ninth principle. In particular Rogerson focuses on developing nations and the limits of community participation in some of these areas that are evident. In New Zealand the wider context is largely supportive of community participation, and it is considered a key aspect of the planning process. It is still important to recognise areas where community participation in decision making may be limited. In particular these could include factors such as a lack of education or information needed to understand the decision being made. One example of this, evident in Lawrence, was a feeling from some members of the community that there was a disconnect between existing residents and new businesses (see section 6.1.3.3). There is a perception that new residents views were not valued or heard because they were new, but also that they were changing the town without seeking the views of long term residents.

7.3.2.10 Good Governance, Cooperation and Institutional Thickness

Rogerson’s tenth principle states “there is a critical need for good governance, cooperation and institutional thickness”. The lack of relationships between and within different sectors of the community was a key finding of this study. It became clear, while exploring the roles of businesses, local government, community groups and organisations that each
operated largely independently, except for when it came to the festival. The community in Lawrence perceived a separation from the local council, they felt ignored by local council, and felt that the council favoured other areas for development (see section 4.7.1.2). There was also concern with the replacement of the Clutha Tourism Network with Enterprise Clutha (see section 4.7.1.4.4). In particular they felt that there was now a reduced accountability as well as a reduced focus on communication and cooperation between towns in the district. Even community group members stated that they were not aware of the number of roles of other community groups, except that there were many (see section 6.1.3.3).


Wilson (2010) has provided a framework for considering the development of economic, social, and environmental capital within a rural community and in so doing to help establish the strengths or weaknesses in terms of ‘multifunctional’ qualities. The comparison with a multifunctionalism regime was selected over a post-productivist regime because of the existence of both productivist and post-productivist values and practices in Lawrence.

In New Zealand, as in Australia, there is little evidence for the specific characteristics of United Kingdom post-productivism. However, a general trend away from production and a new focus on tourism can be seen (Holmes, 2002; Lawson, et al., 1998; Walmsley, 2003). Agricultural production is still a key industry in Lawrence, and the incremental development of tourism is providing an additional economic driver rather than a complete replacement of agricultural activities. The community’s wealth is also dependent on manufacturing, another co-existing activity.

Wilson’s (2010) framework suggests links between the development of capital and the resilience of rural communities. Further, when there is a balance of development between the different types of capital, this indicates a strong multifunctional community (Wilson,
In the second half of this section the capital resources in Lawrence will be discussed in relation to the indicators outlined by Wilson (2010) in order to explore areas of ‘strong capital development’ and areas where capital resources may be lacking.

### 7.3.3.1 Economic Capital

Maintaining rural communities requires jobs and income to support the residents. “Ultimately, it is the economic survival of rural communities that should be at the heart of assessments of the ‘quality’ of rural systems” (Wilson, 2010: 368). ‘Diversified income streams’ and ‘integration into the global capitalist system’ are two indicators of strong economic multifunctionality. The ‘integration into the global capitalist system’ indicator is seen as contentious to some extent. In Lawrence manufacturing, tourism, and agriculture all provide income streams to the community, and are also integrated into the global network. Agriculture relies on global commodity prices, tourist numbers in Lawrence are affected by international events (see section 4.6.5) and the manufacturing business has links to off-shore markets.

All of the informants in Lawrence believed that tourism and manufacturing would be key activities in the future of the town, although many accepted that agriculture would remain the dominant activity. This demonstrates ‘diversified income streams’ like those suggested by Wilson (2010). The growth of tourism in rural areas can be seen as a post-productivist driver (Conradson and Pawson, 2009). However, the role of tourism and manufacturing in Lawrence is seen as an addition to, rather than a replacement of, agriculture. It is evident that many rural tourism activities depend on agricultural infrastructure (for example farm stays) (Fisher, 2006). Rural tourism in New Zealand is more relevant to the regime of multifunctionalism than to the regime of post-productivism because of its co-existence with a strong agriculture base. In Lawrence the diverse income streams, created by the agricultural, tourism and manufacturing markets is a key indicator of strong multifunctionality.

Both tourism and manufacturing further integrate Lawrence in the global market beyond the integration already delivered by agriculture. A large number of the tourists in Lawrence are international visitors, and the manufacturing business has strong links to off-
shore markets. This is seen as an indicator of strong economic capital. However Wilson (2010) accepts that ‘global market integration’ is contentious because it means that the community is dependent on global markets in the same way as agriculture creates this dependence. In Lawrence informants commented on the effect of the global recession on the number of international visitors. Caution needs to be taken to ensure that extensive global market integration does not weaken Lawrence and endogenous development should also be a focus.

One indicator of weakly developed economic capital that is evident in this study was a ‘high dependency on external funding’. Funding of the 150th anniversary festival was a key barrier in its development. The Organising Committee received significantly less funding than they expected, and the Clutha District Council had to underwrite the final budget. The reasons for less funding than expected were all external factors (the Christchurch earthquake, global recession, and a change in government). This demonstrates a dependence on external funding, and also the vulnerability created through this dependence. However it is also recognised that a number of new projects, such as sewerage and swimming pool upgrades will be funded from within the community and through council rates.

Another indicator of weakly developed economic capital is ‘poor infrastructure’; however the infrastructure upgrades in Lawrence are largely changing this. The main street and walking track upgrades that occurred in association with the festival, as well as the planned swimming-pool and sewerage upgrades are key areas where infrastructure development is occurring (CDC, 2009). This perhaps demonstrates that there is development of economic capital in Lawrence. Lawrence also has wireless internet infrastructure that is rare in similar small towns.

7.3.3.2 Social Capital
Social capital is a key element for ensuring resilience in a community (Wilson, 2010). Indicators of strongly developed social capital set out by Wilson (2010) that occur in Lawrence include ‘strong governance structures’ and ‘clear land ownership’. In New
Zealand, compared to many other countries, there are both strong democratic governance structures and unusually clear land ownership.

In Lawrence the Community Board provides a particular form of local democratic governance structure that occurs in only one other town in the district, and there are a large number of community groups (CDC, 2009). The relationships developed by the Organising Committee can also be seen as beneficial, although their one-off nature means that they will not provide for a long-term increase in social capital. Poor communication between the community groups, the Community Board and the local council came through as a key issue in Lawrence. Poor communication between stakeholder groups was identified by Wilson as an indicator of weak social capital. This means that despite the existence of democratic governance structures in Lawrence, they may not be as effective in ensuring resilience as they are in many other communities, which possess additional good communication characteristics.

Clear land ownership, with regard to heritage buildings in Lawrence, is another issue. The clear, private ownership of some buildings led to tension in the community as they were perceived, to some extent, to be community resources that were ‘wasted’ through private ownership. This also demonstrates elements of the indicator ‘lack of control over destiny’. The heritage resources in the town are seen as being ‘lost’ and not available for future community benefit in terms of both use by the public or as a business venture.

Historically, the ability for strong social capital, especially leadership, strong governance, communication and stakeholder control, to aid community resilience is demonstrated by the ability of the Lawrence community to fight to maintain services following the 1980s downturn. This was particularly demonstrated in their achievement in establishing the Community Company which helped to maintain services. The continued existence of a large number of services, particularly health services, the bank and policeman, as a result of previous community action, demonstrate that with strong leadership a community can use their social capital to be more resilient to exogenous change.
7.3.3.3 **Environmental Capital**

Environmental capital is seen as a predictor of strong multifunctional communities and the indicators are less contentious than economic or social capital indicators (Wilson, 2010). While this research has focused on economic and social factors some comments can be made about the environmental capital in Lawrence.

The indicators set out by Wilson (2010) under the heading of environmental capital are largely focused on natural resources (water, soil, biodiversity), but also includes agricultural yields. It is unclear whether physical, human-made resources such as heritage should be considered. Comparing the attributes of biodiversity as an indicator of natural heritage resources it is suggested that they could be considered. In his discussion of the use of biodiversity as an indicator, he stated that biodiversity can be seen as an indicator of strong multifunctionality because high levels of biodiversity “suggest a rural society that has the ‘luxury’ of being able to set aside areas not directly linked to intensive agricultural production (and which may themselves generate income from non-agricultural activities such as tourism)” (Wilson, 2010: 370). The Gabriel’s Gully reserve is an area that is set aside for non-agricultural activity, and also has the potential to generate income from tourism. In this sense the heritage resource has similar characteristics to those set out by Wilson (2010) when considering biodiversity.

‘Sustainable management of environmental resources’ is an indicator of strong environmental capital (Wilson, 2010). This parallels the purpose of the Resource Management Act (1991). New Zealand’s planning system depends on this Act; and, resource consents for development are considered against this principle. This indicates that, in New Zealand, and Lawrence, environmental resources should be sustainably managed, but this research has not considered to what extent they actually are. Indicators of strong or weak environmental capital, such as soil and water quality, have not been explored in this study and further research would be required to establish the level of environmental capital.
7.3.4 Objective Two: Summary

Lawrence exhibits characteristics of both strong and weak multifunctionality. Wilson (2010) states that rural communities that exhibit the most characteristics of strong multifunctionality will still have some characteristics of weak multifunctionality and vice-versa. Multifunctionality regimes, like that set out by Wilson can also be used as a guide to future development, as it encourages the even development of all three capitals, and views the resources in a rural community in a holistic manner (Woods, 2011). From this point of view, the focus for development in Lawrence should be on increasing not only on economic capital but also on social and environmental capital. Importantly, the once strong social capital appears to be diminishing because of communication and cooperation barriers.

Two key frameworks were explored to initiate discussion of the use of tourism as a driver for local economic development in Lawrence and also to explore the resilience, and multifunctionality of Lawrence. Lawrence, to a large extent, possesses many characteristics that meet the requirements for tourism-led local economic development and some of the characteristics of strong multifunctionality. However some key characteristics were not met, or are only in the process of development. Key characteristics of concern are the lack of infrastructure (particularly accommodation), limited skills and education, lack of stakeholder communication and cooperation, global market changes and external funding dependence, attempts focused on large scale projects rather than incremental development, private ownership of heritage, and outside involvement in the festival. Objective two is to discuss the implementation of tourism development in Lawrence. This has been achieved in this section.
7.4 Objective Three: Understand the Roles of Different Groups in Tourism Development in Lawrence

7.4.1 Introduction

The Organising Committee, Local Council and Local stakeholder all played key roles in the festival and general tourism development. These roles are explored in relation to the literature below.

7.4.2 The Festival

The role of the Organising Committee was a key focus of this research. Studies by Arcodia and Whitford (2006) and Yolal et al. (2009) suggest that social capital and cohesion can be developed during the organisation of festival events through community interaction, increasing awareness of community resources, training for volunteers and through developing partnerships within the community. As discussed in the previous chapter, the organisation of this festival divided the community rather than led to cohesion. With particular regard to the benefits outlined in previous studies, key areas of difference become apparent.

Key informants identified that there was poor communication with the community about the festival event, and that the Organising Committee played a role in this situation. Community interaction was a key issue with the event, with some of the organisers suggesting that more communication would be a key lesson for future events. Public meetings were not well attended and information about the festival and decisions was misunderstood or not sought by the community. Both the role of the Organising Committee and the role of the community in the communication breakdown were recognised. Community interaction, which could have led to identification of community resources, did not occur. The Organising Committee could have held more public meetings or workshops with different community groups but it is also recognised that attendance at public meetings was so low that this did not encourage them to continue to take time seeking the community’s views.
Community resources were also downplayed as event managers were brought in. The decision to employ event managers was seen as necessary for holding such a large scale event although some community members felt that the skills were available in the community, but that those organising the festival were not aware of them. As discussed above, the ability for the Organising Committee to be aware of community resources, and to know whether or not the skills required to manage the festival existed in the community was limited because of lack of community attendance at the initial public meetings.

The role of volunteers in the festival was vital to its success. However more could be done to develop the role of volunteers in future events. Volunteers did not receive any direct training and had to learn as they went, and while they developed skills through the process there was no training prior to being involved. This meant that the benefits of skills building were not available during the organising of the event and the role of the volunteers was less than what it could have been, had training been provided.

The Organising Committee played a role in shaping not only the activities at the event, but also the benefit streams received by different groups. Arcodia and Whitford (2006) noted that when the festival subgroup is heterogeneous there is potential for the event to alienate other community members. Benefits from community-driven developments may also be targeted at specific groups within the community rather than at the community as a whole (Eversole, 2003). The festival organisation was directed at those willing to take on running specific activities, and this meant that, in general, those in the community who were directly involved will have received more benefit than those who were not. For example individual fundraising groups were specifically responsible for activities and received the benefits from these. Support for activities was also not always even, portable toilets were only available at certain locations, and some activities were not advertised in the programme despite being available on the day. This may have been due to the specific preferences of the Organising Committee, or where they saw the most benefit could be achieved. In the case of businesses it was a somewhat different picture. Some local businesses had stalls at the festival either advertising the business in town or provided products at the festival site. Other businesses in town benefitted even when they were not directly involved in the festival.
7.4.3 Tourism Development: the Community

There is a risk with any local economic development policies in assuming that a community is cohesive, has similar skills, or even in presuming a similar desire for development (Eversole, 2003). Key informants identified that ‘development’ is not desired by all members of the community because they value the current tranquillity and lifestyle in Lawrence. The different views on the organisation of the festival, and on the events at the festival demonstrate that the community is not cohesive. Establishing the appropriate levels of development, and mitigating and avoiding negative effects of tourism development, especially on the town’s character and lifestyle are key issues for tourism planning and every member of the community must be considered.

Establishing cooperation and communication in Lawrence is a key role for the community. Coordination and organisation are two key aspects of Chile’s (2006) definition of community development. Coordination between different community groups was identified as a key issue in efficiently utilising resources in the town. One key informant noted the Community Board and Community Company often fail to communicate future plans to each other and sometimes undertake the same tasks in different ways rather than cooperating to ensure that their resources are not spent on the same development. The key example given was the Community Company replacing wine barrel planter boxes because they did not know enough about the Community Board’s application for the main street upgrade. The wine barrels had to be taken out despite being new, which was a waste of the Community Company’s resources.

7.4.4 Tourism Development: The Council

Managing the effects on the environment of development activities within their district is a key role for the local council in terms of the Resource Management Act 1991. A key aspect of the Act is that it seeks to manage effects rather than specific activities; and, as such, tourism is not mentioned within the Act (Connell, et al., 2009). This has led to many local councils assuming that they are not responsible for, nor are they an active partner in, the tourism sector (Beca Carter Holdings & Ferner Ltd and Tourism Resource Consultants Ltd, 2004). This is demonstrated by the Clutha District Council’s statement that tourism is
not an important aspect of their role and that their aim is to promote the district to local residents rather than to tourists.

7.4.4.1 Local Government Tourism Planning: Key Concerns

When considering the role of local councils in planning for tourism it is important to identify reasons why tourism planning has not been undertaken and the limits of local government when they do attempt to plan or tourism. In particular it is important to recognise key areas that restrict local government planning and explore their relevance in Lawrence and the Clutha District. A study by Connell, Page and Bentley (2009) addressed the sustainability of tourism planning in New Zealand and found that at a local level limited resources for development, incremental development, and that a lack of collection, recognition and storage of tourism development information were key barriers to proactive tourism planning.

A key concern about tourism development for local governments was the cost involved to councils in managing the impacts of tourism development on their environments and infrastructure. This concern appears to be prevalent in the Clutha District, where not only is there a small rates base, but agriculture is also the key industry, which restricts the funding available for tourism planning. Due to the small rates base and agricultural focus in the district, the development and planning of tourist attractions in Lawrence is limited. Connell, Page and Bently (2009) found that there was an increase in local councils’ recognition of the potential economic benefits of tourism development (between 2001 and 2007), and as well as an increase in the number of councils identifying there was not enough available funding for tourism development that would benefit their communities (Connell, et al., 2009).

Another key finding by Connell, Page and Bentley (2009) was in the lack of information on tourism development, especially due to the number of non-tourism developments with tourism related spin-offs. The inability to access and interpret this information was a key concern because it could not inform planning both within the district and at a regional and national level, and cumulative impacts were more difficult to identify. This means that in many cases councils were not able to identify the level of tourism development in their
district and this limited their ability to plan for it. None of the mainstreet businesses in Lawrence have a solely tourism focus (for example tour operators). This may limit the perception of the level of tourism development in Lawrence, and also hide the need for active planning for tourism spin-off.

7.4.5 Objective Three: Summary

The festival was organised by members of the local community with the assistance of local government funded event managers. Despite building a number of valuable relationships the festival Organising Committee became separate from the community. Key benefits, such as training and community cohesion, were not utilised. The lack of community cohesion was a key finding in this study, and cooperation between different groups was lacking. To some extent different groups were carrying out the same roles, rather than cooperating and dividing roles between them and this led to a waste of resources. The large number of tourism guidance documents for local council gives some indication of the extent to which local councils have ignored tourism activity. These documents outline the key roles and tools for local government in the tourism industry and in particular these documents recognise the importance of local government in planning for tourism even when it is a minor activity in the district. Planning for tourism by both the community and the council could be improved by more clearly defining the roles and expectations of various stakeholders in the future development of Lawrence, and in particular the future of tourism. Objective three is to understand the role of different groups in tourism development in Lawrence. This objective has been met by outlining not only the role of different groups in relation to the festival but also in terms of tourism in general, and comparing these roles to trends in current literature.

7.5 Objective Four: Consider the Local Stakeholder’s Perception of Tourism Development in Lawrence

7.5.1 Introduction

In Lawrence perceptions of tourism development were largely consistent and positive, but few informants were willing to identify specific benefits or drawbacks. However this may
have been biased by the nature of those interviewed. By only conducting interviews with
businesses and organisations the views of residents were not explored. Additional research
on the views of residents would be needed to develop this objective further; however some
comments on the perceptions of tourism development can be made.

7.5.2 Endogenous Development

Several studies have addressed the perceptions of a host community towards tourism
development (Harril, 2004; Lawson, et al., 1998; Long, et al., 1990). These studies focus
on the perceptions of communities to tourism development that has come from outside the
community. Tourism development in Lawrence however, is fundamentally from within the
community and therefore differs significantly from these studies. Previous studies have
found that the residents’ perceptions of the effects of tourism development may depend on
factors such as their socio-demographic characteristics, the residents’ potential economic
dependence on tourism development, and the on the proximity of the development to the
residents’ home (Allen, et al., 1993; Harril, 2004; Long, et al., 1990). This study has
focused on businesses and organisations, not on the views of residents. The resident’s
perception of tourism development in Lawrence is outside the scope of this research.

7.5.3 Economic Dependence

Importantly, there is some acceptance in these studies that the perception of the effects of
tourism development are largely dependent on a social exchange, where some lifestyle or
environmental loss or disruption is seen as acceptable so long as the economic benefits
outweighed these (Allen, et al., 1993; Harril, 2004). Many of those interviewed, as main
street businesses, were receiving economic benefits from tourism activity that others may
not. This means that compared to other members of the community, such as a resident who
may not be benefitting from the development, the perception of the effects may have been
overly favourable. However, even key informants not directly benefiting economically,
saw tourism as positive and did not specify any negative effects.

7.5.4 Development Threshold

The limited perception of tourism effects may also have been related to the relatively low
level of tourism currently taking place. In particular while seeing tourism as “all positive” many informants stated that they didn’t want to see Lawrence become “like Arrowtown”. Tourism in that town is also centred on historic gold mining, but is far more developed, and demonstrates negative impacts such as congestion and loss of community lifestyle. This indicates that while those in Lawrence see tourism as positive, they are also indicating some threshold level at which tourism would begin being seen as negative. As tourism developed residents in Lawrence may become more accepting of future tourism development and impacts of development.

7.5.5 Objective Four: Summary

The endogenous nature of tourism development in Lawrence differs from other towns studied (Long, et al., 1990). The perceptions of local stakeholders, and in particular the local businesses, was consistent with the theory in the literature that economic dependence on tourism will lead to a favourable view of tourism development. The existence of a threshold, as established in previous studies, is also demonstrated to some extent in Lawrence as informants were favourable about the current level of tourism, and of future development, but also identified a level of tourism that they would not find acceptable. Objective four is to consider the local stakeholder’s perception of tourism development in Lawrence. Local stakeholder’s perception of tourism development is largely positive. Tourism development in Lawrence is endogenous, which differs from previous studies. There was also an indication of an threshold level of acceptable tourism development, which aligns with previous studies. Objective four has been met in terms of considering some local stakeholders’ perception of tourism development, but lacks the views of residents, a key area for future research.

7.6 Summary of Key Findings

This chapter has explored each of the four research objectives through comparing the results of this research to current literature. Decline in support for agriculture and the availability of local resources were the key factors that led Lawrence to begin to undertake tourism development. Lawrence reinvented itself because agriculture was no longer supporting the community, especially in terms of services. Using Rogerson’s (2002a) framework it was demonstrated that Lawrence possesses a number of key characteristics
Chapter 7. Discussion

for ‘successful tourism-led local economic development’. Exploring the level of economic, social, and environmental capital in Lawrence through Wilson’s (2010) indicators, suggested that the Lawrence community has a moderate level of resilience, but also has many areas where improvement could be made. Key areas of concern are the lack of social capital that once existed and the dependence on external factors. The roles of local stakeholders were explored and further highlighted social capital considerations. In particular, the lack of cooperation and communication between different groups and the separation of the festival Organising Committee from the community were key issues. Guiding documents were discussed which outlined the role of local government in tourism development and the importance of planning for tourism, even when it is a minor activity. The perception of local stakeholders towards tourism development was positive. It is accepted that these findings may be biased because of the nature of those interviewed. There was also a recognition that ‘too much’ tourism development would not be acceptable.
8. Conclusion

8.1 Introduction

Government restructuring has led to rural decline in New Zealand and small towns have been forced to rely on themselves for their survival. Many small towns are redeveloping themselves through local economic development processes and attempting to reduce their vulnerability to economic decline. Wilson (2010) indicates that strong multifunctionality in rural communities will increase their resilience, and Rogerson (2002a) outlines specific principles that should be followed to achieve successful tourism-led local economic development. The theories of local economic development, post-productivism and multifunctionalism provide a framework for understanding the rural changes that can occur as a society moves from a predominant mode of production to one of consumption. The aim of this thesis was, through a case study, to investigate the role of tourism as a driver for local economic development in small towns, and the impact of tourism on local communities. The theory of local economic development provides a useful lens through which to explore the appropriateness of new development strategies.

Lawrence was chosen as a case study because of its unusual reinvention from a purely agricultural service centre to an attractive stop-over point and day-trip destination for tourists. The number of businesses, such as boutique shops and cafes that have developed in Lawrence, are not common in similarly-sized service centres and make it a particularly interesting example. In 2011 Lawrence held its 150th anniversary celebrations. The festival had huge economic benefits for local businesses and was also a promotion tool for the town. Due to the nature of the festival the significant heritage resources in the town were recognised and promoted. A number of key infrastructure developments also occurred as a
result of the festival. These celebrations provided the catalyst for this research. The research aim and objectives were fulfilled.

In this chapter the key findings for theory, key findings for Lawrence, and recommendations for Lawrence are concluded. Lawrence exhibits a multifunctionalist regime, as opposed to a productivist or post-productivist regime. It also shows that global market integration, an indicator of strongly developed multifunctionality, may not always provide economic resilience. Heritage resources in Lawrence demonstrate similar characteristics as Wilson’s (2010) biodiversity indicator. The Lawrence context also shows the benefit of a strong base and active community, from which tourism can develop. The endogenous and incremental nature of tourism development in Lawrence is seen as a key positive characteristic of tourism development that, among other factors, has led to successful implementation. Finally, seven recommendations are produced that centre on two key themes. Firstly communication between different stakeholders must be increased, and secondly, the future for development in Lawrence must be clearly defined.

8.2 Theoretical background

The populations of rural towns, which often developed as service centres, are declining. Rural decline has been caused, globally, by rural-urban migration, globalisation, changes in demand for rural products, transportation improvements, and agricultural production improvements (see section 2.2). In New Zealand in the 1980s, there was also a reduction in government support for agriculture; and this, coupled with a reduction in small-town service provision, exacerbated the already precarious position of many rural communities. Agricultural economic downturns in Australia and the United Kingdom have also been linked to government restructuring (Evans, et al., 2002; Holmes, 2002). Rural communities in New Zealand can no longer rely on government support for production yields for their income streams (Wilson, 1995).

In Europe, the trend away from traditional ‘production’ activities, especially intensification and specialisation of agriculture, and their replacement with new non-production activities is described under the theory of post-productivism (Evans, et al., 2002; Holmes, 2002; Ilbery and Bowler, 1998; Wilson, 1995). Post-productivism is a
theory that describes changes that occur in rural landscapes that no longer rely on production for rural income streams.

In contrast, recognition that production activities and post-production activities often occur concurrently has led to the development of multifunctionalism, a theory that describes agricultural regimes in a way which considers not only on-farm practices but also other changes in rural communities (Daniels, et al., 2008; Wilson, 2010; Wilson, 2001; Woods, 2011). Espousal

The 1980s New Zealand government’s adoption of free market economic policies led to an era in which community self-reliance was necessary for survival (see section 2.2.2)(Keen, 2003). In particular, local economic development processes became increasingly important as local networks and resources were relied upon (Blakely, 1989; Keen, 2003). Local advantages must be utilised to ensure that the new activities replace production to provide rural income streams (Keen, 2003). Alongside a change in function of rural towns is a societal shift from production to consumption, and the combination of these changes is allowing new activities, such as tourism, to develop. Tourism is increasing, as traditional production activities decline, in rural areas (Briedenhann and Wickens, 2004; Harril, 2004; Walmsley, 2003).

8.3 Key Findings for Theory

8.3.1 Productivism, Post-productivism, or Multifunctionalism?

When discussing multifunctionalism (see section 2.2.5), Daniels et al. (2008) specifically addressed New Zealand as an example of where diversity is being eroded by neoliberal policies, and they state that intensification of dairy farming indicates a productivism focus for the country as a whole. This study was concerned only with Lawrence, rather than the wider New Zealand context, and also the community rather than the agricultural policies, but it clearly shows that not all small towns have a solely production focus. The Lawrence community demonstrates that under neoliberal policies, community driven development has grown, and this self-reliance has encouraged diversification of activities (see Chapter 4). Further, the findings of this study suggest that despite the increased reliance on tourism,
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and a belief that tourism is vital to the town’s survival, agriculture is still the dominant industry of the town and will conceivably continue to be so (see section 6). Therefore post-productivism, simply defined as a shift away from agricultural dependence, is not demonstrated in this case. The regime of multifunctionalism appears to be more applicable in Lawrence as the community is supported by multiple activities.

8.3.2 Multifunctionality Indicators

Wilson (2010) provides indicators for strongly developed multifunctionality, which he suggests also indicate a resilient community (see section 2.2.5 and 7.3.3). The indicators are split into three sections, economic, environmental and social capital indicators, and when a balance of these capitals is achieved the community is seen as resilient. In Lawrence ‘integration into the global capitalist system’, one of Wilson’s indicators of strongly developed multifunctionalism, has demonstrated weakness rather than strength. A new ‘Heritage Resources’ indicator is also suggested for the framework.

8.3.2.1.1 Global Integration

Integration into the global capitalist system is an economic capital indicator of strongly developed multifunctionalism set out by Wilson (2010). Tourism development has been shown to increase integration into the global system but, because of this integration, Lawrence’s economy has been weakened to some extent. Despite the obvious economic benefits of an international tourism market, recent unpredicted hardship is associated by local business owners with global impacts on tourism activity. Specifically tourist numbers in Lawrence, and the businesses that depend on them, were affected by the Chilean ash cloud and global recession. This perhaps suggests that diversity of income streams should be considered not only in terms of promoting diverse activities but also in terms of a range of market dependencies. The festival provides an example of this balance in creating resilience. It demonstrated a diverse tourism market, in that the focus of the festival was more local, with the majority of visitors expected from within the district and region rather than the usual focus on international visitors. Local visitors came to Lawrence and provided a tourism market, even despite global factors reducing the number of international visitors. In the case of Lawrence, further integration into the global capitalist
system may not increase the resilience of the town, or promote strongly developed economic capital despite being an indicator of strongly developed multifunctionality suggested by Wilson (2010).

8.3.2.1.2 Heritage Resources
Biodiversity is an environmental capital indicator of strongly developed multifunctionality set out by Wilson (2010). Through exploring the resources in Lawrence, it is proposed that they could be considered in a similar way to biodiversity as an indicator of environmental capital. Heritage resources could be considered as an indicator in a similar way as biodiversity. Wilson’s (2010) environmental indicators are largely focused on natural resources (water, soil, biodiversity) but also include the human-created resource agricultural yields. This means that human-created resources, such as heritage could be considered. Heritage and biodiversity both have characteristics of requiring non-agricultural space, and are available as a tourism and recreation resource. Therefore heritage resources could be an environmental capital indicator of strongly developed multifunctionality in Wilson’s framework. If heritage can be considered as an indicator of environmental capital, then other human-made physical resources may also need to be explored.

8.4 Key Findings for Lawrence
8.4.1 A Base for Tourism Development
Like many other small towns in New Zealand, Lawrence faced a diminishing role as an agricultural service centre due to the privatisation of the forestry industry and the 1980s government restructuring that reduced agriculture support. However, unlike other small New Zealand towns, Lawrence managed to retain or re-establish a number of key services, such as the bank, service station, and policeman, which provide a base for future tourism development (see section 4.5). Predominantly these services exist because the Community Company was established and then fought for them. A new manufacturing firm was also established, which has provided more jobs to the community than would have otherwise been expected.
8.4.2 Tourism Beginnings

The location on State Highway 8 was another key factor that provided a base for tourism development (see section 4.6.1). The number of tourists passing through Lawrence was relatively high, and cafes were established to take advantage of this traffic. Once a cafe culture was established Lawrence became known as a day-trip destination and tourist stop-over point. An event culture has also developed in Lawrence and it holds a number of events throughout the year that cater to different visitor markets, such as the Arts Festival and Quarter Mile Sprint (see section 4.6.4). In 2011 Lawrence held its 150th Anniversary Festival and, despite this festival being aimed at locals, it attracted a large number of tourists (see Chapter 5).

8.4.3 An Active Community

As discussed in section 7.2.1 the community played a key role in the initiation of tourism development and the festival in Lawrence. The Community Company played a vital role in establishing a base for tourism development through retaining services that support current development. Members of community also played key roles in establishing the cafes and boutique shops that now drive the tourism market, and also in the initiation of the festival development. The festival was organised by members of the local community with the assistance of local-government-funded event managers (see section 5.3). An important role of the Organising Committee was to establish relationships that led not only to the successful event itself but also to significant infrastructure development in Lawrence.

The Clutha District Council remains a relatively inactive partner in tourism development, despite recent involvement in the bike trail development. Many significant national planning documents outline guidance for local government to be actively involved in the tourism industry in their communities, even when tourism is only a minor activity and tourists are just passing through (see section 4.7). The Clutha District Council however believes that tourism is not a key aspect of what it does, and its focus is elsewhere on business initiation and agriculture support.

Clearly defined expectations for both the community and the council could lead to improvements in planning for tourism in Lawrence. This is especially important due to the
underlying theme of dysfunction identified in this study. Lack of communication between the different groups was a key barrier to any of the groups carrying out their role efficiently.

8.4.4 Endogenous and Incremental Development

Local perceptions of tourism development in Lawrence were positive (see section 6.1.1). Tourism development in Lawrence has, so far, been both endogenous and incremental. This differs from many other tourism developments, and may reduce the existence of negative perceptions. A key perception of tourism development in Lawrence was that it was ‘vital’ to the economic future of the town. This could have led to an overly positive view of tourism. However the nature of the specific tourism activities available in Lawrence has attracted what are deemed to be a ‘desirable’ group of tourists. The festival attracted a largely older group of tourists and this was seen as positive, and also was perceived as the reason there were no obvious negative impacts (see section 5.5). The limited extent of current development is also important for current perceptions as key informants recognised that the extensive tourism development that exists in Arrowtown would not be desirable (see section 6.1.1). These findings may have been biased by the nature of those interviewed. By conducting interviews with businesses and organisations only, the views of individual residents were not explored. Further research on the views of residents might have developed this objective further.

8.4.5 Successful Implementation

The implementation of tourism development in Lawrence meets many of the characteristics for ‘successful tourism-led local economic development’ set out by Rogerson (2002a) (see section 7.3.2) as well as having a number of positive indicators of strong multifunctionality set out by Wilson (2010) (see section 7.3.3). This means that in a number of aspects tourism in Lawrence should provide for future economic development as well as for a resilient community that will be better equipped to cope with negative external forces. There are key positive and negative elements to current tourism development in Lawrence, which together determine its level of success (see Chapter 7).
8.4.5.1 The Positives

Key physical characteristics in Lawrence provide conditions for successful tourism development. Lawrence is environmentally attractive, safe, secure, and accessible. There are a large number of services in Lawrence, which provide for both locals and tourists. One of these services, with particular attraction to tourists, is the provision of free wireless internet and phone calls in the town. The manufacturing firm and agriculture add to tourism to provide diverse income streams. Lawrence is relatively small, which could prevent a ‘tourist oasis’ from forming. Environmental resources, such as the heritage buildings and Gabriel’s Gully, are available and must be managed sustainably under the Resource Management Act 1991.

The actions of Lawrence residents also support successful tourism development. Current Lawrence businesses, which are profiting from servicing tourists, are providing spin-off benefits such as fundraising for a community pool. The community is also initiating projects, such as the festival. Community participation in development is also relatively strong because of the political context where Lawrence has both a Community Company and Community Board, and participates in democratically electing local government representatives.

8.4.5.2 The Negatives

While Lawrence has a number of resources that would provide for a ‘total tourism product’ many of them require development, particularly the heritage resources. Infrastructure development is to some extent lacking, particularly in terms of accommodation for visitors. The median income and education levels in Lawrence are below both the Otago and New Zealand levels and lack of skills may pose problems for manufacturing expansion. Also, because of the physical separation of Gabriel’s Gully from the township, there is the potential, if the Gully were developed in a certain way, to create a ‘tourist oasis’ where visitors do no interact with the community.

Recent tourism developments, such as the festival and bike trail, are not only large scale but also have significant outside input into the development. Lawrence was dependent on external funding for the festival, and local council needed to underwrite the festival
because the Organising Committee’s external funding expectations were not met. Global integration through tourism is also increasing vulnerability in Lawrence because the town is becoming more reliant on international tourists, the stream of which is dependent on unpredictable factors such as economic recession. While there is a potentially strong governance structure, the effectiveness of this structure is threatened by diminishing communication between different groups. In particular, the once strong community resilience that led to the establishment of the Community Company and the service retention appears to be weakening. Local networks and networking were undermined by a lack of communication and cooperation between different groups, which may lead to benefit leakages in the future.

Recommendations for improving these characteristics and working towards a more resilient community are discussed in the next section.

8.5 Recommendations

What can Lawrence do in the future to facilitate both successful local economic development, and a more resilient community? The following recommendations largely centre on the development of relationships and networks to provide benefit to those people involved in the relationships.

8.5.1 Increase Communication

Lack of communication between different groups was identified in this study as a key barrier to success. More active communication is required.

**Recommendation One: Communication between community groups should be increased, particularly between the Community Company and Community Board.**

The waste of resources involved in both groups undertaking main street development without communicating their plans to the other group was clear. These resources could have been used elsewhere. It is important to recognise that where development plans may overlap the communication systems need to ensure that resources are used efficiently. This
is also likely to be true in relation to the stated (or unstated) strategic visions that drive specific plans.

It was also clear that few people understood the functions of different community groups, or were even aware of the number of different community groups in Lawrence. Better understanding of the town's social resources, and possible networks would be increased through increased communication.

Increased communication could be achieved by methods such as encouraging contact between key members (informal meetings, phone conversations), or through publication of recent action (through the Tuapeka Times or on a community notice board). In the case of the Community Board and Community Company regular updates or notifications of intent could be sent between the groups to ensure that resources are not wasted in overlapping projects.

**Recommendation Two: There needs to be acceptance in the community of the limited resources of local government and also acceptance by local government that the community feels its needs are not met.**

Realism on the part of the community is important; the council cannot do everything for everyone in the district on a limited budget. However it is also important to make sure that the community feels its needs are met, or at least recognised. The dissatisfaction that was identified in this research needs to be addressed, particularly in relation to the perceived inequity of support for Catlins tourism in contrast to Lawrence. Methods for addressing this could include the Community Board regularly (perhaps monthly) taking submissions from the community and not only communicating these to council but also responding to each submission, even if the Community Board declines to take any action.

**Recommendation Three: Communication and cooperation between businesses should be increased.**

Several key informants were concerned by the lack of communication and cooperation between businesses. Simple measures such as advertising the cafes in the boutique shops
and *vice versa* could increase business. Other measures such as developing an overall business strategy could also be undertaken although many businesses stated that they did not have time for regular meetings. Rotational closure in winter could also be developed, where individual cafes close on a rotation so that the customer base is spread between the different businesses. This would allow for better business planning of staff time; and more consistent service for the tourists.

8.5.2 Define the Future

Proactive tourism planning is necessary to ensure that any negative impacts are avoided or mitigated. There is no reason why the community itself should not undertake this planning.

**Recommendation Four: Skills should be improved *within* the community to prepare for future tourism development.**

While future development, such as the bike trail, is not guaranteed, enhancing skills within the community would not only prepare individuals for future growth but will also encourage networks and relationships between community members. A skills building/mentoring program could be introduced where local residents with particular skills (for instance accounting or business management) provide training to other members of the community who are willing to be involved. Research would be needed to identify the skills residents hold, whether they are willing to provide guidance to other residents, whether residents would want to develop skills, and whether meetings could be arranged.

**Recommendation Five: Future development should be strategically planned to ensure benefit streams are kept within the community.**

If the planned bike trail, or other similar developments, go ahead then businesses in the community should work together to ensure that benefit streams are maximised, appropriate services are provided for, and that local businesses gain most benefit. For example, studies found that bike trail benefit streams are maximised when local businesses and local activities are advertised in a single guide pamphlet (Stewart and Barr, 2005).
Recommendation Six: Endogenous and diversified growth should be supported. Local government and the community should focus on supporting local businesses, especially those that provide for diverse income streams and thus ensure resilience.

Support for private, local initiatives is vital. Manufacturing is one example of a key resource in Lawrence that could be lost. Ensuring that the current manufacturing company remains operative should be a key focus for the future of Lawrence in precedence to attracting new, outside businesses. Ensuring local services (bank, service station) remain is also a key factor. Methods for achieving this could include allowing for expansion and possible rates relief for key supportive businesses.

Recommendation seven: Information must be gathered to make strategic decisions.

Future research is required, particularly to assess the environmental capital in Lawrence, and to understand the views of residents towards tourism development. With information such as the views of residents, and the availability of different capitals, as well as monitoring development, an overall strategic plan could be developed. A committee, similar to the festival Organising Committee could be established to collate the views of local stakeholders and residents and to suggest future development plans for the community, similar to the Long Term Council Community Plans. These plans would not have to set out rules but could indicate aspirations, such as development of walking tracks in the Gully, as well as key infrastructure concerns.

8.6 Summary

The Lawrence community has reinvented itself from that of being a purely agricultural service centre to an attractive stop-over point and day-trip destination. This is largely due to a number of location-specific resources and the drive of the community to retain services. However, Lawrence still faces significant difficulty in attracting over-night guests, and many of its businesses are struggling. The anniversary celebrations, held in March 2011, provided significant economic benefit to the community but also highlighted dysfunction and lack of communication in the community.
Diverse economic activity, utilisation of spin-off benefits (fundraising), and the large number of services are key positive characteristics that may lead to successful local economic development in Lawrence and also provide economic resilience. Community driven development is also strong in Lawrence; both historically, related to the 1980s downturn, and more recently in initiating the 150th anniversary festival. The festival Organising Committee, despite problems with information communication to the community, demonstrated that relationships between groups in the community and other stakeholders such as businesses and the local council can lead to positive change in Lawrence, such as infrastructure development. The perception that the future of Lawrence depends on future development, specifically the bike trail development, demonstrates, to some extent, vulnerability, however future development is planned and there are a number of underdeveloped resources that are available to allow future development.

For Lawrence to ensure it has a resilient community and that local economic development policies are successful, communication and cooperation needs to be improved. In particular communication between different community groups and different businesses needs to be established. Stronger communication between the local government and the community could also lead to a better understanding of the limited government resources and of the community’s specific desires. Resilience can also be achieved by actively developing capital. In particular, local skills building, planning for future development, supporting endogenous and diverse businesses and increasing information through monitoring will allow the community to be better prepared for the future.
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Appendix 1

Information Sheet and Consent Form for Participants

TOURISM AS A DRIVER FOR SMALL TOWN LOCAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
INFORMATION SHEET FOR PARTICIPANTS

Thank you for showing an interest in this project. Please read this information sheet carefully before deciding whether or not to participate. If you decide to participate we thank you. If you decide not to take part there will be no disadvantage to you of any kind and we thank you for considering our request.

What is the Aim of the Project?

The aim of this project is to explore the role and impact of tourism in local economic development in small towns. It focuses on the case study of Lawrence which possess and is developing a number of specific tourism promotion activities. The research is being undertaken by Catriona McNaughton as part of the requirements for the Masters of Planning programme.

What Type of Participants are being sought?

As the study seeks the view of the organisation it will focus on participants in management roles. The most appropriate participant will be selected by the organisation and the organisation’s not the individuals views will be sought.

What will Participants be Asked to Do?

Should you agree to take part in this project, you will be asked to participate in a semi structured interview conducted in person, which will be recorded for transcribing. The interview will be approximately 20 minutes in duration and the questions will ask for the views of your organisation in relation to the above aim. At no point will personal information...
or opinions be required. Please be aware that you may decide not to take part in the project or terminate the interview at any time without any disadvantage to yourself of any kind.

**What Data or Information will be Collected and What Use will be Made of it?**
The interview will be recorded, transcribed, and stored in accordance with University of Otago policy. Personal information will only be collected for use by the researcher, Catriona McNaughton, in contacting participants during the research process.

The researcher, Catriona McNaughton, and supervisor, Associate Professor Etienne Nel, will have access to the data. The results of the project may be published and available in the University of Otago Library, and you are welcome to request a copy of the results if you wish. Every attempt will be made to ensure your anonymity. Participants will have the opportunity to correct or withdraw the information they provide in the interview before the research is published by contacting the researcher, Catriona McNaughton, or supervisor Associate Professor Etienne Nel.

This project involves an open-questioning technique. The general line of questioning includes the role of the organisation in relation to tourism or to Lawrence and the perceived impacts of tourism. The precise nature of the questions which will be asked have not been determined in advance, but will depend on the way in which the interview develops. Consequently, although the University of Otago Human Ethics Committee is aware of the general areas to be explored in the interview, the Committee has not been able to review the precise questions to be used.

In the event that the line of questioning does develop in such a way that you feel hesitant or uncomfortable you are reminded of your right to decline to answer any particular question(s) and also that you may withdraw from the project at any stage without any disadvantage to yourself of any kind.

The data collected will be securely stored in a locked filing cabinet in the Geography department in such a way that only those mentioned above will have access to it. At the end of the project any personal information will be destroyed immediately except that, as required by the University's research policy, any raw data on which the results of the project depend will be retained in secure storage for five years, after which it will be destroyed.

**Can Participants Change their Mind and Withdraw from the Project?**
You may withdraw from participation in the project at any time and without any disadvantage to yourself of any kind.

**What if Participants have any Questions?**
If you have any questions about our project, either now or in the future, please feel free to contact either:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catriona McNaughton</th>
<th>Associate Professor Etienne Nel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department of Geography</td>
<td>Department of Geography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Otago</td>
<td>University of Otago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(03) 4794218</td>
<td>(03) 4798548</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This study has been approved by the Department of Geography, University of Otago.
TOURISM AS A DRIVER FOR SMALL TOWN LOCAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

CONSENT FORM FOR PARTICIPANTS

I have read the Information Sheet concerning this project and understand what it is about. All my questions have been answered to my satisfaction. I understand that I am free to request further information at any stage.

I know that:

1. My participation in the project is entirely voluntary;

2. I am free to withdraw from the project at any time without any disadvantage;

3. Personal identifying information (audio tapes) will be destroyed at the conclusion of the project but any raw data on which the results of the project depend will be retained in secure storage for at least five years;

4. This project involves an open-questioning technique where the precise nature of the questions which will be asked have not been determined in advance, but will depend on the way in which the interview develops and that in the event that the line of questioning develops in such a way that I feel hesitant or uncomfortable I may decline to answer any particular question(s) and/or may withdraw from the project without any disadvantage of any kind

5. The results of the project may be published and available in the University of Otago Library (Dunedin, New Zealand) but every attempt will be made to preserve my anonymity.

I agree to take part in this project.

.................................................. ........................................
(Signature of participant) (Date)
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**Key Informant List**

This table lists the key informants and their affiliation. To ensure anonymity the key informants have been divided into groups. These are Local Council Staff, Local Organisations, Local Businesses (hospitality, retail, or other) and External Businesses. External Businesses are those that serviced the festival but are not located in Lawrence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Informant</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Key Informant - 1</td>
<td>Local Council Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Informant - 2</td>
<td>Local Council Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Informant - 3</td>
<td>Local business (other)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Informant - 4</td>
<td>Local Council Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Informant - 5</td>
<td>Local business (hospitality)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Informant - 6</td>
<td>Local Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Informant - 7</td>
<td>Local business (retail)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Informant - 8</td>
<td>Local business (retail)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Informant - 9</td>
<td>Local Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Informant - 10</td>
<td>Local business (other)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Informant - 11</td>
<td>Local business (other)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Informant - 12</td>
<td>Local business (retail)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Informant - 13</td>
<td>Local business (hospitality)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Informant - 14</td>
<td>Local business (hospitality)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Informant - 15</td>
<td>External business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Informant - 16</td>
<td>Local business (hospitality)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Informant - 17</td>
<td>Local business (other)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Informant - 18</td>
<td>Local business (retail)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Informant - 19</td>
<td>External business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Informant - 20</td>
<td>External business</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3

General Question Framework

**Business trends**
Tell me about business trends? How did the community respond, what were the major changes?
How has tourism developed in Lawrence? What drove this development?
What major changes have occurred because of tourism?

**Community**
What is the role of the community in Tourism Promotion?
What other roles do the community have?
What is the role of community groups?
What role does the district council play in development in Lawrence?

**Festival**
Could you tell me about the festival?
Was it beneficial?
What activities took place?
Who was involved?
How did it go?
Were there downsides?
What was the effect on the community? On business?
Will it have impacts in the future?
Do you think everyone received benefits from the festival? Are there groups that didn’t?

**Tourism sector**
Do you think the tourism sector is important to the community? Why? How?
What is the impact of tourism development both good and bad? How could these impacts be changed for the better?
Do you think the community has the ability to support growth in the tourism sector? More visitors?
What role does the council have in tourism development?
What current developments might impact on the community?

What does the future hold for Lawrence?