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ABSTRACT

Traditionally, approaches to the study of the second home phenomenon, although making worthwhile contributions, have failed to appreciate the importance of, and influence that the preceding structures and processes of development exert on all aspects of the resulting second home areas, and associated owners.

This study compares and contrasts two different types of second home development (planned and spontaneous). It attempts to illustrate the importance of the structures and processes of second home development in influencing the type of resort that emerges, and the characteristics of the second home owners.

Pauanui and Whitianga, representing planned and spontaneous resorts respectively, were surveyed. Contrasts were revealed in; the physical and social features; the characteristics of the second homes and their owners; the utilisation of the resort and environs; and the perceived image.

These contrasts are viewed as a response to different sequences and structures and processes of development. The contrasting catalysts of development (the agents of development and the potential second home owners), provide the impetus for the emergence of two distinct types of second home resorts. The ongoing structures and processes of development of the planned and spontaneous second home resorts are considered disparate and self-perpetuating.
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

This thesis compares and contrasts two different types of second home development. The first type of development is recent, planned and controlled, while the second type of development is spontaneous, occurring over a longer period of time, and is largely unregulated. As an example of a planned and controlled second home development Pauanui Ocean Beach Resort was chosen. In contrast, Whitianga was selected to illustrate the characteristics of a spontaneous and mainly unregulated development.

The aim of this thesis is to illustrate the importance of the structures and processes of second home development in influencing the type of resort that emerges.

The basic assumption is that planned and spontaneous resorts will contrast markedly with regard to:

1. the physical and social features;
2. the characteristics of the second homes and their owners;
3. the utilisation of the resort and environs;
4. the perceived image.

It is argued that these differences are attributable to the strong overall influence of the initial and succeeding structures and processes of development.
The existing body of literature on second homes can be categorized very generally into six different approaches to the study of the second home phenomenon.

Initially, studies of second home development were descriptive, concentrating mainly on describing the location and structures as they existed in their static state (Wolfe, 1951, 1956, 1965; Siegel, 1964; Farrell, 1965; Marsden, 1969). The second approach can be seen as an extension of the initial approach, as it attempts to explain location in relation to the relative accessibility of the second home location. This is usually seen in terms of distance, time or cost to the nearest urban centres containing large pools of potential second home owners (Murphy, 1977; Tombaugh, 1968, 1969). The third approach is still locational, but more profound than simple description. The location of, and decision-making processes associated with, second home ownership are studied through the application of Wolpert's concept of place utility (Wolpert, 1965). Basically the individual evaluates the utility of a particular place according to his subjective perception of the actual environment. He evaluates the utility of the location with respect to only that portion of the environment that he perceives as relevant to his decision-making (Aldskogius, 1967, 1969; Robertson, 1977).

The fourth, and more recent approach concentrates more on the sociological aspects of second home ownership and presence (Tombaugh, 1968; Wolfe, Ragatz, 1970; Clout, 1970). This approach is most often expressed in the form of impact
studies. In most cases these studies include other aspects of second home impact, such as the economic and environmental factors (Ragatz, 1970; Bielckus et al, 1972; de Vane, 1975).

A fifth approach is derived from the ability of some geographical models, such as the gravity model, to deal with the trend of second home locations (Wolfe, 1970; Ragatz, 1970; Burby et al, 1972). Attempts have also been made to establish models that can be used to predict future demand for second home property and overcome the shortcomings of existing urban and regional theory with regard to their applicability to the study of the second home phenomenon (Ragatz, 1968).

Lastly a sixth, if rather indirect approach, may be found in the body of literature dealing with second homes from a recreational land use point of view, in terms of the planning of the recreational facilities of an area (David, 1969; Dulhunty, 1970; Conner et al, 1971; Boschken, 1975).

Although all of the aforementioned approaches have made a very worthwhile contribution to the study of the second home phenomenon, they have all failed to look retrospectively beyond the second home resort, community or location in its static state at the time of the study. Previous studies have failed to appreciate the importance of and influence that the preceeding structures and processes of development exert on all aspects of the resulting second home area and owners.

Figure 1.1 illustrates the influence of the structures
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and processes of development on the second home resort and its associated characteristics. Through this influence the structures and processes also have an effect on the results of the various approaches applied in the study of the second home phenomenon.

Pearce (1981) presents a structured examination of the structures and processes of tourist development, which embraces the provision of a wide range of facilities and services. This framework examines the spectrum of supply, and considers the roles and functions of the various development agents, with the aim of providing a general basis for analysing tourist development. While this framework has been developed at the macro-level, it is applied at the micro-(resort) level for the purpose of this thesis.

Using Pearce's structured examination this thesis develops two models to explain the sequence of development of the two contrasting resorts, in relation to the structures and processes. Firstly, a comparison of the structures and processes of development of the two resorts is carried out. Secondly, the effects of the structures and processes in the form of the characteristics of the resort, the owners and the utilisation, are compared and discussed. Thirdly, the present and future development of second homes as perceived by the second home owners and visitors is compared and discussed.

The factual data on which these discussions are based was collected from a variety of sources. These sources included
the rates records of the Thames-Coromandel District Council (T-C.D.C.), interviews with various people associated with the agents of development, historical documentation, and census data. Questionnaire surveys administered to second home owners and visitors provided the information related to the characteristics, utilisations and perceptions of the two resorts.
2.1 SECOND HOMES: A DEFINITION

Since national traditions of second home development vary enormously throughout the world, a wide range of dwellings can be included in the term second home. For the purpose of this thesis a second home will be defined as -

a static dwelling of a permanent nature, that is the occasional residence of a household that normally resides elsewhere, and which is primarily used for recreational purposes.

The continuum of second homes may extend from double garages and fishing baches through converted farm cottages to architect-designed, purpose-built houses, villas and chalets. Second homes may be found as single buildings in isolated areas, small clusters e.g. by a river mouth, or as a complete urban resort e.g. as coastal or alpine resorts. Such a residence may be referred to locally as a holiday home, vacation home, summer cottage, bach, crib or whare.

2.2 SECOND HOMES: AN OVERVIEW

The popularisation and proliferation of second homes throughout the world is essentially a post-1945 phenomenon. The major catalytic factors associated with this upsurge in second home ownership are; increased leisure time (attributable to a shorter working week and in many countries a
compulsory three or more weeks minimum paid leave), higher disposable real incomes, a largely urban based population, and increased personal mobility. This last factor is the result of improvements in private and public transportation, and increased levels of car ownership.

Once only the indulgence of a small, moneyed leisure class, second home ownership has become more attainable and common place among a wider range and larger number of people. The desire to own a second home is not new; but what is new is the comparative affluence of a greater proportion of people to whom a second home is now a financial possibility.

In New Zealand, as in many countries of the western world, increased leisure and recreational opportunities have been reflected in an increasing demand for, and acquisition of, second homes in rural areas, According to Clout the specific motives for the acquisition of a second home include -

"capital accumulation, fashion following, status attainment and the desire to engage in non-urban recreation"

(Clout, 1974, p.102)

Although the ownership of a second home is a means to capital accumulation there is evidence that the dominant reason for the acquisition of a second home, for the majority of owners, would be the desire to engage in non-urban recreation. A Swedish survey of second home owners found that the main motivations behind the acquisition of a second home were "to have somewhere to go for weekends and on public holidays", and
"to be able to get out into the country". (Larsson, 1969). These results clearly support the assumption that the predominate motivation for acquisition is a recreational one.

For many people a second home may be seen as a compensation for city living, providing a place where the urbanite can recover from the stresses of city life. This conception of the second home as a place to escape has been supported by research on second homes in France.

Clout (1969) found that the ratio of second home users to all households increased in close correlation with the greater size of urban settlements. The second home compensates for city living by providing a base from which to partake in both passive and active non-urban recreational activities.

Wolfe (1977) on the other hand, suggests that an important and prevailing reason for the vast proliferation of second homes, especially in Canada, is that of status.

"The ability to own and maintain an inessential house is an important index of having arrived."
(Wolfe, 1977, p.30)

To be able to say 'my wife and children are spending the holidays at our house at Pauanui', or 'I'm off to the crib for the weekend to do a spot of fishing' is one way of proving that one had 'arrived' in the upper social echelon who can afford the luxury of an inessential home. Few owners, however, are likely to admit directly that status is an important factor in acquiring a second home.
One further motive for acquiring a second home, although not a major one, is for its use as a place for (eventual) retirement. Second homes may be bought with a view to them becoming first homes on retirement, perhaps passing through a phase in which the owner is in semi-retirement. The length and frequency of his visits gradually increase until the second home becomes unambiguously the first. Bielckus et al (1972) concluded from their research on second homes in England and Wales that retirement was the second most important motive for the original acquisition of a second home, with 10.5 percent of owners stating this as their main aim. De Vane (1975) conducted a similar study of a smaller scale, in the administrative county of Gwynedd in North Wales. He found that of the total owners of second homes, 31.3 percent purchased with the original intention of eventual retirement to this residence.

One further means of acquiring a second home that can not be considered a motive as it is essentially motiveless, is through inheritance. This means of acquisition is most commonly found in European countries with a well established rural tradition, such as France. Compared with younger countries such as Australia and New Zealand, where the majority of second homes are purpose-built and second home ownership is a relatively recent phenomenon, the French have tended to keep in close contact with their agricultural past through family links. Many city families have rural grandparents if not parents, from whom the country property is inherited. A National Statistical Institute enquiry in 1962 put the inherited proportion of second homes in France as high as
12 percent (Clout, 1969, p.441). This form of acquisition can not be included as a motivation for the acquisition of a second home, as the owner is not confronted with the decision-making process of acquiring a second home. He is only confronted with the decision of whether to use the property for a second home or to dispose of it in some other way.

It is likely that the motives for ownership will change throughout an individual's life cycle, so that a residence initially acquired for recreational use and status, may in later stages of the life cycle be viewed as a retirement, and therefore primary, residence.

Two aspects of use that are particularly relevant to the study of second home development are the amount of time the owners spend in their second homes, and the way they utilise their time.

The frequency of use of the second home is related to a number of factors, such as distance between the primary and secondary home, work requirements, family commitments, age and interests. A mean figure for second home use of 53 days has been estimated for the United States (Clout, 1972, p.395) compared with a value of about 90 days in England and Wales (Bielckus et al, 1972, p.55). Values are, however, widely distributed about the mean: 28 percent of second homes in the United States were occupied for less than 30 days and 6 percent for 180 days and over. In England and Wales 12 percent were used for more than 150 days, with some 79 percent of second
homes in England and Wales being used both at weekends and for holidays. Figures in the United States are not strictly comparable, but only 40 percent were used throughout the year. The figures for England and Wales also compare closely with similar findings in the Swedish context (Larsson, 1969).

Beilckus et al (1972) concluded that the high number of visits which some families are able to make, and the greater weekend use of those second homes nearer the primary residence, means that many people are able to spend a much longer time at their second home than they would do with conventional types of holiday.

Clout (1974) has found that the temporal distinction between the occupation of primary and secondary residences is contracting, and will continue to do so as working weeks become ever shorter in the future. Second homes within easy access of urban centres are already being occupied by urbanites for two and increasingly three nights per week virtually throughout the year. But more remote areas are suitable for second home occupation during long vacations when considerable lengths of travelling time represent only a very small proportion of the total recreation experience.

Another more complex type of occupation involves the whole family staying in its second home during the father's official paid holiday, but with the mother and children remaining there throughout the whole period when schools are closed to be joined by the father each weekend. Part-of-the-year
residences as Clout (1974, p.104) calls them, have developed in France, Scandinavia and North America, and are occupied by at least some members of the family for up to three consecutive summer months each year. With places like the Coromandel Peninsula, which is within two and a half to three hours drive from three major urban centres, it would appear that this pattern of second home use is also possible within New Zealand. This point will be further explored, with regard to Whitianga and Pauanui, in Chapter Six.

The popular image of the second home owner is that of a professional, well-paid, city dweller. This is still largely true, especially in relation to the new, privately developed resort areas in New Zealand, because the ownership and use of a second home is still easier to realise for the upper socio-economic strata of society.

Ownership status very often has a distinct bias towards those in the higher income groups, in non-manual occupations, and with a higher-than-average education (Tombaugh, 1968; Clout, 1970; Bielckus et al, 1972).

The factors favouring the upper socio-economic members of society owning a second home are obviously financial, but options in lifestyle are also important. The living patterns of this group makes it easier for them to live a two-home existence. The longer annual holidays usually associated with managerial and professional occupations, and a more flexible employment situation allows for greater freedom and flexibility
in the use of their second home.

The general increase in leisure time has also meant an increased use of the second home in the winter, especially at weekends. Car ownership, which is essential for access to the second home in many cases, is almost universal amongst owners. In most countries the second home that is used at weekends as well as for long vacations will be within half a day's drive from the primary residence (Tombaugh, 1969; Washer, 1977; Bennett, 1979).

Although second home development is considered to be predominately a post-1945 phenomenon, it is not exclusively so. In New Zealand there was a total of 6,716 baches (Table 2.1) as early as 1926. The figure equated to approximately 2 percent of New Zealand households owning or part-owing a bach at that time. Since then the number has increased fairly steadily to 37,100 in 1981, when approximately 4.3 percent of New Zealand households owned or part-owned a second home for use as a holiday residence.

This total is rather low when compared to other countries. France, reputed as having the largest number of second homes for a European country, had 1,232,000 in 1968 (Clout, 1970) which represents 18 percent of French households owning a second home (Table 2.2). Sweden, with an estimated 490,000 second homes in 1970 had a 22 percent proportion of households owning a second home. Great Britain, however, with approximately 200,000 second homes had only approximately 2 percent of
Table 2.1: Number of second homes in New Zealand and the proportion of households owning a second home.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage of Households</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage of Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1926</td>
<td>6,716</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>26,997</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936</td>
<td>8,435</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>29,534</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>10,975</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>32,446</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>15,615</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>33,143</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>19,899</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>37,100</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: New Zealand Population Census Data

Table 2.2: Number of second homes in other countries and the proportion of households owning a second home.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage of Households</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>1,232,000</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>1968 (Clout, 1970)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>490,000</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>1970 (Clout, 1974)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Britain</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1971 (Clout, 1974)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1970 (Clout, 1974)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>1971 (Coppock, 1977)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
British households owning a second home (Clout, 1974).

In 1970 the total for the United States was estimated at 3,000,000 with 5 percent of the households owning a second home (Clout, 1974). In Australia, an estimated 200,000 households owning a second home represented 5.4 percent of all Australian households in 1971 (Coppock, 1977).

Two main patterns of second home development can be found; those where an old settlement has provided the structures, and those where purpose-built second homes are developed (Simmons, 1975). A combination of these two types of development is quite common, and as previously mentioned, the structure of the second homes within these developments may vary immensely from a small unserviced fishing bach to a multi-roomed luxurious seaside villa. Each country has a different type of second home; a reflection of their purpose, their location and the encompassing culture.

Coppock (1977) suggests that the function of second homes will vary greatly from country to country depending on location, climate and culture. In countries such as Australia and New Zealand with an equable climate for most of the year, and a tradition for the 'great outdoors', the function of a second home is as a base for physical activities such as boating, watersports, and tramping. Hence second homes functioning as such, tend to be found in rural and/or coastal locations.
In highly urbanised communities such as Sweden and France, with a high proportion of the population living in flats and apartments, the function of the second home may be to provide access to open space and greenery. The second home may also function as a means of maintaining one's rural links. This is especially notable as a function in France, where many of the second homes are converted farm cottages that have been inherited by the present owner.

The spatial distribution of second homes in most countries is not even. By far the most popular location is near or beside natural or man-made water surfaces. These water surfaces, especially in New Zealand, are mainly coastal, and within close proximity to urban centres, so as to make weekend use possible. In popular skiing areas however, such as France and Switzerland, a notable proportion of second homes may also be found in mountainous regions, close to ski fields and other associated winter sports areas.

In New Zealand the largest concentrations of second homes can be found in coastal counties, and within close proximity of the major population concentrations (Figure 2.1). In 1981 the largest number of second homes were to be found in the Thames-Coromandel district (4,268 baches) and Rodney County (3,751 baches). Both of these areas are well known for the multitude of seaside resorts located within their boundaries, and within which second homes may be quite strongly concentrated. Both are also within close proximity to the Bay of Plenty, Waikato, and the Auckland urban area; three areas
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SOURCE: New Zealand Population Census Data
which in combination contain well over one-third of New Zealand's total population. Other major coastal concentrations of second homes may be found within close proximity to the Wellington and Christchurch urban areas. The major inland concentrations are to be found around large inland bodies of water, notably Lake Taupo in the North Island, and the Southern Lakes in the South Island. (Figure 2.1).

Overseas studies have attempted to isolate what may be considered the main controlling factors in the location of second homes. One important explanation proffered for the location of second homes is their relative accessibility from the nearest large centre in which, it is assumed, the majority of second home owners live (Tombaugh, 1969; Murphy, 1977). New Zealand studies (Lau, 1974, p.47; Washer, 1977, p.86) suggest that a large majority of second homes appear to be found within 160 to 240 kilometres of major population centres. Clout (1972, p.398) found that even in the United States, where personal mobility is high and state freeways have lowered the relative distances, two-thirds of the second homes were located in the same state, and 58 percent were within 160 kilometres of the primary residence. Studies conducted in Sweden (Norrbom, 1966) and the Northeastern states of the U.S.A. (Ragatz, 1970) support Clout's findings, and suggest that a radius of approximately 160 kilometres provides the average limit of distance for most second homes.

Another important factor influencing location is recreational place utility. The prospective and actual owner
assesses a location relative to the set of place characteristics which they consider constitutes an attractive environment for their needs. Aldskoguis (1967) recognised that in making spatial choices, the decision maker would evaluate the recreational place utility in terms of such factors as site attractiveness and the time/cost inconveniences associated with increasing length of journey, thus illustrating a relationship between settlement patterns of second homes and site characteristics. Robertson (1977) has also used the place utility approach in an attempt to understand the decision process of a prospective second home buyer. Robertson decided on three scales of characteristics of factors - locational, situational, and site that may influence judgements about utility. He also divides utility into three types - anticipated, actual and projected - to account for the changes in the decision processes once the second home has been purchased and settled in.

Site attractiveness or scenic quality is also important as a locational factor. This is emphasized by the fact that nearer, less interesting sites are often bypassed in favour of more distant, but scenically attractive sites. Notably, coastal and inland bodies of water exert a powerful influence on location, not only as an important component of scenery but also as an essential element for a wide range of recreational activities. Studies in New Zealand (Washer, 1977; Bennett, 1979) Michigan (Tombaugh, 1970) and Sweden (Aldskoguis, 1968) confirm the importance of nearness to water as a dominating locational factor. Other controlling factors in the location of second
homes have been the availability of land, and the climates of the importing and exporting regions (Coppock, 1977).

The development of second homes appears to arouse strong and conflicting feelings no matter where it occurs. Some see them as a flagrant display of wealth and inequity at a time when thousands of people are homeless or living in unfit first homes, some as a conspicuous consumption of financial and physical resources and some as a factor that is depressing the economy and eroding the social and cultural life of the receiving region. Others see them as a natural and desirable answer to the demand for recreation and self-fulfilment, as contributing to the "natural" balance of payments and the preservation of the environment. They are seen also as a positive aid to the economy and social vitality of the receiving regions (Bielckus, Rogers, Wibberley, 1972). These attitudes are based partly on fact and partly on emotion. The actual implications vary according to the social, environmental and economic characteristics of any one area, and usually fall somewhere between the above two extremes.

Positive and negative factors can be found in all three categories of impacts, (social, economic and environmental) attributed to second homes. One of the major negative social impacts associated with the second home owner is that he is intruding on the permanent residents of the area, and thus reducing their quality of life. Quite understandably, varying degrees of hostility may arise between the two types of residents, as it is the natural instinct of any group to
distrust and fear the intrusion of outsiders into their community. However, on the positive side of the scale, the second home owners are at the same time bringing new ideas into these rural areas.

The economic impacts associated with second home development can also be positive and negative. The second homes contribute to the local tax base of an area through the payment of rates for the provision of various public services. This, however, is seen by many as a waste of expensive services, because with the majority of the second home use concentrated into the main summer months the services are extremely underutilised in the winter months. In addition to this, the cost of these services is rarely covered by the rate contributions, and the local ratepayers end up in effect, supporting the second home ratepayers.

From a positive viewpoint services are often improved or maintained to the advantage of the local residents. The money that is brought in through general expenditure has a multiple effect (De Vane, 1975). Many goods and services become available to the locals that would not have been possible without the cash flows created by the second home owners. Also businesses and jobs are created and supported, although the seasonality of the demand is a problem. It is important to note that some of the rural destination areas of the second home owners are economically depressed and are often experiencing an outflow of the local population. While the economic trade-off from the presence of such recreational facilities may not
be optimal, this type of landuse could benefit declining rural communities which have little opportunity of attracting other forms of employment - generating industries. The creation of a new economic base may be possible through second home development (Ragatz, 1968).

In countries where the second homes are mainly converted primary residences rather than purpose-built, the second home owners are reducing the supply of houses in the rural areas making it very difficult for members of the local population, especially the young, to acquire a primary residence. In most cases the prices that second homes purchaser's are able to pay are well in excess of those affordable by local rural workers, and for many the solution is to leave the area. Inflation of property prices does occur in many instances. This is to the advantage of the local landowners but not the local landbuyers (Bielckus et al., 1972). It is true that the demand for holiday homes may have added to the pressures forcing local people to leave the area, but these pressures have other causes also. Second homes are not always the cause of depopulation, often they are a symptom of its effects (Ragatz, 1968).

Environmental impacts are generally seen as negative, especially as most conservationists feel that any interference with the natural landscape will be detrimental. It is inevitable that extra pressure will be applied to the environment through the mere presence of extra people, services and buildings. Aesthetically the extent of this impact depends partly on the
type of construction. Old renovated rural houses usually blend into the rural environment, whereas many of the purpose-built houses fail to conform with the surroundings and can be very damaging to the visual character of an area.

Associated with the development of second homes are increased traffic and noise, waste disposal problems and pollution. Careful planning can minimise these disadvantages not only environmentally, but also economically and socially.

Unfortunately, in most countries planning has only occurred after the problems have manifested themselves.

In Sweden, as in most countries, the principal planning theme is protection of the landscape and access to the most popular areas. This is especially important since the main locational factor for second homes appears to be access to natural scenic beauty, which could easily be destroyed by careless development. Hence maintenance of the amenity value of the landscape is foremost in current planning, and the preservation of as much of the landscape as possible is rated as more important than the development of second homes.

In Denmark, coastal studies show that private allotments of land for second homes has prevented public access to many good quality beaches (Bielckus, 1977). Over half of the second homes are situated in Zealand, where the North coast is catering for the enormous demand from Copenhagen. The locational demand for second homes has a strong coastal bias.
Future planning in Denmark is trying to get away from ribbon development and is aimed at resort-type concentrated development of settlements. These may be in groups of as many as two hundred second homes, in an attempt to preserve as much of the natural landscape as possible, and to make the provision of services for second home areas economically viable. An attempt has thus been made to ensure that the inherent qualities of an area which attract such developments in the first place are not lost through bad planning. 

"There is a growing recognition in national planning in Denmark that recreational homes constitute a settlement type in their own right and should therefore be located, planned for and maintained on the basis of their specific requirements".  

(Bielckus, 1977, p.37)

Very few other countries have recognised this, and do not have any planning regulations specific to second home development. In New Zealand there are examples of planned development such as Pauanui and Onemana in the Coromandel Peninsula, however these have been initiated by private developers under the general planning requirements of the local authorities concerned. Any innovations or ordinances to create a resort atmosphere and retain a high aesthetic and environmental quality of development have been initiated by the private developer, to the benefit of both the developer and the second home owners.

Much of the previous second home development through
the world has tended to be ribbon-like in nature, restricting access to scenic areas. Planning regulations that are being instigated in many countries are attempting to curb this type of development. In Denmark, France, United States and New Zealand there is now a move to resort development. Second home development in the U.S.A. has changed in the last one to two decades with nearly one-half of American second home buyers in 1970 choosing to acquire landlots of houses in planned resort communities on coasts, lakeshores, or in the mountains. Condominiums, as these resorts are called, relate to the common ownership of an area of land by a group of people who have individual possession of their second homes but share the grounds and whatever facilities they pay to be provided. Condominium developments involve not only estates of individual family houses but also highrise blocks of apartments with such facilities as squash courts, golf courses, social clubs, and spa complexes.

In New Zealand, the development of second homes most parallels those developments in Denmark and Australia. The second homes are mainly coastal in location and purpose-built. The original pattern of development was ribbon and scattered. However now with increased affluence, stricter building restrictions and covenants, and greater awareness of environmental impacts developers and buyers are favouring the resort type self-contained development, such as Pauanui.
2.3 OBJECTIVES AND CHAPTER OUTLINE

As noted in the Introduction, there are an increasing number of studies being undertaken on all aspects of second home development from a number of different approaches. Most of these studies while making some very worthwhile contributions towards an understanding of the second home phenomenon have neglected to study the structures and processes of the development of these second home areas as a means to explain some of the contrasts that may arise between different areas.

This thesis compares and contrasts Pauanui and Whitianga, as examples of a planned and a spontaneous development respectively, in an attempt to highlight the importance and influence of the structure and processes of second home development. These structures and processes are expected to generate contrasts in the characteristics of the second homes and owners, and the perceptions and utilisations of the resort.

Chapter Three outlines and discusses Pearce's (1981) structured framework for the examination of the structures and processes of tourist development in general, and its application to second home development. Methodology is also discussed. The study area, and its physical and historical setting are discussed in Chapter Four. Two models, based on Pearce's structured framework, are developed in Chapter Five to explain the sequence and the structures and processes of the development of Pauanui and Whitianga. Chapter Six attempts to highlight some of the contrasts between the two resorts that have resulted because of the differences in the development of
each resort. Such features as the socio-economic characteristics of the second home owners, the acquisition and characteristics of the second home, and the utilisation of the second home are examined and compared between the two resorts. Finally the perception of the two resorts and second home development on the Coromandel Peninsula in general is examined and discussed in Chapter Seven, before concluding in Chapter Eight.
CHAPTER THREE

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

3.1 TOURIST DEVELOPMENT

Tourist development takes many forms, of which the second home phenomenon is one. Tourist development has been defined as:

The provision or enhancement of facilities and services to meet the needs of the tourist.

(Pearce, 1981, p.2)

It can occur in different ways, at different scales and at different rates. It may also take place in many different contexts. As a result, the form tourist development may take can vary enormously from situation to situation, and from one context to another. Such variability in form and context, while occurring at the macro-level may also be found at the micro-level, as in second home development. To date this variability has not been considered in the study of second homes as has been done by Miossec (1976) in determining the structural evolution of tourist regions as a whole.

This framework encompasses all aspects of development, most importantly the development of a region through space and time: it is dynamic. This notion of spatial and temporal evolution is very important, both in analysing past processes and in planning for future development. Such factors as changes in the behaviour of the tourists and the local
population can be related to the growth of resorts and the expansion of the transport network.

The framework also acknowledges that the various elements associated with tourist development need not develop simultaneously. This may present a major source of the problems associated with supply and demand. The key factor is that impact is related to development, and more importantly, particular impacts are related to specific stages of development.

Although Miossec's framework does examine such aspects of the development process as the provision of supplies and the development of infrastructure, the actual means of, and the agents for development are not elaborated on.

Pearce (1981) suggests that fundamental questions such as, who builds the resorts, how, for what reasons, and with what results, are remaining, not only unanswered but unasked. With regard to second home development however, answers to the question of 'what results?' (for example impact studies) have been attempted using a number of approaches (Figure 1.1). As noted in Chapter One many of these other fundamental questions have remained unasked. More generally the context in which the development occurs is neglected. An understanding of the structures and processes of the development will provide a wider comprehension of the features and characteristics associated with the established and expanding second home resort.
Building on the basic framework provided by Miossec's model, Pearce (1981) examines in more detail the various elements involved in tourist development, and outlines the roles and functions of the various agents of development. The purpose of this is to provide a basis for analysing tourist development.

Although, as previously mentioned, Pearce's conceptual framework has been developed at the macro-scale it also provides a guideline for a micro-scale study of second home development.

3.2 STRUCTURE OF A CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

The basic structure of Pearce's framework for the examination of the structures and processes of tourist development is divided into two main components: elements of supply, and agents of development (Figure 3.1). The two main components are further divided into a number of categories.

3.2.1 Elements of Supply

Pearce has grouped the numerous types of facilities and services sought by the tourist, and second home owner, into the following broad sectors:

1. Attractions;
2. Transport;
3. Accommodation;
4. Supporting facilities;
5. Infrastructure.
STRUCTURES AND PROCESSES OF DEVELOPMENT

ELEMENTS OF SUPPLY
1. Attractions
2. Transport
3. Accommodation
4. Supporting Facilities
5. Infrastructure

AGENTS OF DEVELOPMENT
PUBLIC SECTOR
PRIVATE SECTOR

MOTIVES AND RESPONSIBILITIES
1. Economic
2. Social
3. Environmental
4. Political

(After Pearce, 1981)
In terms of second home development, the attractions induce people to visit, or locate their second homes in an area; transport services enable them to do so; the accommodation and supporting facilities (e.g. shops, restaurants) cater for their well-being while there and the infrastructure assures the essential functioning of all of the aforementioned.

The supporting facilities and services are further divided into three types depending on whether they are purpose-built, transformed, or shared with other activities. Some areas, such as Pauanui and Onemana on the Coromandel Peninsula, have been developed expressly as second home sub-divisions. On the other hand an old permanent dwelling or other type of building may be acquired and their use transformed to that of a second home. In other instances, tourism or second home development may supplement an original activity, for example second home owners in Whitianga and Queenstown take advantage of the services and infrastructure provided essentially for the resident population.

To fully appreciate the influence on, and the importance of the structures and processes involved in the development of a resort it is necessary to look at the five broad sectors of the elements of supply in greater detail.

Many different attractions induce people to visit particular areas or spend their holidays in specific regions. These attractions have been classified in a variety of ways (Suzuki, 1967; Peters, 1969; Defert, 1972). The three main distinctions
are natural features, such as physical features of the land, vegetation and climate; man-made objects, such as historic buildings, amusement parks, duty free shopping; and man and his culture, as expressed through language, music, folklore, cuisine and so forth.

The development of tourism in general has been closely associated with advances in transport technology.

Since 1945 transport patterns have become more flexible and diffuse. The rise in automobile ownership and improvements in public transport services have opened up large recreational areas to people living in urban centres in New Zealand.

The accommodation component can be divided into two main sectors; commercial and private. The commercial sector includes hotels, motels, boarding houses, holiday camps etc. The private sector notably comprises private permanent residences used for hosting friends and relations, and second homes. Camping and caravanning can encompass both private and commercial sectors as it involves private tents or caravans in commercial camping grounds. Although holiday communities comprised totally of second homes or luxury hotels are becoming much more common, most holiday areas will offer a mix of accommodation types, depending on the nature of the resort and its clientele.

A range of supporting services may be required by the tourist and second home owner. These services may include a
variety of shops, restaurants, banks, hairdressers and medical centres. Auxiliary facilities and services are the most numerous and mainly service the resident population, however a number of luxury facilities and services may also become established due to the increased market provided by the tourist population. In contrast areas established solely for the purpose of tourist or second home development may provide some luxury services with the initial development rather than as demand requires it.

An adequate infrastructure will be needed to support the abovementioned services and facilities. This includes transport infrastructure (roading and parking, airfields, railway lines, harbours) and public utilities such as electricity, water reticulation, and sewage disposal. Most purpose-built second home resorts provide adequate infrastructure with the initial development. Infrastructure in a transformed resort area will however have to be shared with the permanent residents. This may lead to problems of demand exceeding supply at certain times of the year. Pearce (1981) points out that the critical point regarding infrastructure is that although it is essential it is basically a charge on development. With a few exceptions, the infrastructure does not itself generate revenue directly. To meet the demands of the seasonal peaks in population many second home areas have to provide extensive infrastructure which is not utilised to anywhere near capacity for three-quarters of the year. This situation can create a financial burden for the local authority and resident population.
Successful tourist and second home development depends largely on maintaining an adequate mix both within and between the five elements of supply. Unless certain facilities are to be over-charged or under-utilised, the capacity of each of the five sectors must be comparable, taking into account the periods of non-tourist use. Balanced development through time and space is critical, especially if social, economic and environmental impacts are to be kept to a minimum, supply must keep pace with demand.

3.2.2 Agents of Development

For development to occur the various components outlined above must be utilised or supplied by someone or some organisation. There is a wide range of development agents in existence, and their composition will vary from situation to situation. This will depend on the historical, political, economic, cultural and geographical context of the development. In a general context the agents of development can be divided into two sectors; public and private, and their participation may occur at all levels: international, national, regional and local. The public sector usually involves government, at all levels of the hierarchy, through which the development activities must be co-ordinated. Participation by the private sector also involves different levels from the large multinational company who may diversify into tourist-development, through national development companies to private individuals building their own second home.

The involvement of these different bodies will depend
on their motives, responsibilities and capabilities. Pearce (1981) examines the motives and responsibilities of the two sectors involved in tourist development. Four factors have been defined as the motives and responsibilities of the public sector. These are economic, social, environmental and political.

Some of the economic factors which may stimulate public sector involvement in tourist development are: improved balance of payments situation; regional development; diversification of the economy; increased income levels; increased state revenue (taxes); and new employment opportunities (Pearce, 1981). Central government may also have a responsibility to facilitate and stimulate private sector participation in an effort to promote economic growth. In the majority of developments it will also be the responsibility of the government to provide most of the necessary infrastructure.

Social considerations at various government levels (local, regional, national) may be to provide adequate recreational facilities for the population concerned, or to protect the social and economic well-being of the individual.

Although the responsibility of protecting and conserving the environment, both physical and cultural, should be the responsibility of both the public and private sector, it is a duty that usually falls to the public sector.

As tourism, especially international tourism, involves the movement of people, governments may encourage the development
of tourism to further political objectives.

To date the most significant of these four motivations has been economic, however social and environmental goals are becoming increasingly important in the more developed countries (E.C.E., 1976; AIEST, 1978).

Responsibility for development will vary throughout the government hierarchy depending on the nature, degree and location of the development, however it is usually the central government which is the controlling body, while the regional and local governments implement the projects and regulations.

The private sector's main concern is with profit-making. This is especially so with regard to developments by companies, as the basic responsibility of the developer is to maximise returns to the shareholders. On the small scale it has been shown in Chapter One that the prime motive of the second home owner is not profitability but non-urban recreation. The private sector agents of development are now also taking social and environmental factors into consideration to ensure the long-term security of their economic investment and to appease public opinion.

The capabilities of these development agents is partly dependent on their size relative to the projects they are undertaking and the availability of resources. The public sector also has the ability to control development in both sectors through its legislative powers.
Pearce (1981, p.12) states that:

"Tourist development occurs when motivation is matched with capability to provide the facilities and services."

outline earlier. He also notes that to be successful, this activity must occur under certain conditions, particularly the existence of a potential market for the product being developed. That is, supply must be matched with demand whether this is latent or, for example, created through extensive promotion.

Given the range of supply elements and the host of development agents with their different motivations and capabilities, many different degrees and types of tourist development may occur. Most development will consist of a mix, either structured or informal, of the different development agents. The degree of public/private participation will depend in large part on the scale and the nature of the project, the stage of development, the government policy in and regarding the relative location, and the capabilities of each.

Pearce has concluded that, to date, few writers have tried to identify and classify different types or processes of tourist development. He has found that much of the literature is ideographic in nature, with few attempts being made to compare case studies let alone generalize from them. The two resorts that have been studied for this thesis serve the useful purpose of highlighting the fact that different processes
of development can and do occur. Although the criteria used to examine Whitianga and Pauanui may vary, they generally take into account the characteristics of the developers and the resource being developed, the manner in which the resource is developed, the context of development and its spatial organisation.

3.3 METHODOLOGY

The basic research aim of this thesis is to illustrate the influence on and importance of the structures and processes of development in relation to these second home resorts.

In order to achieve this aim information was collected pertaining to the development stages and the physical, aesthetic and social features of each resort, the characteristics of the second homes and their owners, the utilisation of each resort, and the perceptions of second home owners and visitors to the present and future second home development.

A variety of methods were used to collect the appropriate data. Information related to the development stages, and associated structures and processes was obtained from the T-C.D.C. rates records and deposited plans, historical documentation, and interviews with people connected with the development of each resort.

Information related to the features, characteristics and utilisation was obtained from a questionnaire survey
administered to a one-in-five sample of second home owners. The sample was selected from the T-C.D.C. rates records, and totalled 125 for each area. The questionnaires (Appendices A, B) were administered by hand, accompanied by an introductory letter, (Appendix C) to all households in the sample who occupied their second home during the period from late December 1981 to January 31, 1982. A questionnaire and stamped envelope for its return were posted to each second home owner who could not be contacted during this period.

One hundred and one completed questionnaires were collected at Pauanui and after postal returns a total of ninety eight questionnaires were collected from Whitianga. These response rates of 90 percent for Pauanui and 78 percent for Whitianga were more than satisfactory.

Information pertaining to the perceptions of second home owners and visitors was obtained from this questionnaire survey and from another questionnaire administered to 50 visitors in each resort (Appendix D). These visitors were randomly selected from camping grounds in the respective resorts.

As two separate areas were being compared on the grounds of their development, any statistical analysis involved the testing of suspected differences. Such differences may be in the form of variables measuring socio-economic status, public and private place utility, recreational resources and perception.
The questionnaire survey data was measured at the nominal level, with the responses being allocated to a number of possible categories. The basic frequency characteristics of this data were established to determine any preferential response or trend in responses.

As the two samples were drawn from different populations (Pauanui and Whitianga), relationships between the variables measured, and their respective categories of response were tested. Given that the data has been measured at the nominal level, contingency table or cross-tabulation analysis was used. The S.P.S.S. package programme CROSSTABS was used to compute and display two way to n-way cross-tabulation tables.

The cross-tabulations are a joint-frequency distribution of responses according to their classificatory variables. The joint frequency distribution was tested for any significant difference using chi-square. This test statistic, with appropriate degrees of freedom was generated by CROSSTABS. The level of significance used in the analysis was the 0.05 level.
4.1 THE COROMANDEL PENINSULA: An overview

The Coromandel Peninsula is approximately 118 kilometres by road from Auckland, separated by the Firth of Thames and the Hauraki Plains.

4.1.1 The Physical Setting

The Peninsula consists largely of the Cape Colville range, some 130 kilometres long and an average 25 kilometres wide, stretching from Cape Colville in the north to Te Aroha in the south (Figure 4.1). The land surface is rugged and broken with elevations of up to 900 m above sea level. The intense volcanic and tectonic processes of the past associated with more recent vigorous erosion in an area of plentiful and intense rainfall has given rise to a typically rugged nature. The only areas of extensive flat land exist between Thames and Te Aroha, and an area near Waihi and north of Whitianga Harbour. The coastline is dominated by rocky headlands with shingle beaches on the west coast and hill country juxtaposed to the sea, with sandy beaches on the east coast.

The indigenous vegetation of the Coromandel Peninsula is comprised largely of mixed subtropical rainforest. The native forest, mainly secondary in growth, still comprises the majority of the vegetation of the Coromandel Peninsula and forms a valuable tourist resource. Some fine examples of
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the New Zealand kauri, initially dominant still remain, along with rimu and totara.

The typical lush nature of the indigenous forest is a response to the equable climate of the area which is humid with abundant sunshine.

Basic climatological information is lacking for the immediate Whitianga area, but does exist for Tairua forest, situated adjacent to Pauanui. This information is summarised in Table 4.1. In the main holiday months of December, January and February, higher temperatures, lower humidities and less rainfall are experienced than the yearly average (Table 4.2).

All-year-round mild temperatures, and especially the warmer and drier summer months, in conjunction with the rugged landscape, lush indigenous vegetation and safe sandy, sheltered beaches, combine to make the Coromandel Peninsula one of the most physically attractive tourist resort areas in New Zealand.

The attractiveness of the Coromandel Peninsula to the tourist is not contained solely within the physical resources of the area. The relics of the areas historical development are another important attraction.

4.1.2 The Four Phases of Historical Development

The historical development which characterises much of the Coromandel Peninsula, can be categorised into four phases of development.
Table 4.1: Summary of climatological observations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Temperature (°C)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily mean</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily mean maximum</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily mean minimum</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Relative Humidity (%) |       |       |       |       |
| Daily mean            | 82    |       |       |       |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rainfall (mm)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1823</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean monthly rainfall</td>
<td>151.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of raindays</td>
<td>138</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: New Zealand Meteorological Service Annual Summaries

Table 4.2: Summary of climatological observations for December, January and February - Tairua Forest 1952-1970.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Temperature (°C)</th>
<th>November</th>
<th>January</th>
<th>February</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily mean</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily mean maximum</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily mean minimum</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Relative Humidity (%) | November | January | February | Mean |
| Daily mean            | 74       | 74      | 79       | 75.6 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rainfall (mm)</th>
<th>November</th>
<th>January</th>
<th>February</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of raindays</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of total rainfall</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of total raindays</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: New Zealand Meteorological Service Annual Summaries
The first of these phases was pre-1860, during which time the Maori population dominated the economy and the social character of the region. This phase also marked the arrival of Captain Cook and his discovery of the potential of kauri for ship's planking and spars.

The second and third phases of development, timber-milling and gold-mining, occurred between 1860 and 1920. These phases which began with the construction of several large sawmills, and the spectacular gold-rushes of the Thames fields in 1867 were marked by the rapid and unique transformation of the Coromandel landscape (Wise's N.Z. Guide, 1979).

The large scale and systematic mining of the mineral wealth of the Coromandel began with the opening of the Thames gold-field in 1857. There were three major discoveries in three comparatively small areas; Coromandel, Thames and Ohinemuri Valley. The history of gold-mining on the Peninsula related to a sequence of boom periods followed by periods of slump. However from 1910 mineral production declined continuously. By the beginning of the twentieth century the last extensive kauri forests to be found on the peninsula were felled.

Evidence of the timber-millers, gold-miners and gum-diggers can still be found today in the form of old mine and mill sites, log dams, logging tracks and permanent changes to the vegetation cover and physical landscape. The location and form of many of the settlements were significantly
influenced by their initial function as gold-mining and timber towns.

During this period the Peninsula reached its peak of growth, in both population size and economic importance.

The discovery of gold brought many thousands of people to the Peninsula. This influx resulted in the development and growth of numerous townships. Canvas towns grew up rapidly, later to be replaced by permanent buildings. A characteristic of these townships, still in evidence today, is the large number of hotels constructed to cater for the transient population of the time.

Other industries of this time that live on in the history of the Peninsula were gum-digging and flax-milling.

The fourth and final phase of historical development on the Coromandel Peninsula involves the small scale growth of farming and the growth of tourism.

Farming, notably dairying, became an important factor in the Coromandel's economic base once mineral and timber exploitation declined. In the 1940's the areas of reasonably stable hill pastures were limited to a narrow coastal belt, seldom more than three miles wide, extending from Port Charles to Cape Colville and southwards along the west coast to Thames. Unfortunately most hill pastures were not increasing in productivity. Derelict scrubby farmlands with weed infested,
sheet-eroded pastures, neglected orchards and tumble-down buildings characterised much of the hill country on the Coromandel Peninsula in the late 1940's.

Settlement on the Coromandel Peninsula is uneven, essentially peripheral and largely coastal in location. It strongly reflects the influences of the past. Over time, new patterns have been superimposed upon the old ones. Some of the mining towns which experienced mushroom growth during gold booms disappeared with their ore. Others, although having declined considerably, have remained in existence as service centres for farming communities. The Peninsula settlements have tended not to be homogeneous in character and each town has distinguishing features of its own. Thames, now a service town for the surrounding dairy farms, still reflects its conception during the goldrush years. Coromandel township has also survived as a small but important farming and tourist centre. Whitianga, once renowned for its sawmills, is now popular as a holiday centre.

4.1.3 Second Home Growth and Potential

With its long coastline, scenic variety, numerous safe swimming beaches, deep-sea fishing attractions and an interesting and varied history, the Coromandel Peninsula was becoming increasingly important in the 1940's as a playground for holidaymakers from the Waikato, Auckland, Bay of Plenty and other neighbouring localities. The growth of this tourist traffic has produced distinctive settlement forms, as did the other industries which flourished in the past.
After 1940 the Coromandel coastline was characterised by sporadic development of beach cottages in many areas. Whangamata and Whitianga, with their deep-sea fishing attractions and excellent swimming beaches, began to grow rapidly as nodal centres for holiday makers. Other popular second home areas that emerged were Hahei, Tairua and later, Pauanui.

Tourism, and especially second home development, has become increasingly important as a landuse on the Coromandel Peninsula. With the opening of the Kopu-Hikuai State Highway (25a) in 1967 the eastern coast of the Coromandel Peninsula became more easily accessible to visitors from populous areas. By 1981, Provisional New Zealand Population Census statistics showed that 1.31 million people lived within the Central Auckland and South Auckland-Bay of Plenty statistical areas. This serves to illustrate the recreational demand within easy driving range of the Peninsula.

In terms of second homes, the census figures for baches in the Thames and Coromandel divisions illustrate the popularity of the Coromandel Peninsula as a second home location. There has been a rapid increase in the number of second homes (purpose-built or converted) in the Coromandel since 1945.

This is especially so after 1966 (Figure 4.2). While paralleling the general increase in second homes for New Zealand (Figure 4.3), the Thames-Coromandel District (T-C.D.) does show some deviation in the national trend. This is particularly apparent in the period between the 1971 and 1976
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The District shows an overall increase in the number of second homes between 1971 and 1976 of 31 percent, in contrast to 2.1 percent nationally. Likewise, between 1976 and 1981, second home growth on the Peninsula exceeded national second home growth with an increase of 31 percent compared to 14.4 percent. A possible explanation of this regional and national contrast may be found in the development of planned resorts such as Pauanui and Onemana, and the parallel growth of such established areas as Whangamata and Whitianga.

This active development, matched with the large source of potential second home owners in Auckland, South Auckland, and Bay of Plenty statistical areas may account for this rapid increase. Of the national total number of second homes built between 1971 and 1981, 32 percent of them were in the T-C.D. Similarly for the same period, the district showed a growth rate of 72 percent in comparison with the national rate of 16.8 percent.

Nationally the T-C.D. had the largest number of second homes in New Zealand in 1981 (Figure 2.1), having surpassed Rodney County in 1976. This may reflect an increasing interest in the Coromandel as a desirable location for the building of a second home.

Little information exists as to the total volume and demands of visitors to the Coromandel Peninsula, but it is quite evident that rapid development has been taking place.
since. Until recently the eastern coast of the Coromandel has been dominated by sporadic development of second homes on small coastal pockets of land. Problems of land utilisation can arise with such spontaneous development and a basic problem is whether the Coromandel Coast has the ability to absorb the effect of this recreational land use.

4.2 THE STUDY AREAS

This thesis considers two specific resorts in the Coromandel. These study areas, Pauanui and Whitianga, are situated on the east coast of the Peninsula, and within two and a half to three hours drive of a large catchment area. They are located within 69 kilometres of each other, and represent areas with similar characteristics, and accessibility for the hinterland population.

Most importantly, they are examples of two types of second home development.

Pauanui is a prime example of the more recent type, of planned and controlled development that is beginning to appear on the New Zealand landscape. From start to finish, the total development is carefully planned and controlled and it occurs over a relatively short period of time.

Whitianga, on the other hand, has developed over a long period of time, and its growth and development has been far from uniform, both temporally and spatially. In the past there was no overall planning concept for the development of
Whitianga and its growth and development during this time could be described as unregulated and spontaneous.

4.2.1 Pauanui Ocean Beach Resort

Pauanui (big or many Paua) has been developed on a spit running south to north of the eastern coast of the Coromandel Peninsula, approximately 45 kilometres from Thames. The northern end of Pauanui Spit opposite Tairua Head, forms the southern shore of the Tairua Harbour entrance (Plate 1).

Prior to 1967, Pauanui was covered with pines, pohutukawas, low scrub and was completely undeveloped. The only occupants were wild horses and stray cattle.

The spit's location and natural and undeveloped condition was retained until this late stage in the development of the Peninsula because there was no road access to Pauanui. In 1967 the Kopu-Hikuai State Highway (25a) was opened. This provided a direct, sealed access across the Peninsula from Auckland, Waikato and the Bay of Plenty via Thames to Tairua, Hikuai and Pauanui.

This highway was a major factor in the decision of Hopper Bros Development Ltd to purchase the sand spit and develop Pauanui Ocean Beach Resort. Two hundred and forty hectares in size, Pauanui has a permanent population of approximately 300 (1982). The peak summer population reaches anywhere between 8-10,000, and the static population at any
one time is estimated to be between 400 and 500. Pauanui is sited 400 m across the Tairua estuary and 18 kilometres by road from the township of Tairua. This is the nearest service town to Pauanui.

Pauanui has been developed specifically as a second home resort. It is a controlled development that includes a full supply of infrastructure and services. Approximately 1,400 sections have been developed and sold, and of these 756 have houses or units on them. There are still 100 to 150 sections to be landscaped and sold before the development of Pauanui will be complete. Included in the overall planning of Pauanui has been the allotment of large areas of open space, public reserves and walkways. A number of public sporting and recreational facilities, such as a ten-hole golf course and tennis court, have also been incorporated into the development.

Pauanui is a resort planned for, and economically dependent on its second home population.

4.2.2 Whitianga

Te Whitianga-a-Kupe (The crossing of Kupe) is also on the east coast of the Coromandel Peninsula, and is situated 69 kilometres north of Pauanui (Plate 2).

The settlement of Whitianga was originally based on the timber industry, and for many years Whitianga was one of the main timber centres in New Zealand. By the 1850's a European
PLATE 2: Whitianga
settlement had been well-established on the eastern side of the river. However just as the gold industry declined on the west coast of the Peninsula, so too did the timber industry that had made Whitianga wealthy. By 1924 most milling had ceased. Today Whitianga is economically dependent upon the tourism and fishing industries which have developed.

Although Whitianga was sited on the eastern side of the harbour from 1836 to approximately 1881, it has now been located on its present site on the western side of the harbour for one hundred years. Whitianga has had a long and varied history of development, and currently has a permanent population of approximately two thousand. However the town attracts many thousands more visitors and residents during the summer months. The recreational and social facilities of Whitianga are similar to Pauanui, but parts of the infrastructure have been neglected. Whitianga was an established settlement before it became popular as a location for second homes. Most of the second home development has been initiated by the individual second home owner. Consequently development has been spontaneous and unregulated with secondary and primary residences interspersed. The subdivision of land has occurred mainly through original farmers subdividing farmland and selling it to individuals or professional developers. There have been very few major professional subdivisions carried out in Whitianga. Whitianga is a small urban centre within which second homes have been built over a period of time. It is now economically dependent on the domestic tourism generated by the natural and historical assets of the area.
CHAPTER FIVE

STRUCTURES AND PROCESSES OF DEVELOPMENT:
Pauanui and Whitianga

5.1 THE DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK OF PAUANUI

Any study of second homes must include an examination of the structures and processes of their development if valid conclusions are to be made, and contrasts explained.

Two models have been developed to illustrate and contrast the spatial and temporal development of Pauanui and Whitianga, building on Pearce's (1981) examination of the structures and processes of tourist development.

The first model (Figure 5.1) outlines the structures and processes involved in the development of Pauanui as a second home resort. Pauanui was initiated by a private sector development company, therefore the model begins with the motivations and responsibilities of the agents of development (Box 1). More than one agent is involved because the private sector developer must confer with and abide by regulations set by the public sector. With regard to Pauanui this is the local authority. The responsibility of the agents of development are to provide the elements of supply (Box 3). The degree of public and private sector involvement here may vary with every development. The model illustrates that for Pauanui the private sector has been the main agent involved in the provision of these elements. The subdivision and
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provision of the elements of supply result in the establishment of the resort; Pauanui Ocean Beach Resort (Box 4). The next step in the sequence of development, as illustrated in Box 5, is for the developers to market their product. Once established the potential demand and the resort are ready to be introduced to each other. Economic returns from the sale of sections revert back to the developer and realise the potential demand. The model has now gone full cycle.

As illustrated by Miossec's model, development is dynamic, therefore the model does not stop when it returns to Box 2, rather the sequence of development continues in circular motion. Subsequent development is at a slower pace, but is nonetheless essential to maintain a high level of supply and demand.

5.2 THE PROCESS OF DEVELOPMENT

Prior to 1967 Pauanui was completely undeveloped and uninhabited. An important reason for this was the lack of road access.

5.2.1 Motivations and Responsibilities

During the early 1960's the four Hopper brothers of Hopper Bros Development Ltd, a road construction company based in Orewa and Whangaparoa (north of Auckland), were looking for a substantial area of land somewhere in the Coromandel. Their aim was to landscape, road and subdivide a sizeable block of land with the intention of developing a second home beach resort. They also wanted some project to occupy their men and
machinery during the winter months when there was little road contracting work. Their idea was to develop a 'model' subdivision, compatible with the environment and aesthetically pleasing, that included man-made amenities to make it attractive to families (Figure 5.2a). The developers' philosophy was "to give people what they want and if you make it the best they will pay for it" (Mr Ian Hopper, pers.comm.). The Hoppers believed that people needed and wanted more than just a beach if they were going to settle in one area for the holidays without getting bored. There is a need for a variety of activities for all members of the family to attract and retain people in an area. This could be argued to be a sensible planning strategy for the developers, as a rapid turnover of sections is avoided. Prospective buyers must then purchase sections developed at later stages.

5.2.2 Agents of Development

Hopper Brothers Development Ltd is a private company of which Pauanui Ocean Beach Resort Ltd (P.O.B.R. Ltd) is a subsidiary. All the development work involved in the creation of Pauanui was carried out by this company and its subsidiaries. The public sector involvement in the development of Pauanui was mainly indirect, limited and of a legislative nature. The Thames-Coromandel District Council (T-C.D.C.) were positive towards the development concepts and construction of Pauanui, and they were generally co-operative. The T-C.D.C. approved the application by P.O.B.R. Ltd to change the zoning of Pauanui from rural to residential and gave planning consent for the development of Pauanui to proceed. The Council required a
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full engineering plan (which did not include a connected water supply, power and sewage reticulation, landscaping or recreation areas), and inspected road works and development works before accepting and sealing plans. Once sealed the plans became the responsibility of the T-C.D.C. These plans were then deposited with the district land registrar and freehold titles for the sections could then be sold.

Although it is usually the responsibility of the public sector to supply most of the infrastructure, this has not been the case with regard to Pauanui. All of the infrastructure, within Pauanui, has been supplied by the developer and the cost passed on, through the section price, to the buyer. The only involvement the public sector had was in the provision of a loan for the sewage headworks and the provision of road access to Pauanui. At present the responsibilities of the T-C.D.C. in Pauanui are to maintain the reserves, rubbish compactor and public areas.

On July 17, 1967 P.O.B.R.Ltd purchased the initial block of approximately 103 hectares from Mr J.R. Needham, a local farmer (Figure 5.2b). This block consisted of land from and including the present airstrip north to Royal Billy point, but excluding the block which is now Pleasant Place and El Dorado Leader (Figure 5.2a). Within twelve months the airstrip and first roads were completed. The first block of sections were developed and released for sale. The first sections were developed in McCall Avenue, Lowe Park Lane and Dunlop Drive, and these sold much faster than the developers anticipated.
On May 20, 1969 P.O.B.R. Ltd purchased a further six-chain wide strip of 11 hectares of land adjacent to the airstrip for $30,000 with a first option of refusal on any further land on the spit (Figure 5.2b). By the end of 1969 the 10-hole golf course was roughed out and Kennedy Park Drive and Pauanui Boulevard were formed and gradually sealed. On the 3rd of July 1970 P.O.B.R. Ltd purchased another block of approximately 55 hectares extending from the second block out as far as Beach Road. A 1.2 hectare block to the south-west of the main development for a temporary oxidisation pond was also purchased (Figure 5.2b). The price paid was $126,000, with another first refusal clause. By this time section development had moved as far as Coutts Road, Hobson Place and Prescott Place. This development also included the beginning of the shopping complex with a dairy/restaurant/general store combined. Of the sections released for sale in 1970, 129 sold within two weeks. The demand for sections was high and they were being purchased as quickly as they could be developed. In 1972 the T-C.D.C. gave notice of intention to purchase land in Oxley Gully for the construction of permanent oxidisation ponds, to include the treatment of sewage from Tairua. The Council took possession of the land in 1973. On the 30th September 1974 P.O.B.R. Ltd purchased two final blocks of land; the El Dorado Leader/Pleasant Place block and the block which is now intended as the airstrip extension/light industrial school site, from Slipper Island resorts (Figure 5.2b). This company had originally purchased the blocks from the Needhams in direct violation of P.O.B.R. Ltd's first refusal clause. The two blocks cost P.O.B.R. Ltd $370,000. The final completed
size of Pauanui is 240 hectares.

The development of the sections involved some contouring work and a lot of tree planting and grass growing. All the sections are connected to water, underground power and sewage, and are maintained for a year after purchase by the developer.

5.2.3 Elements of Supply

The raison d'être of a purpose-built second home resort is to provide a base from which people can engage in recreational pursuits. The more recent type of planned resorts like Pauanui, aim to do this in the most comfortable way possible. This entails providing a number of elements of supply. The resort initially requires a number of attractions, man-made or natural, to create a demand for the service it supplies. These attractions are also a source of recreation for the second home owner while at the resort. An adequate transport network is necessary to provide access to, and within, the resort. Once there, the second home owner accommodates himself in a second home he has purchased, or had built on a section subdivided and developed by the developer. Any visitors are accommodated in motor camps, motels, or rented second homes. The development of the sections involves the supply of infrastructure in addition to transport. This infrastructure takes the form of water, electricity, sewage and a number of supporting facilities such as shops, medical services and trade services.
(i) **Attractions**

The first of the elements of supply referred to in Box 3 of the model is attractions. The natural attractions of Pauanui and the surrounding area are many and varied. Naturally the major attraction is the ocean, its beach and the estuary between Pauanui and Tairua. These water resources are excellent for swimming, boating and fishing. There are also a number of bush walks and tramps in Tairua Forest. The forest also contains examples of the historical development of the area in the form of old gold mines and kauri log dams.

The developers have also provided a number of amenities to complement the natural attractions. These attractions are mainly recreation based, such as a 10-hole golf course (Plate 3), a putt-putt (mini golf course) (Plate 4), bowling green, eight tennis courts, public picnic areas, an airstrip, boat ramps and ski lanes, an equestrian park, an athletics park and cricket pitch, and a number of public reserves. The developers also supplied money for the development of the Pauanui social club (Plate 5), youth club, surf club, recreation hall and church (Plate 6). The natural and man-made attractions complement each other and are designed to attract and entertain all ages and members of the family.

(ii) **Transport**

As previously mentioned, road access across the Peninsula was supplied by the public sector in the same year as the initial land purchase of Pauanui was made. This highway has vastly improved the relative accessibility and attractiveness
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of Pauanui to the surrounding major urban centres.

The opening of the Kopu-Hikuai State Highway (25a) was a major factor in the decision-making processes of the Hoppers to purchase at Pauanui. There is no public transport service to Pauanui so the only means of getting there is by motor vehicle, aeroplane or boat.

All road works within Pauanui itself were completed by Hopper Brothers Construction Ltd. The planning of the road network involved some innovative ideas rarely used in New Zealand. The roads in Pauanui (Figure 5.2a) are generally curved, and narrow with grass-median strips dividing left and right lanes. A curved road restricts the amount of the road ahead that the driver can see. The developers felt that this factor plus narrower lanes would restrict the speed of traffic. The roads in Pauanui are 'V' shaped rather than crown shaped, with grass median strips (Plate 7). The purpose of this is so that any precipitation will collect on the median strip and soak down to replenish the ground water supply. The majority of roads in Pauanui are cul-de-sacs so as to restrict through traffic from the second homes as much as possible. This, combined with the eight miles of meandering walkways, is aimed at encouraging people to use their feet rather than cars (Ian Hopper, pers.comm.). Now that the road network for Pauanui is complete it is up to the T-C.D.C. to maintain it.

(iii) Accommodation

Pauanui has been developed exclusively as a second home
PLATE 7: Vista Paku
coastal resort. The developers develop and subdivide the land, and sell the freehold titles to prospective second home owners. Theoretically from this point the developers relinquish all responsibility with regard to the purchased section. In Pauanui however, the developers will maintain the section for one year after purchase. As a means of retaining a relatively high standard of development the developers have also included a building covenant into the agreement for sale and purchase (Figure 5.3). This covenant includes a number of specific criteria, over and above the building requirements of the T-C.D.C., which must be met when erecting a dwelling at Pauanui. There is no time limit with regard to commencement of building. However once started, the exterior must be completed within six months. Second-hand transported homes are not permitted but new ones are (Plate 8), and there are no height restrictions other than normal ordinances, which include a graduated height restriction adjacent to the airstrip. Approximately 1,400 sections have been developed and sold so far. Of these 756 have houses or units on them (T-C.D.C. Rates Records). If a section has not been built on, but is still being utilised for holidays by means of a tent or caravan, it must have an operative amenity chalet on it. These can be provided by the owner or purchased from the developers for approximately $2,000. The chalet is a small transportable building which is connected to the water, power and sewerage systems to provide hot water, toilet and washing facilities.

There is also accommodation at Pauanui which may be classified in the commercial sector. This takes the form of
PLATE 8: New Transportable Second Homes - Pauanui
FACTS RE THE BUILDING COVENANT
PURCHASERS ARE REQUESTED TO ACQUAINT THEMSELVES WITH THESE DETAILS AS THEY ARE CONTAINED WITHIN THE AGREEMENT FOR SALE AND PURCHASE.

This covenant has been included solely for the protection of property owners, so that properties will not be subjected to the devaluing effect of poorly designed buildings erected on neighbouring lots.

By taking a reasonable attitude, lot owners will ensure a good standard of architecture throughout the development. This will result in their investment being considerably enhanced over the years.

Here is a brief outline of the covenant:

1. Each dwelling erected must cover a minimum ground area of 500 sq. ft., exclusive of carport or garage and have the approval of the company's architect as to exterior design, unless it is planned by a registered architect. But this approval will not be required for any building over 800 sq. ft and $7000 in value, when the responsibility for effective exterior appearance rests with the owner who, it is considered, is unlikely to outlay a large sum of money on a building which has no outward appeal.

2. Not more than two dwelling units may be erected on any one lot.

3. No flat asbestos cement sheathing for exterior walls, secondhand buildings or secondhand materials will be permitted for any building.

PAUANUI OCEAN BEACH RESORT LTD.

Figure 5.3 SOURCE: Hopper Brothers Development Ltd
two relatively large well equipped motor camps with provision for tenting and caravanning. They also provide motel flats and tourist chalets.

(iv) Infrastructure

The developers of Pauanui have supplied all the infrastructure within Pauanui. This includes the transport infrastructure - roading, parking, airstrip, boat ramps, and walkways - and the public utilities - electricity, water and sewage.

With few exceptions infrastructure is a charge on development. However the developers have included these overheads into the prices of the sections. It is good planning and economic sense to supply all the infrastructure during the initial development stage, especially if the total development occurs over a number of years. The infrastructure that has been supplied has been used as a good advertising and selling ploy to create and retain a demand for sections. The developers found that it was actually cheaper and far less detrimental to the environment to supply a sewage system in preference to septic tanks. The electricity reticulation is also underground so as not to detract aesthetically from the area. Rubbish disposal in Pauanui is by means of a rubbish compactor (Plate 9) rather than an open tip.

The public sector had no involvement in supplying any of the infrastructure during Pauanui's development. The T-C.D.C. is at present considering replacing the old sewage
PLATE 9: Rubbish Compactor - Pauanui
system with a new system of aerated oxidisation ponds to service both Tairua and Pauanui. This system is better suited to coping with demands imposed by the fluctuating holiday population. At an estimated cost of $1.5 million (T-C.D.C., 1979) the economic impact on the ratepayers of Tairua and Pauanui will be substantial – approximately $120 per year each for the next 30 years (Thames Star, 23.10.79).

(v) Supporting Facilities

The shops and services at Pauanui are still fairly limited for a town that has a peak summer population of up to 10,000 people. This may be attributable to its youth, as Pauanui has only been in existence for the last fourteen years, and to the seasonal nature of the population.

Defert (1966), proposes a hierarchical model for the development of the supporting services in a traditional resort (Figure 5.4). Those used every day, such as dairies, cafés, and grocers' stores will be the most numerous and among the first to be established, whereas the higher order services, such as jewellers, will come at a later stage when a much larger clientele exists. Today, however, resort development may be so rapid, as in the case of Pauanui, that some luxury services are provided from the outset. Pauanui has examples of all five of Defert's catagories. The everyday services at Pauanui are a dairy-takeaway bar, a timber and hardware store, Post Office, supermarket/general store and a real estate agent. The trade services include an electrician, builders, plumbers, a service station, glazier, earthworks, cabinet-maker and
DEVELOPMENT OF SHOPS AND SERVICES IN A TOURIST RESORT
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joiner, plumbers and drainlayers, painters and decorators, nursery and a handyman service. In the comfort category is a clothing/drapery/haberdashery store, and in the security category is the Pauanui Volunteer Fire Brigade (Plate 10). Pauanui does not have a resident policeman nor a doctor, but a doctor from Tairua holds surgery at the local medical centre for a limited number of hours per week. Pauanui also has an information centre to assist the general public (Plate 11).

Because of the seasonality of the population numbers, Pauanui can not support a large number and variety of shops for twelve months of the year. Initially the only shop was a dairy/restaurant/general store where the present dairy is. With increased demand the number and variety of shops increased. In 1971 there were two shops, increasing to four in 1973. By 1975 there were five shops and a restaurant, and by 1977 there were, and still are nine shops in Pauanui. These shops include the service station, medical centre, information centre and Post Office.

5.2.4 The Developed Resort

Once the initial blocks of sections had been subdivided, landscaped and connected to the basic infrastructure of water, electricity and sewage, the sections could be released for sale. At this stage Pauanui, with a number of supporting facilities to meet the initial demand, could be considered an established second home resort.

Pauanui began as a 'pet' project of the four brothers of
PLATE 10: Pauanui Fire Station

PLATE 11: Pauanui Information Centre, Medical Centre and Post Office
Hopper Brothers Development Ltd. Pauanui offered them an opportunity to put into practice the experience and ideas they had gathered, and create a properly conceived and designed coastal community. An American landscape architect, Professor Walter Lewis, commented

"My impression is that most New Zealand developers have expected nature and the elements to adhere to them, hence the tendency to bulldoze everything in sight. Pauanui is not like that. A real effort has been made not to interfere with the existing contour of the land, or the vegetation. By careful and generous use of space, the developers have preserved the essential character of the area - a parkland by the sea - and at the same time have given Pauanui all the services and amenities associated with a prestigious residential development." (Plate 12)  

(Management Magazine, 1976)

The Hoppers achieved what they set out to do and today Pauanui is a popular, well serviced second home resort. It attracts both second home owners, campers and day visitors in large numbers during the summer. Although the vast majority of Pauanui's population is only in residence during the summer months, an increasing number of second home owners are utilising their second homes at weekends during the winter months.

5.2.5 Demand for Second Home Ownership

The success and popularity of Pauanui as a second home resort has been reflected in the consistently high demand for sections. This is due to the actual demand from prospective buyers, and also due to the marketing and planning strategies
PLATE 12: Pauanui from Mount Paku (Tairua)
employed by the developers. Rather than developing all the prime beach front sections at once, as many previous 'get-rich-quick' developers have done, the Hoppers avoided what they considered as "environmentally disastrous ribbon development" (Ian Hopper, pers.comm.) by developing sections in blocks which include both beach and back sections (Figure 5.5). They have also only developed and released a limited number of sections year year. This strategy has kept demand, profits and employment rates high over the fourteen years that Pauanui has been in existence.

Approximately 1,400 sections had been sold by February 1982 (Mrs Parker, P.O.B.R. Information Centre, pers.comm.). Built on these sections are 756 houses and units (T-C.D.C. Rates Records, 1981) of which approximately 130 are now permanent residences. The rest of the sections, if in use, have amenity chalets used in conjunction with caravans or tents. The building permits for dwellings from March 1968 to September 1980 (Figure 5.6), increase at a steady pace, as does the value of works for buildings, plumbing and drainage (Figure 5.7), illustrating the constant demand and development of Pauanui.

5.2.6 Economic Returns

The economic returns from Pauanui have benefitted both the public and private sector. The economic benefits for the public sector have been in the form of rates levied on the land owners of Pauanui by the T-C.D.C. The present rating system used by the T-C.D.C. is a rate in the dollar-per-average-assessment value. This system has caused some consternation
Figure 5.5
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SOURCE: T-C.D.C. Building Permits Records
RUNNING TOTAL OF ALL WORK: BUILDING PLUMBING DRAINAGE — PAUANUI

Figure 5.7
SOURCE: T-C.D.C. Building Permits Records
for the developers and residents of Pauanui. The problem is that average assessment values in different towns vary and different levels of infrastructure occur between towns. Table 5.1 illustrates this variation in the average assessment values.

This rating system is something of an anomaly with regard to Pauanui, because as each new block of sections is developed the sections within it are supplied with sewage, water and power reticulation. Very little other than maintenance is required to be done by the T-C.D.C. because as these services are provided by P.O.B.R. Ltd and included in the section price. This results in a high section value, as compared with sections in places such as Whitianga (which is without a sewage system or a decent water supply, (Mr G. Lawrence, Planner T-C.D.C., pers.comm.) and therefore incurs a higher rating. The purchaser of a section in Pauanui virtually ends up paying for their infrastructure twice. Because the T-C.D.C. is only required to do maintenance work in Pauanui, the rates levied there are not being spent in Pauanui. Mr Ian Hopper is endeavouring to persuade the T-C.D.C. to adopt a more equitable rating system.

The economic benefits for the private sector, namely the developers, are most obviously the capital from section sales. The prices of sections released by the developers have increased quite markedly over the development period (Table 5.2). This is attributable to inflation and the growth in demand for them. They also own and lease the land on which all the supporting facilities are sited.
Table 5.1: Average rates of specific towns on the Coromandel Peninsula 1976.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Township</th>
<th>Average Rates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coromandel</td>
<td>$130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whangamata</td>
<td>$150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tairua</td>
<td>$155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pauanui</td>
<td>$218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thames</td>
<td>$250*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitianga</td>
<td>$183</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*includes special works and servicing loans.


Table 5.2: The highest and lowest new section prices 1970-1980 (inflation adjusted).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Beachfront section ($)</th>
<th>Back section ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>14,285</td>
<td>2,976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>13,477</td>
<td>3,369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>19,635</td>
<td>4,207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>23,310</td>
<td>8,158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>29,380</td>
<td>8,394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>25,617</td>
<td>7,319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>33,816</td>
<td>10,507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>31,678</td>
<td>10,559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>37,735</td>
<td>9,433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>37,313</td>
<td>9,121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>31,869</td>
<td>7,790</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: P.O.B.R. Ltd Section Price Schedules
The Hoppers also prefer to sell their sections on a deposit and interest term repayment basis, rather than cash.

As the model Figure 5.1 illustrates, the structures and processes of development of Pauanui are circular with the economic returns arrow going to the agents of development (Box 2) and an arrow from there going to the elements of supply (Box 3). This indeed has been the nature of the development of Pauanui. Although the developers have gained large profits from the development, they have also put large amounts of money back into the development, in the form of additional attractions, supporting facilities and infrastructure. Admittedly this extra care and attention towards the development does help to keep the demand and profits up, but the Hoppers are genuinely concerned about the environmental and social well-being of Pauanui. Their aim was to create a 'unique self-contained coastal community' (Pauanui Brochure) and they are prepared to continue assistance to retain that ideal.

5.3 THE DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK OF WHITIANGA

In order to highlight the differences between a planned and a spontaneous second home resort, Pauanui will now be contrasted with Whitianga, an example of the latter type of development.

The sequence of development illustrated by the model of the development of Whitianga reflects that of a spontaneous second home development (Figure 5.8).
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The initial function of Whitianga as a timber centre is shown in Box 1. Many of the events and developments that have occurred during the very early stages of Whitianga's development and the natural physical assets of the environment later proved to be a positive pull factor in attracting visitors (Box 2). Therefore, as the timber supplies declined, the township turned to tourism and fishing as a means of support.

Following the basic elements of supply the Whitianga model becomes circular. This is due firstly to the multiple function of Whitianga as a service town, a tourist resort, and a second home location, and secondly the out-of-phase development of the tourist resort function and the second home location function, (i.e. the tourist demand preceeded the second home demand).

Box 3 contains the agents of development involved in providing subsequent elements of tourist supply in Whitianga. Box 4 comprises the motivations and responsibilities of these agents in providing the elements of supply (Box 5). Once these subsequent elements have been supplied Whitianga gains the function of a holiday resort (Box 6).

Over time a certain percentage of the visitors perceive Whitianga as a potential second home location. This is manifested in the demand for, and growth of second homes (Box 7). Consequently this demand must be met by a number of new or improved supply elements. This factor directs the model from
demand back to the agents of development to provide these elements, thus illustrating the circular nature of the development.

As proposed here the structures and processes of the development of Whitianga contrast with those of Pauanui. An expanded discussion of the factors in the model will further illustrate this contrast.

5.3.1 Historical/Economical function of Whitianga

Whitianga's original function was mainly as a service town and timber-milling and export centre. The first European settlement at Whitianga was established on the eastern side of Whitianga harbour during the early 1800's. By the 1860's a large sawmill, timber yard, repair slip and ship building yard were established. In 60 years Whitianga became one of the main timber centres in New Zealand with more than 600 million feet of kauri, along with approximately 100,000 tons of kauri gum being exported to countries such as Norway, Sweden, France, Italy and Great Britain (McVicker, 1979).

Although Whitianga was originally sited on the eastern side of the harbour from 1836, in approximately 1887, it located on its present site (Figure 5.9) on the western side of the harbour.

By 1920 the timber that had made Whitianga wealthy had declined, and most of the milling ended. The people of Whitianga who wished to remain there were forced to find other
means of support. The solution was found in the natural attractions and assets of the environs. Today Whitianga relies on fishing and tourism with assistance from some small factories for its economic livelihood.

The decline of the timber industry in Whitianga was matched with a decline in population from 442 in 1921 to 313 in 1926; a 29 percent loss (N.Z. Population Census Data). From 1926 to 1945 there was a gradual increase in population numbers with an average increase of 13 percent. From 1951 to 1971 there was an average population increase of 21.6 percent which parallels the general national increase of population. The period 1971 to 1976 showed the highest increase in Whitianga's population since 1900, with an increase of 43 percent, compared to 9.3 percent nationally. Likewise a similar trend is apparent for the years 1976 to 1981 with an increase of 34 percent accounting for a 28 fold increase over the national increase of 1.2 percent.

The population growth of Whitianga from 1966 to 1981 can possibly be accounted for by the increased importance of tourism in the economy, and the increasing demand for second homes, (this will be discussed in 5.3.4). This may also be reflected in the rapid increase in the size of the work force. From 1966 to 1971 the work force increased by 22 percent. However for the period 1971 to 1976, in which the most rapid growth of second homes in the T-C.D. was experienced (Figure 4.2), there was an increase in the work force of 51 percent. A similar increase (32 percent) was also evident for the period
1976 to 1981. The increase in the work force may be related to the growing economic importance of tourism and second homes in Whitianga during this period.

5.3.2 Initial Attractions

As personal mobility grew, places like Whitianga gained in popularity as holiday spots. The initial attractions of Whitianga were both physical and man-made.

Whitianga offered a warm sunny climate, beaches for swimming, attractive scenery, and an ocean full of fish and marine life for fishermen and underwater enthusiasts. Buffalo Beach along which Whitianga has extended, is 3.2 kilometres of safe sandy beach for swimming and net fishing. Whitianga is also world-renowned for its deep-sea fishing (especially for Marlin) and the Alderman Islands also attract many scubadivers.

Along with the physical attractions, the historical events of the area are an integral part of the attractiveness of Whitianga. Mercury Bay, in which Whitianga is situated, is where Captain Cook was anchored when he hoisted the British flag on the 15th of November 1769 to formally claim New Zealand for the King of England (McVicker, 1979). In 1838 Gordon Brown built the first hewn stone wharf at Whitianga. It is still in existence and is claimed to be the oldest in Australasia (Whalley, 1974). In 1840 H.M.S. Buffalo, in Whitianga to load kauri spars, ran aground on the beach (later to be named Buffalo Beach) and sank. Relics from the ship can be found in Whitianga homes and shops today (McVicker, 1979). In 1895
Neil Henry began a one-man ferry service across Whitianga Harbour; the ferry service which is still in operation today.

Whitianga Rock and the pa site on it is another tourist attraction. Just beyond Whitianga Rock is a stone boom built to trap the kauri logs as they were floated down the Whitianga Estuary. It is these physical and historical features which originally attracted visitors to Whitianga and encouraged some of them to buy or build second homes in the region.

Whitianga has developed from a timber town into a holiday resort catering for all types of visitors from day visitors through to campers and second home owners. Because of this sequence of development, the rest of the model in Figure 5.8 is examined as two circular phases, so as to highlight the development of the different but interrelated functions of Whitianga.

Whitianga is an established township with a permanent population of approximately 2,000. The economy of Whitianga is based on tourism and fishing. Because of this Whitianga has a two-fold function, firstly as a service centre for the local rural and resident population, and secondly as a holiday-tourist node, catering for a peak seasonal population of approximately 15,500. The development of second homes has become an integral part of this latter function.

5.3.3 Agents of Development

Both the public and private sector have been involved
quite extensively in the general development of Whitianga.

Public sector involvement in Whitianga was that of any local authority, with respect to its administrative district. The motivations and responsibilities of the Coromandel County Council prior to 1975, and latterly the T-C.D.C. have been to develop and maintain Whitianga as a functioning economic township. This has involved general council duties of supplying basic transport facilities, infrastructure, parks and reserves and communities facilities. These have been maintained with finance from rates levied on property owners, and central government grants and loans. The Council has also been responsible for facilitating and stimulating private sector participation in an effort to promote economic growth within the township. The public sector has been directly involved in the development of Whitianga as a township, but not as a holiday resort.

Private sector involvement in the development of Whitianga as a holiday resort can be divided into three groups:—land developers, those who have supplied a particular service, and second home owners.

Land development by individuals or companies has not been anywhere near the scale of the development of Pauanui, nor have the developments been specifically for second homes. Most of the growth and development of the residential areas of Whitianga in recent years has been initiated by the original landowning farmers who have sold the land to developers to
subdivide, or else have subdivided it themselves (Mr G. Lawrence, T-C.D.C. Planner, pers.comm.). Most of the professional subdivision has occurred in the last ten to fifteen years. Examples of these types of developers are Mid Island Development, Robinson and Broadbent, and Landel Company (District Planning Schemes, T-C.D.C.) (Figure 5.10).

There have been a number of different developers involved in the subdivision in Whitianga and the different subdivisions reflect the different planning concepts and periods in which they occurred. There is no continuity between the different developments, thus the residential development of Whitianga has been rather piecemeal with no general direction, except from the ribbon development along the beach line inland. One fairly extensive subdivision at the northern end of Whitianga, Centennial Heights, was undertaken by Landel Corporation (Figure 5.10). As in the case of most previous subdivisions, this development involved just the basic roading and land division. The subdivision is located on a hill and the minor accesses are poor. The developers cut corners, and the sections did not sell very well. Landel Corporation was involved with Securitibank and crashed with it, leaving Centennial Heights half developed and half sold (Mr G. Lawrence, Planner T-C.D.C., pers.comm.).

Since the amalgamation of the T-C.D.C. in 1975 there has been no further subdivision in Whitianga (Mid Islands development was approved before 1975), and there will be no further subdivision until the water supply has been upgraded.
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and a sewage scheme built. The Council will consider developments that include this infrastructure. The problem is that the Coromandel County Council, before the amalgamation, was eager to see Whitianga expand, so it permitted developers to come into Whitianga and subdivide up blocks of land. However the Council permitted the developers to perform just the basic subdivision, with the only infrastructure being roading. The roading was very often poor and heavily subsidised by the Council who, in turn, relied on the rates to pay for it. This was a bankrupt policy, as the rates could not finance the needs, and it has been suggested that the Council were left with the debts while the developers got all the profits (Mr G. Lawrence, Planner T-C.D.C., pers.comm.).

The second group of development agents in the private sector related to tourist development are those, be they individuals or small companies, who provide the services for the tourists and second home owners. Included in this group are shopkeepers, hoteliers, moteliers and camping ground owners, fishing trip operators and boat cruise and scenic flight operators. These people provide many of the elements of supply for the visiting and resident tourist, and their main motivation, as with the first group, is profit-making.

The third group in the private sector are the second home owners who acquire their properties by purchasing sections and erecting dwellings, by inheritance, or by buying completed dwellings, for personal use or capital accumulation. The main motivation of the second home owner is a recreational one.
5.3.4 Subsequent Elements of Supply

A number of elements of supply have developed in Whitianga related to its function as a service town and tourist resort. Some of these elements would have been developed to service the permanent population, before Whitianga's popularity as a tourist resort was realised. The majority, however, have developed subsequently to the benefit of both the visitors and the permanent residents.

(i) Attractions

The physical attractions of Whitianga have remained basically the same as when it was a timber town. Most of the man-made attractions are historical in nature and have been little added to. The economic utility of these natural and man-made attractions has increased markedly in response to tourist demand.

(ii) Transport

The transport facilities to, and within, Whitianga have also improved markedly with increased tourist demand. Access to Whitianga is by road, sea and air, and this includes both public and private sector involvement. Road access to Whitianga has been provided by the public sector and greatly improved by the opening of the Kopu-Hikuai road. Unlike Pauanui, there is a public bus service to Whitianga from the major urban centres. This service is not daily however, and so the most popular means of transport is the private car. Roading within Whitianga has been supplied mainly by the public sector, with a small amount of private sector involvement from
later subdivisions. All maintenance is carried out by the T-C.D.C. The road development in Whitianga reflects the different periods of subdivision. The long straight roads along the beach front were built during the initial residential development. Later subdivisions have tended towards more curving roads and cul-de-sacs as found in the residential areas that are further inland.

Mercury Airlines is a small air service which operates out of Whitianga to Pauanui, Thames, Ardmore and Auckland International Airport on Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays during the winter, and twice daily during the peak summer holiday periods. Private planes also utilise the Mercury Bay Aero Club airstrip.

(iii) Accommodation

Accommodation in Whitianga is largely supplied by the private sector, as in Pauanui. However, although there are approximately 960 second homes in Whitianga (T-C.D.C. Rates Records), understandably they are not the dominant feature of development, as found at Pauanui. As Whitianga is firstly a holiday resort, and secondly an area with a concentration of second homes there is a large amount of commercial accommodation in Whitianga in the form of motels, motor camps, holiday flats and a licensed hotel. Whitianga has six motor camps, twenty four motels and numerous holiday flats for rent.

As illustrated by Plate 13 and 14 the type and quality of second homes in Whitianga varies considerably. The minimum
PLATE 13: Second Home - Whitianga

PLATE 14: Second Homes - Whitianga
requirements for residential accommodation is set out in the T-C.D.C. summary of building requirements. This summary applies to both permanently occupied houses and second homes. The approximate minimum area set down for a house or bach is 33.6 sq.metres ($m^2$) and this includes at least one double bedroom ($10 m^2$), a kitchen ($4 m^2$), a living room ($14 m^2$) with some form of heating; a bathroom containing a bath and/or shower ($1.6 m^2$), a wash hand basin, some form of laundry area ($1.4 m^2$) with a laundry facility, such as a wash tub (not in the kitchen), and a toilet ($1.4 m^2$). A common practice in Whitianga is to use double sized long-run iron garages as second homes (Plate 15). This is becoming quite a problem as it is illegal to use such outbuildings for temporary, holiday or permanent accommodation. Despite the illegality of this practice many such structures are still apparent.

(iv) Supporting facilities

The supporting facilities and services in Whitianga are more than adequate for a township and population of its size. The supporting facilities can be divided into two groups, those catering for the everyday needs of the residents and visitors, and those directed mainly at the recreational 'tourist' needs of the visitors. There are approximately 60 shops in Whitianga (Auckland Provincial Business and Trade Directory, 1980) serving the everyday, general living needs of the local residents, second home residents and visitors. There are also a number of transport and trade services which may be utilised by both permanent and second home residents. Whitianga also has two doctors, a dentist, three restaurants, three arts and
PLATE 15: Second Homes (converted long-run Iron Garages) - Whitianga
crafts centres, two banks, a Post Office, a hospital and various recreational facilities such as a swimming pool, squash courts and a nine-hole golf course.

There are a number of facilities that have developed in direct relation to the tourism function of Whitianga. These services include the commercial accommodation, coastal mini-bus tours, boat hire, charter boat trips, jet boat scenic trips, line-fishing trips, scuba hire, scenic flights and souvenir shops. These services utilise the natural attractions of the area to provide a service to visitors.

(v) Infrastructure

The infrastructure has mostly been supplied by the public sector, with the exception of some of the roading. Since the amalgamation of the T-C.D.C. there has been a movement towards upgrading much of the infrastructure in Whitianga. The water supply has recently been upgraded to Health Department standards (Mr G Lawrence, T-C.D.C. Planner, pers.comm.), and a sewage scheme is planned for Whitianga in the near future.

The difference in the standard and supply of infrastructure between Pauanui and Whitianga is a reflection of the policies of the two County Councils before the amalgamation. The Coromandel County Council allowed developers to do just basic subdivisions without infrastructure being supplied, whereas the Thames County Council required some basic infrastructure be supplied with development. Although stricter, the Thames County Council were still receptive to the innovative ideas of
the Pauanui developers, with the proviso that if they did not work, the developers had to re-do it the conventional way.

5.3.5 Whitianga Holiday resort and Second home growth.

Whitianga relies on tourism to provide employment and revenue for the viability of the township. Employment directly related to tourism is manifest in the form of scenic flights, fishing trips, and mini bus tours etcetera. Employment such as trade services (building, plumbing, painting etcetera) and shops, although indirectly related to tourism, are still very reliant on it.

The number of second homes built in Whitianga reflects a significant economic input into the trade services of Whitianga (Figure 5.1la).

Figure 5.1la and b illustrate the cumulative growth of the number of second homes built or purchased by the second home owners sampled in Whitianga. Sixty three percent of the sample built their second home as compared to 37 percent who purchased.

Although the cumulative growth of purchased second homes does not account for anyone who may have sold a second home before 1951, when compared to the increase in number of second homes for the whole Coromandel (Figure 4.2), figure 11a and b do reflect the recency of the peak demand for second homes in Whitianga. This demand occurred at approximately the same time as Pauanui was developed. Pauanui experienced rapid growth from conception.
It may be assumed therefore, that a number of external factors, such as increased affluence and car ownership may be attributed to the growth in demand for second homes in these two resorts.

In conclusion, the function of Whitianga differs from that of Pauanui reflecting their different developments. The initial function of Whitianga was as a service town. Over time the economic base of Whitianga changed from the timber industry to tourism and fishing. A tourist demand created in response to the natural and historical attractions of the area was responsible for Whitianga developing a new function as a holiday resort. The second home development in Whitianga is a part of this function.

5.4 DISCUSSION

The two models (Figures 5.1 and 5.8) discussed in this Chapter, reflect the differences that have occurred in the processes and structures of development and their temporal and spatial organisation. The sequences of development are different, and have resulted in two spatially and temporally contrasting resorts. The importance of second homes varies in relation to the main function of each resort.

Pauanui functions primarily as a second home resort, hence all the components of the Pauanui model (Figure 5.1) are directed toward second home development. In contrast, the second model (Figure 5.8) reflecting the development of Whitianga illustrates this development as a service town-cum-
holiday resort with second home development as a sub-function. Second home development in Pauanui has been initiated by the developers creating a purpose-built, fully serviced and supplied resort ready for the potential market. Second home development in Whitianga has been initiated by the potential second home owners purchasing or building second homes. The owners have then created a demand for more of the elements of supply as illustrated by the lack of an adequate sewage system to service the peak summer population.

A lag such as this can result in a number of detrimental impacts. In Whitianga results of a survey by the Hauraki Regional Board have indicated that significant seepage of septic tank effluent into opening drains is occurring. This is due to the high natural ground water table in winter, and waste is flushed out at times of rainfall to contaminate critical areas such as streams and beaches (Mr G. Lawrence, T-C.D.C. Planner, pers.comm.).

The elements of supply between the two resorts vary. The elements of supply presented by Pearce (1981) have all been supplied to some degree by the developers of Pauanui, with the intention of adding and upgrading these elements so as to keep supply ahead of demand. The opposite has occurred in Whitianga, with demand out-stripping supply. This leads to problems as it is easier and less expensive to supply the basic infrastructure and some of the facilities prior to development. Further development can then be connected as required. Hence the need for a long-term planning strategy.
Whitianga reflects a large number of small developers and operators who have subdivided or who supply a service. Pauanui, in contrast has been developed, supplied, and controlled almost totally by one developer, and this is reflected in the continuity of the temporal and spatial organisation of this resort.

Whitianga shows more the growth features of a natural population than does Pauanui. This is reflected in the gradual increase in the number of second homes built in Whitianga up until 1970, after which followed a rapid growth phase to the present (Figure 5.11a and b). In contrast, Pauanui shows no pre-rapid growth phase. This is viewed largely as a result of the active development of Pauanui as a second home resort, as opposed to the passive development of Whitianga. Both Whitianga and Pauanui do, however, show coincident rapid growth phases. The rapid growth phases demonstrated by Whitianga and Pauanui are also reflected in the total number of second homes owned for the entire Thames-Coromandel District (Figure 2.1).

The continuity and planned nature of Pauanui is reflected in the Land and Improved Property Values (Figure 5.12a and b). A 'Z' test (a parametric test for comparing possible difference of arithmetic means between two samples, with n > 30) was conducted to establish if there was any difference in the mean land values between Pauanui and Whitianga. The mean land values per section were $15,204 and $12,813 for Pauanui and Whitianga respectively. They were significantly different at the 0.025 level. The
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higher mean land values in Pauanui can be accounted for by the cost of the supplied infrastructure being included in the price of the sections. Using an 'F' test for comparison of variance, a significant difference in the variance of land values between Pauanui and Whitianga was found at the 0.05 level. This is reflected in the standard deviation of the land values for Pauanui (s.d. $5,515) and Whitianga (s.d. $9,602). The contrast in the range of the land values is viewed as an indication of the continuity of the standard of section available at Pauanui, reflecting the relatively uniform building environment of Pauanui. Such uniformity is produced by the relative accessibility of all second home owners to all facilities, public utilities and attractions, and the spatially compact nature of the Pauanui development. This again reflects the continuity of a planned, single-agent development.

Whitianga, in contrast, has a wide range of land values. In general the second homes are unevenly distributed over the total area. The quality of the sections also varies in relation to the quality of the subdivision, and the accessibility to facilities, public utilities and attractions. Hence the variance in land values may be attributed to the varying quality and location of the different sections, as they were generally of a similar size. The contrasting distribution of land values in Pauanui and Whitianga are illustrated in Figure 5.12a.

A plot of the distribution of the improved values (Figure 5.12b) suggests a difference between Pauanui and
Whitianga. For example, 80 percent of the improved values are less than $24,000 at Whitianga, whereas only 53 percent are less than this figure for Pauanui. A difference-of-means test revealed a significant difference of mean improved values between Pauanui ($23,267) and Whitianga ($15,664) at the 0.01 level.

The reasons for this difference lie mainly in the planning and building codes developed for the two areas. Though both areas are administered by the T-C.D.C. there is a great amount of variability in the application and implementation of the building codes. The main point of contrast is that Pauanui has a building covenant. This covenant (Figure 5.3) states that a consistently high standard of development must be maintained. The initiation of this has had the cumulative effect of creating a community precedent for high building standards. Subsequent second home owners are therefore obliged to maintain a high standard in response to the covenant and passive community pressure.

Whitianga, unlike Pauanui, has no covenant but is still subject to compliance with the T-C.D.C. building regulations. These regulations however, are not strictly adhered to, or strictly enforced, as evidenced by the wide range in building types and standards.

Pauanui is a very recent development, as seen in Figure 5.11a. Consequently second homes will be much newer, in contrast to the many older style baches at Whitianga, which may in some cases, be up to 30-40 years old and more.
The demands for second homes in Pauanui and Whitianga are basically the same, as are the actual number of second homes, yet the resultant spatial and temporal structures are different, as were the processes of development. Hence the result has been two contrasting resorts. The question to be answered now is considering the different structures and processes of development which have resulted in two different resorts, do these differences manifest themselves in the characteristics of the various owners, their activities, impacts, perceptions, second home characteristics and use? These points will be discussed in the subsequent Chapters.
CHAPTER SIX

CONTRASTS IN CHARACTERISTICS
AND UTILISATION

6.1 INTRODUCTION

As discussed in the Introduction many different approaches have been applied to the study of the second home phenomenon. It has been suggested that these previous studies have failed to appreciate the importance and influence of the preceding structures and processes of development in the resulting second home area, and on owners. To underscore this, the second part of the basic hypothesis of this thesis is considered. This is that the contrasting resorts will enjoy different social, physical, and aesthetic features; utilities and utilisers; and perceived images. This Chapter involves an examination of the individuals from whom the demand for second homes comes; how the resorts are utilised; and the social, physical and aesthetic features that have resulted.

The data base for this comparison was taken from the questionnaire survey of a sample of second home owners. This sample was chosen from the T-C.D.C. rating records (1979-1981). A rate demand notice for Pauanui and Whitianga is sent to the permanent residence of the occupier of a residence within the two resorts. It can be assumed that each demand sent to an address outside the authority constitutes a second
This sampling technique proved to be very satisfactory. A 20 percent sample from the rates records was used to obtain 125 second home owners for both Pauanui and Whitianga.

The perceptions of the two resorts by the second home owners and visitors will be discussed in Chapter Seven.

6.2 THE SECOND HOME OWNERS

To investigate contrasts in who utilises the resorts, it is necessary to define who the second home owners are in terms of their socio-economic status and place of permanent residence.

6.2.1 Occupation

The occupational structures of the second home owners at Pauanui and Whitianga contrast quite markedly with each other and with that of the New Zealand labour force in 1981 (Table 6.1).

The results of the Whitianga sample have fallen into two distinctive occupational groups. Of the Whitianga respondents 30.8 percent were employed in the professional, technical, managerial and administrative sector and another 35.2 percent were employed in the production and agricultural sectors (Table 6.1). In contrast, the Pauanui respondents to the survey are strongly concentrated in the professional, technical, administrative and managerial sector, which account for 69 percent of the total respondents.
Table 6.1: Occupations of second home owners in Pauanui and Whitianga and total working population in New Zealand 1982.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Pauanui %</th>
<th>Whitianga %</th>
<th>New Zealand %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional &amp; Technical</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>12.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration &amp; Managerial</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>5.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>8.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Production</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>13.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>3.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other = housewife, widow etc.

SOURCE: Survey Data and N.Z. Population Census Data 1981

Table 6.2: Income of second home owners in Pauanui and Whitianga and the New Zealand male population aged 15 years and over 1982.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Pauanui %</th>
<th>Whitianga %</th>
<th>New Zealand %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>under $1,999</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>5.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2 - 3,999</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$4 - 5,999</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$6 - 7,999</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>17.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$8 - 9,999</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>11.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10 - 14,999</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15 - 19,999</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>47.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20 - 24,999</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>6.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25 - 29,999</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,000 and over</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 95  n = 84

SOURCE: Survey Data and N.Z. Population Census Data 1981
This figure is very high when compared with similar studies carried out in New Zealand. For example, in Orewa 48.6 percent of the second home owners were from professional or managerial occupations (Lau, 1974, p.78). On Banks Peninsula 52 percent of second home owners were from these occupations (Washer, 1977, p.84) and relative figures for Whangamata were 36 percent (Bennett, 1981, p.46). Whitianga most closely reflects Whangamata which also had a fairly strong concentration in the agricultural and production occupations at 44.6 percent.

It is popularly believed that second home ownership and use is the privilege of higher socio-economic groups (Coppock, 1977) and this would appear to be supported by studies conducted in New Zealand. When comparing the Pauanui and Whitianga figures with those of the total working population in New Zealand for 1981 (Table 6.1) there is a definite over-representation of owners from the professional and managerial occupations, in Whitianga and Pauanui especially.

6.2.2 Income

This popular stereotype is sustained by an examination of the incomes of second home owners in the two areas. Incomes were heavily weighted towards the higher income brackets (Table 6.2). Once again there was a contrast between Pauanui and Whitianga. Pauanui had more people in the highest income brackets, with 56.9 percent earning $25,000 or more, as compared to 34.5 percent for Whitianga. The strongest representation for Whitianga was in the $10-25,000 bracket with 53.6 percent.
Figure 6.1 illustrates the variance in the cumulative percentage of incomes between the two areas. The median income for Pauanui is $28,000, $8,000 more than Whitianga at $20,000. Twelve percent and 8.5 percent of the Whitianga and Pauanui sample showed incomes of less than $10,000 respectively. This may be attributed to the corresponding retirement figures (Table 6.1). On a national scale the median incomes for both Whitianga and Pauanui were far in excess of the median income ($12,000) for New Zealand males over 15 years of age (New Zealand Population Provisional Census Data, 1981).

6.2.3 Family Structure

The structure of second home households illustrated that the use of the second home was primarily a family activity. Typically the family structure was that of a husband and wife with children school age or older (Table 6.3). Eighty percent and 66.3 percent of second home households in Pauanui and Whitianga respectively fitted this description, hence 93.0 percent and 88.4 percent of the heads of the households in Pauanui and Whitianga respectively, were married (Table 6.4).

6.2.4 Location of Permanent Residences

In order to obtain a broad picture of the owners of the second homes in Pauanui and Whitianga, it is necessary to know the location of the first home or permanent residence. Distance between the permanent residence and the second home of the two sample areas will be an influence upon the use made of the second homes throughout the year. It is important to
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Figure 6.1
Table 6.3: The family structure of second home households.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage in Life Cycle</th>
<th>Age of head</th>
<th>Age of youngest child</th>
<th>Pauanui %</th>
<th>Whitianga %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>young family</td>
<td>20-40</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>school age family</td>
<td>25-60</td>
<td>5-17</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>38.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>older family</td>
<td>35-60</td>
<td>&gt;17</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>childless couple</td>
<td>30-69</td>
<td>no children</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elderly/retired</td>
<td>50+</td>
<td>&gt;17</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other ie single/widow</td>
<td>30+</td>
<td>5+</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 100 n = 95

SOURCE: Survey Data

Table 6.4: Marital status of head of second home households.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pauanui %</th>
<th>Whitianga %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>never married</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>married</td>
<td>93.0</td>
<td>88.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>widowed</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other ie divorced</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 100 n = 95

SOURCE: Survey Data

Table 6.5: How second home owners came to know of the area in which their second home is now located.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pauanui %</th>
<th>Whitianga %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visit to the location</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through friends</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real estate agent</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From relations</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From local residents</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 101 n = 98

SOURCE: Survey Data
know the origin of the second home owners with regards to whether it be distant rural areas, or the closest major urban centres. It is also important to note where, within the large urban areas, the permanent residences are.

The survey established some definite and contrasting patterns concerning the location of the respondents' permanent residences. The majority of permanent residences of second home owners at Pauanui and Whitianga are to be found in three urban areas, Auckland, Hamilton and Matamata. Fifty one and one-half percent of second home owners in Pauanui have their permanent residences in Auckland, 16.2 percent in Hamilton and 8.1 percent in Matamata (Figure 6.2a). For Whitianga 34.9 percent of the permanent residences were located in Auckland, 10.5 percent in Hamilton, and 11.6 percent in Matamata (Figure 6.2b).

Figure 6.3a illustrates the compact nature of the location of the permanent residences from Pauanui. There is a distinct distance decay effect and sectoral bias with regard to the location of the permanent residences of the second home owners at Pauanui. This may be explained by the recency of Pauanui as a second home resort. The marketing of Pauanui would have been directed mainly at people in the major urban areas close to Pauanui as these areas would contain the highest concentrations of potential second home owners. Figures 6.3a and b show that the highest percentage of second home owners for the whole of New Zealand does, in fact, occur in Auckland (18.6 percent) with the adjacent county of Franklin also
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containing a relatively high percentage (6.9 percent). All the counties surrounding the Coromandel Peninsula contain a relatively high percentage of second home owners for the whole of New Zealand.

The locations of the permanent residences for second home owners in Whitianga are also concentrated around the Peninsula and illustrate the effect of distance decay on the concentration of permanent residences in the various counties. The locations of permanent residences for Whitianga are more diverse than for Pauanui (Figure 6.2b). This may be explained by the age and function of Whitianga. Having long been established as a holiday resort, Whitianga has attracted a large number of visitors over a substantial period of time. Hence Whitianga is relatively well known to a larger number of people than Pauanui is.

Table 6.5 shows that 71.4 percent of Whitianga second home owners came to know of Whitianga by visiting the place, as opposed to 45.5 percent for Pauanui. For both areas friends were an important source of contact, at 37.6 percent and 31.6 for Pauanui and Whitianga respectively. Another important source for Pauanui was through advertising (23.8 percent), whereas for Whitianga it did not prove important (1.0 percent). This figure (23.8 percent) reflects the active marketing and advertising of Pauanui by the developers. The popularity of Whitianga as a place to visit is complemented by its location on the major Provincial Highway as well as its length of establishment. Whereas Pauanui, besides being a relatively
recent development is 11 kilometres off any main routeway and
does not provide access to any other place. Unlike Whitianga,
Pauanui is not serviced by any public mode of transport and
therefore is not as easily accessed as Whitianga.

Located within the four major urban centres of New
Zealand are 40.41 percent of total second home owners. To
establish if any relationship between population size and the
number of second homes owned exists, a regression analysis of
the county populations and the number of second homes owned by
people of the respective counties of New Zealand was carried
out, using data taken from the 1981 Provisional Census statistics. An $r^2$ value of 0.868 was yielded indicating that 86.8
percent of the variation of the number of second homes owned
can be accounted for by county population size (Figure 6.3a
and b). The regression equation produced was $Y = 103.33 +
0.0109X$. In other words the larger the population size the
more second home owners one would expect to find within that
population. Although this appears obvious, such a relationship
maybe used to predict the potential number of second home owners
for a given population.

To examine the relationship between the location of the
permanent residences and the socio-economic characteristics of
the second home owners, Auckland, being the largest single
generating source, was examined in more detail.

The suburbs of Auckland, in which the second home owners
lived were divided into three categories. These three
categories were; those which contained a high proportion of professional, managerial, administrative and technical workers (1), those which contained a high proportion of workers engaged in manufacturing (2), and those which contained a high proportion of production workers, transport and equipment operators and labourers (3).

In Category 1, 33.3 percent of the respondents had second homes in Pauanui and 14.0 percent had second homes in Whitianga (Survey data). In Category 2, 16.2 percent were Pauanui and 11.6 percent were Whitianga, and in Category 3, 1.0 percent were Pauanui and 5.8 percent were Whitianga.

The figures for Category 1 are proportionally higher for Pauanui than for Whitianga. Once again this supports the popular belief that second homes are generally owned by people in the higher socio-economic levels of society, while also illustrating a contrast between Pauanui and Whitianga.

Of the professional and technical workers with second homes in Pauanui, the majority resided permanently in Auckland, Hamilton, Matamata and Tauranga. In contrast, Whitianga second home owners showed a wider range of the location of permanent residences with Waikato, Franklin, Wellington and Rotorua featuring as important. A chi-square test showed a significant difference at the 0.05 level between the source of the professional and technical workers owning a second home at Pauanui and Whitianga.
When comparing the occupation of second home owners with the location of their permanent residence, it was found that for the total survey most of the professional and technical workers resided permanently in the Category 1 suburbs of Auckland. Thirty eight percent of these people had second homes at Pauanui, in comparison to 16.7 percent for Whitianga. For all second home owners at Pauanui and Whitianga in the professional and technical occupation category, no distinctive concentration by suburb in Auckland was noted.

The remaining occupational categories were fairly equally proportioned. Once again this reinforces the more compact grouping of permanent residences of second home owners in Pauanui and the more diverse nature of permanent residences of second home owners in Whitianga.

From the survey data, we can state that the average second home owner in Pauanui and Whitianga is professional by occupation, with an income that is above the national average, is married with children of school age or older and lives in one of three major urban centres that are within three hours drive of his second home. This summation supports those of other studies both here and overseas (Washer, 1976; Bennett, 1980; Clout, 1971; Bielckus et al, 1972).

There are differences between the Pauanui and Whitianga second home owners. The Pauanui second home owners fit the suggested characteristics of a second home owner somewhat better than the Whitianga second home owner, in that the figures
for Pauanui show that a greater percentage of Pauanui second home owners are professional, and in a high income bracket. It is suggested that these results are a reflection of the different structures and processes of development relative to the two resorts.

Now that the socio-economic characteristics of the second home owners in Pauanui and Whitianga have been determined, we know who has second homes at the two resorts, and that there are contrasts between the two groups of owners. An examination can now be undertaken to ascertain the characteristics of the actual second home and if there are also contrasts in the type of second home found in the two resorts.

6.3 THE SECOND HOME CHARACTERISTICS

It is generally acknowledged that there are two types of second homes:—those that are purpose-built and those that have been converted from another use. As the area of land on which Pauanui Ocean Beach Resort was built had no previous buildings on it, all the second homes at Pauanui have all been purpose-built (Plate 16). In Whitianga, with a previously established population, it can be assumed that some of the second homes will have previously been permanent residences, but the majority are also purpose-built (Figure 5.11a)(Plate 17).

Of the Pauanui second home owners 69.3 percent purchased sections and had second homes built on them (or built them themselves (Survey data)). Pertaining to this, the figure for Whitianga was 64.1 percent. The remainder of the respondents
PLATE 16: Second Home - Pauanui

PLATE 17: Second Home - Whitianga
(30.6 percent and 33.9 percent for Pauanui and Whitianga respectively) purchased a complete second home (Survey data). Naturally, a higher figure for purchased second homes in Whitianga would be expected, because of the well established housing market.

Although Whitianga has been a holiday resort for a much longer period than Pauanui, only 10.8 percent of built second homes and 8.8 percent of purchased second homes were owned in Whitianga before 1965 (Tables 6.6a, b and c). Figures 5.11a and b, although not accounting for any second homes sold in Whitianga before 1945, illustrates a peak demand for both Pauanui and Whitianga beginning in the 1970's, with 85.7 percent of the purpose-built second homes and 66.5 percent of the purchased second homes in Whitianga being acquired after 1970. This is reflected in the rapid increase in second homes in the T-C.D. for 1971 to 1976 (Figure 4.2) compared to a relatively static national growth rate (Figure 4.3).

As the development of Pauanui did not begin until 1968 100 percent of both built and purchased second homes in Pauanui were acquired after 1970. It can therefore be concluded that the majority of second homes built in both Pauanui and Whitianga are of a similar age. A similarity does not, however exist in relation to the value, design and aesthetic quality of second homes in the two resorts. The mean improved values of the second homes sampled in Pauanui and Whitianga were $23,900 and $16,600 respectively and the mean land values for the two samples were $16,600 (Pauanui) and $11,500 (Whitianga)
Table 6.6a: Time of purchase of section.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pauanui %</th>
<th>Whitianga %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before 1940 to 1960</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961 to 1965</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966 to 1969</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970 to 1975</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>51.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976 to 1981</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 70

SOURCE: Survey Data

Table 6.6b: Time of building of second home.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pauanui %</th>
<th>Whitianga %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before 1940 to 1960</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961 to 1965</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966 to 1969</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970 to 1975</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>33.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976 to 1981</td>
<td>65.8</td>
<td>51.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 70

SOURCE: Survey Data

Table 6.6c: Time of purchase of second home.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pauanui %</th>
<th>Whitianga %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before 1940 to 1960</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961 to 1965</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966 to 1969</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970 to 1975</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976 to 1981</td>
<td>80.7</td>
<td>45.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 31

SOURCE: Survey Data
(T-C.D.C. Rates Records). The land and improved values for Pauanui are notably high than for Whitianga.

The design of second homes is quite varied in both Pauanui and Whitianga (Plates 18 and 19). The design and aesthetic quality in Whitianga may range from an architect-designed and landscaped second home property to a second-hand long-run iron garage sited on a bare unmown section. The second homes in Pauanui are all of a relatively high structural and design quality. This may be attributed to the standard and aesthetic quality of the design being controlled in Pauanui.

Once again contrasts can be seen between Pauanui and Whitianga and can be attributed to the differing structures and processes of development associated with the two resorts.

6.4 ACQUISITION OF SECOND HOMES

In Chapter One it was noted that according to Clout (1974) the specific motives for acquiring a second home were capital accumulation, fashion following, status attainment, and the desire to engage in non-urban recreation. Added to these was the motive of eventual retirement. It was assumed that of these six motives, recreation was the most important motive.

This assumption is also borne out by the motives of the Pauanui and Whitianga second home owners for acquiring their houses. Given a choice of three motives, (as a holiday home; an investment or an eventual permanent residence) the respondents were asked to indicate which of these were their motives for
PLATE 18: Architect-designed second home - Pauanui

PLATE 19: Standard-designed second home - Whitianga
acquiring a second home. Of the Pauanui respondents 87.1 percent acquired their property as a holiday home and 74.4 percent of Whitianga respondents acquired their property for the same purpose (Table 6.7). The second most important motive, for Pauanui residents was as an investment (21.8 percent). The second most important motive for Whitianga residents was as an eventual permanent residence.

The higher retirement figure for Whitianga may be explained by its function as a service town with an established permanent population. The lack of an established permanent population and facilities to cater for such a population in Pauanui may initially deter people from retiring there.

Having established the reasons for acquiring a second home, respondents were asked to suggest three reasons why they chose to locate specifically at Pauanui or Whitianga.

Of the Whitianga respondents, 68.3 percent stated recreational and social facilities, 38.9 percent stated physical environment and climate and 37.6 percent stated water facilities as their reasons for locating their second home at Whitianga (Table 6.8). For the same reasons Pauanui responses were 42.4 percent, 26.3 percent and 20.2 percent respectively.

When the figures for recreational and social facilities are broken down further it becomes obvious that boating and fishing are important recreational reasons for locating in Whitianga. Of the 68.3 percent who mentioned recreational and social facilities 50.6 percent was comprised of boating and
fishing facilities, which are, unsurprisingly, Whitianga's main tourist attractions.

The most important reason second home owners in Pauanui gave for their location choice was Pauanui's relative location to their permanent residence. This point links in well with the close proximity of the location of permanent residences to the Coromandel Peninsula, as illustrated in Figure 6.2a and b. This factor of relative accessibility in terms of distance, time or cost between second home locations and major urban centres has been deemed an important locational factor supported by overseas studies such as those carried out by Tombaugh (1969) and Murphy (1977).

The second most important locational factor for Pauanui second home owners was the type of planned development that Pauanui is. Of the Pauanui respondents 52.5 percent stated this as a locational factor.

In summary, interesting contrasts exist between the responses of reasons for locating specifically at Pauanui and Whitianga. The majority of Pauanui respondents suggested 'relative location', 'type of development', and 'recreational and social facilities' as the most important reasons for locating at Pauanui. In contrast, 'type of development' and 'relative location' were insignificant as reasons for location at Whitianga. The most popular reasons suggested by the Whitianga respondents were either recreational-social or environmental in nature. This interesting contrast may reflect
Table 6.7: Reasons for acquiring a second home.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Pauanui %</th>
<th>Whitianga %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As a holiday home</td>
<td>87.1</td>
<td>74.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As an investment</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As an eventual permanent residence</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>32.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 101</td>
<td></td>
<td>n = 90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: Survey Data

Table 6.8: Reasons for locating second home in Pauanui or Whitianga.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Pauanui %</th>
<th>Whitianga %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location relative to first home</td>
<td>62.6</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational and social facilities</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>68.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of development</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atmosphere and Appeal</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>38.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical environment and climate</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>38.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water facilities</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>37.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable price</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends and relations there</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous holidays there</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 101</td>
<td></td>
<td>n = 98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: Survey Data
the type of development in which the second home has been located.

As it is generally assumed that acquiring a second home is largely because of its function as a holiday home (Pauanui 87.1 percent, Whitianga 74.4 percent) rather than for an investment or other purpose, the high proportion of Pauanui residents emphasising 'type of development' (52.5 percent) as the reason for acquisition reflects a conscious awareness of the type of planned development in which they are located. This contrasts markedly with Whitianga as only 3.5 percent suggested type of development as their reason for locating in Whitianga.

The problems of asking open-ended and closed questions is best highlighted when the reasons for acquiring, and the reasons for locating a second home are considered together. The only reason completely common to acquisition and location is investment. Of the Whitianga respondents 16.7 percent opted for investment as a reason for acquiring a second home. When asked to suggest reasons for locating specifically at Whitianga only 2.4 percent of the respondents suggested investment. This highlights the general problem of predirecting a respondent's answer in a closed question by offering a limited number of responses, of which none of these may be actually considered important by the respondent.

For 91.1 percent of the Pauanui respondents and 90.0 of the Whitianga respondents it was their first second home, and
93.1 percent and 94.4 percent respectively were owned solely by the particular household.

It has now been established who uses the two resorts and why they chose that particular one. The next logical progression is to ascertain how much time the owners spend at their second homes, and how they utilise their time while there.

6.5 UTILISATION OF SECOND HOMES

The number of times per year that the second home was used was similar for both areas. Of the Pauanui respondents 88.1 percent and 73.6 percent of the Whitianga respondents used their second homes six or more times per year (Table 6.9). The approximate total number of weeks per year that the second home was utilised was also similar with 72.0 percent of Pauanui and 72.9 percent of Whitianga respondents using their second homes for a total of approximately one to ten weeks per year (Table 6.10).

The respondents for Pauanui and Whitianga were asked to indicate which months of the year they had occupied their second homes. As expected, the most popular were the summer months of December 1980, January 1981, and December 1981, which also coincide with the school holidays (Table 6.11). It is also interesting to note the high utility of second homes during the winter months. As Whitianga and Pauanui are both within three hours drive of a major proportion of the source areas of the second home owners, it is possible to utilise
Table 6.9: Number of times per year second home is utilised at Pauanui and Whitianga

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Pauanui %</th>
<th>Whitianga %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Once per year</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twice per year</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three times per year</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four times per year</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five times per year</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six times per year or more</td>
<td>88.1</td>
<td>73.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 101
n = 87

SOURCE: Survey Data

Table 6.10: Approximate total number of weeks per year the second home is used.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weeks range</th>
<th>Pauanui %</th>
<th>Whitianga %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 5</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td>44.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 15</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 20</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 52</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 100
n = 85

SOURCE: Survey Data

Table 6.11: Occupancy by Month by Owners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Dec'80</th>
<th>Jan'81</th>
<th>Feb'81</th>
<th>Mar'81</th>
<th>Apr'81</th>
<th>May'81</th>
<th>Jun'81</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% occupied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pauanui</td>
<td>85.1</td>
<td>91.1</td>
<td>70.3</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>63.4</td>
<td>69.3</td>
<td>52.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitianga</td>
<td>83.1</td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td>56.6</td>
<td>44.6</td>
<td>60.2</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>41.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Jul'81</th>
<th>Aug'81</th>
<th>Sep'81</th>
<th>Oct'81</th>
<th>Nov'81</th>
<th>Dec'81</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% occupied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pauanui</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>62.4</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>75.2</td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td>84.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitianga</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>61.4</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>69.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 101
n = 83

SOURCE: Survey Data
the second homes at weekends, as well as long weekends and winter school holidays.

It was assumed that when not in use by the owner's household many owners would allow others to utilise their homes. Only 15.8 percent of owners at Pauanui and 27.8 percent of owners at Whitianga did not allow others to utilise their second homes (Table 6.12). Of the respondents 61.4 percent and 57.4 percent of Pauanui owners allowed friends and relatives respectively to utilise their second home, and for Whitianga 46.7 and 48.9 percent allowed their second home to be utilised by friends and or relatives respectively.

Friends and relatives were generally not expected to pay any rent for their use of the home, however others outside this circle were.

If the second home was rented then it was generally only for one to five weeks in Pauanui (76.9 percent) and in Whitianga it was generally rented for two to ten weeks (86.7 percent).

The reasons for and against renting were once again similar. The main reason for renting was to cover expenses, which 20.0 percent of Pauanui owners and 15.3 percent of Whitianga owners gave as a reason (Table 6.13). The main reason for not renting was to keep the second home free for the owning household's own use:—38.6 percent of Pauanui and 31.9 percent of Whitianga owners gave this as a reason against renting. Other reasons suggested for not renting were the lack of respect
Table 6.12: Percentage of second home owners who allow people outside the immediate household to use the residence 1982.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pauanui</th>
<th>Whitianga</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do not allow others</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>61.4</td>
<td>46.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatives</td>
<td>57.4</td>
<td>48.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends and relatives</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>n = 101</em></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>n = 90</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: Survey Data

Table 6.13: Reasons for and against renting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pauanui</th>
<th>Whitianga</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGAINST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of respect for property</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In frequent use by owners</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free for own use</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>31.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privacy</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not wish to</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To cover expenses</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not utilised much by owners</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No reason</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>n = 70</em></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>n = 72</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: Survey Data
The factors related to the time of utilisation of the second home for Pauanui and Whitianga were similar, with most owners using their homes more than six times per year for a total of approximately one to ten weeks per year.

In summary, the main use of the second home occurred in summer, however it is notable that the second homes were all utilised at some stage during each month of the year. When not utilised by the owners many of the second homes were utilised by friends and relatives, who in most cases did not pay for this use. Those owners who did rent did so mainly to cover some of the costs associated with owning a second home, while those who did not rent preferred to keep their second home free for their own use.

Having established when the second homes are utilised, it is necessary to examine how they are utilised.

The second home owners in Pauanui and Whitianga used a range of recreational equipment while at their second home. The popularity of this equipment did vary between the two resorts. Pauanui respondents preferred golf clubs (81.3 percent), games equipment, such as tennis racquets, softball gear, cricket equipment, and frisbees etcetera, (69.8 percent) and boats (54.2 percent) (Table 6.14). Other equipment such as water sports equipment (surf boards, windsurfer, diving gear, water
Table 6.14: Recreational equipment used

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment</th>
<th>Pauanui %</th>
<th>Whitianga %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Games equipment</td>
<td>69.8</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watersports equipment</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>33.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boat</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>85.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor bike</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf clubs</td>
<td>81.3</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing gear</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>71.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aeroplane</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 96 n = 88

SOURCE: Survey Data

Table 6.15: Recreational activities of the second home household 1982.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Pauanui %</th>
<th>Whitianga %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Golf</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racquet sports</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water sports</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>70.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive activities</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>34.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Games</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'on foot' activities</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike activities</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boating</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>68.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flying, horseriding and others</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>77.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 99 n = 95

SOURCE: Survey Data
skis, etcetera), bikes and fishing gear were also relatively popular. In Whitianga, respondents favoured boats (85.2 percent) and fishing gear (71.6 percent), with water sports equipment being the third most popular (33.0 percent).

This use of recreational equipment is a reflection of the activities which respondents engage in while at their second homes. The most popular activities for Pauanui respondents were golf (77.8 percent) water sports, which include swimming (77.8 percent), and racquet sports, which is mainly tennis (65.7 percent) (Table 6.15). Also fairly popular were boating, and 'on foot' activities, such as walking, jogging and tramping. The Whitianga respondents favoured fishing (77.9 percent), water sports (70.5 percent) and boating (68.4 percent). Other popular activities were passive activities such as reading, drinking, billiards, photography and picnics, and 'on foot' activities.

Once again there is a contrast between the two groups of respondents. This contrast is a reflection of the elements of supply associated with each particular resort. Both groups had a high participation in water sports which is to be expected due to their coastal location. Whitianga respondents participated in fishing and boating activities much more than Pauanui respondents, who favoured golf and tennis. Once again, the activities of two groups reflected the development, with the main attraction of Whitianga being the fishing facilities available and one of the main attractions of Pauanui being the additional man-made recreational activities. It is
interesting to note that all the facilities listed in Table 6.15 are available at both places, yet a contrast in popularity is most evident.

A number of entertainment or social facilities were also used by the second home owners. The most popular of these facilities were social clubs with 81.0 percent of Pauanui and 37.1 percent of Whitianga respondents utilising them (Table 6.16).

There is only one social club at Pauanui which is the Pauanui Club. Membership is restricted to property owners and as the figures show it is well patronised. Entertainment facilities in Pauanui are fairly restricted with one social club, a 'putt putt' (mini golf course) and a youth club that hosts dances and movies once a week during the summer. The high patronage of the club can possibly be explained by the lack of other entertainment facilities.

In Whitianga 37.1 percent of the respondents utilised social clubs such as the R.S.A. and the Mercury Bay Club, and 33.7 percent utilised the picture theatre and 21.3 percent of the Whitianga respondents also utilised the local hotel. A higher percentage of Whitianga respondents (29.9 percent) than Pauanui respondents (15.0 percent) did not utilise any entertainment facilities, even though there are more of these facilities available in Whitianga than in Pauanui. More people in Pauanui engaged in social interaction with others (54.8 percent) than did those at Whitianga (45.2 percent). Also more
### Table 6.16: Percentage and types of entertainment facilities used, 1982.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Pauanui %</th>
<th>Whitianga %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social clubs</td>
<td>81.0</td>
<td>37.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movies</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>33.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth clubs and dances</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mini golf</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>n = 100</strong></td>
<td><strong>n = 89</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Survey Data
people in Pauanui belonged to social organisations (80.2 percent) (i.e. Pauanui Club) than did the second home owners in Whitianga (32.7 percent). This contrast may be accounted for by the nature of the facilities. Those at Pauanui have been provided expressly for use by the second home owners, whereas in Whitianga the entertainment facilities are shared with the local population. Some second home owners may feel that they should not utilise facilities such as social clubs because they are not permanent residents.

From the foregoing it can be clearly seen that the structures and processes of development do have a notable influence on the resultant resort. This is reflected in the characteristics of the second home owners and their homes, the attractions of the resort, and the utilisation and perception of the facilities by the second home owners.

The contrasts in the structures and processes of development between Pauanui and Whitianga have been highlighted in Chapter Three. The importance of and response to these structures and processes are reflected in the physical nature of the resorts and associated characteristics and utilisations.

Chapter Seven now examines how the two resorts and the development of second homes are perceived. As Whitianga and Pauanui have two distinct holiday populations, second home owners and visitors, the perceptions of these two groups will be examined separately.
CHAPTER SEVEN
PERCEPTIONS OF PRESENT AND FUTURE DEVELOPMENTS

7.1 INTRODUCTION

It is evident from the previous chapters that the structures and processes of development associated with each resort have resulted in contrasts in the physical features, characteristics of the second homes and their owners and utilisation.

The two models in Chapter Five (Figures 5.1 and 5.8) illustrate development as a circular, on-going process, in which supply and demand play an important role. The demand associated with any resort must be effected by how the current and future development associated with the resort is perceived. It is therefore important to consider both stages of development because their perception by individuals may change with time and situation. This changing perception will possibly reflect the type of resort and the associated elements of supply, both present and future.

It is also important to consider both the perceptions of the present second home owners, as they realise the present demand, and the visitors to the resort who represent a possible future demand.
7.2 SECOND HOME OWNERS PERCEPTIONS

(i) Present development

The questionnaire survey of second home owners in Pauanui and Whitianga included questions to determine the owners perceptions of the current and future second home development.

The second home owners were asked whether the local facilities and services within Pauanui and Whitianga, and within the Coromandel Peninsula as a whole, were sufficient to serve the needs of second home owners at the present time. The services and facilities within each area and for the whole Peninsula were perceived as very adequate, as 85.7 percent and 96.8 percent of Pauanui respondents felt that the facilities and services within Pauanui and the whole Peninsula respectively were sufficient. Only 75.8 percent of the Whitianga second home owners felt that the facilities and services within Whitianga were sufficient. This may be a reflection of the previously poor quality of the water supply and the lack of sewage system. Ninety-three percent did feel the Coromandel Peninsula as a whole serviced their needs.

The sample of second home owners were also asked their perceptions on how the presence of second homes affected the general area of Pauanui and Whitianga economically, socially and environmentally. The respondents were asked to state whether they thought the areas were better off, about the same or worse off in relation to the three factors, due to the presence of second homes.
Of the Pauanui respondents 97.0 percent thought Pauanui was economically better off, 72.2 percent thought Pauanui was socially better off but only 50.0 percent thought Pauanui was environmentally better off (Tables 7.1, 7.2, 7.3). However 30.9 percent did think it was environmentally about the same. Of the Whitianga residents 91.5 percent thought that Whitianga was economically better off, 60.4 percent thought Whitianga was socially better off, but only 27.5 percent thought it was environmentally better off. Thirty five percent thought Whitianga was environmentally about the same and 37.4 percent thought it was worse off.

Both Pauanui and Whitianga respondents felt that the resort area in which they had located their second homes were economically and socially better off for the presence of such homes. With regard to the residents perceptions of the environmental aspects, the results were not so positive. Of the Pauanui respondents 19.1 percent thought that the Pauanui area was actually worse off because of the presence of second homes. This was favourable compared to the 37.4 percent of Whitianga respondents commenting on the environmental impact on Whitianga.

The respondents were asked to suggest one reason for their response. The reasons given for the positive economic impact were an increased cash flow (43.3 percent Pauanui and 75.8 percent Whitianga), more and better services (41.8 percent Pauanui and 12.2 percent Whitianga), and provision of employment (14.9 percent Pauanui and 12.1 Whitianga).
Table 7.1: Second home owners perceptions of the economic impact of second homes on Pauanui and Whitianga.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pauanui %</th>
<th>Whitianga %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Better off</td>
<td>97.0</td>
<td>91.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About the same</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worse off</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 100</td>
<td></td>
<td>n = 94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: Survey Data

Table 7.2: Second home owners perceptions of the social impact of second homes on Pauanui and Whitianga.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pauanui %</th>
<th>Whitianga %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Better off</td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td>60.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About the same</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>31.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worse off</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 97</td>
<td></td>
<td>n = 91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: Survey Data

Table 7.3: Second home owners perceptions of the environmental impact of second homes on Pauanui and Whitianga.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pauanui %</th>
<th>Whitianga %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Better off</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About the same</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>35.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worse off</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>37.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 94</td>
<td></td>
<td>n = 91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: Survey Data
Reasons related to the social impact were mainly more social facilities and activities (50.0 percent Pauanui and 28.3 percent Whitianga), and interaction between the permanent residents and the second home owners (30.4 percent Pauanui and 28.3 percent Whitianga).

In relation to the environmental impact question 59.0 percent and 25.3 percent of Whitianga and Pauanui second home owners respectively felt that the presence of second homes had interfered with the natural environment and, to some degree, had polluted the area. Of the Whitianga respondents 17.9 percent also felt that the Whitianga area and facilities were over-extended. On the positive side of the scale, 37.3 percent of Pauanui respondents felt that the planning related to Pauanui had actually retained and even enhanced the natural assets of the area.

It should be noted that 19.6 percent of the Pauanui respondents felt that the environment had not been detrimentally effected because of the high standard of planning applied to Pauanui, as compared to a nil response from the Whitianga sample. Thirteen percent of Whitianga respondents felt that the environment of Whitianga had been detrimentally effected because of a lack of planning. There was no perception of this by the Pauanui respondents.

The Pauanui respondents also perceived the importance of the fairly extensive supply of facilities and services in Pauanui that have been planned and supplied to enhance the
resort, yet with due consideration for the surrounding environment. Unlike the Pauanui respondents, the Whitianga respondents perceived the lack of supply of services and planning to be to the detriment of the environment in Whitianga.

It can be concluded that the effects and influence of the structures and processes of development on the resultant second home areas are perceived, if somewhat subconsciously, by the second home owners to whom they cater.

(ii) Future Development

As the future perceptions are also important in moulding the development process, the second home owners in Pauanui and Whitianga were also asked how they perceived future second home development in their locality, and within the Peninsula in general.

Most of the respondents in both Pauanui and Whitianga did not feel that further development of second homes in their respective locations should be restricted in anyway (58.6 percent Pauanui and 72.0 percent Whitianga). There was a substantial minority of the Pauanui (40.4 percent) and Whitianga (28.0 percent) second home owners in the sample who felt that future development should be restricted. The reasons they gave for this are listed in Table 7.4. Of the Pauanui respondents, 35.1 percent felt that the services of Pauanui were extended to their full capacity at present and could not handle a higher demand. A further 29.7 percent felt that
Table 7.4: Second home owners reasons for restricting further development of second homes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Pauanui %</th>
<th>Whitianga %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Services are extended to full capacity</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More services and facilities spoil holiday atmosphere</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resort is large enough</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To prevent overcrowding and degradation of natural resources</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More design control and stricter building restrictions</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular maintenance of homes enforced</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Until infrastructure upgraded</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 37 | n = 25

SOURCE: Survey Data

Table 7.5: Second home owners perceptions of future problems resulting from further second home development on the Coromandel Peninsula.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Pauanui %</th>
<th>Whitianga %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increased traffic and decreased road quality</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over extension of infrastructure and facilities</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>62.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollution and degradation of natural resources</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overcrowding and 'over suburbanisation'</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A need for more law enforcement</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressure on fishing resources</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 83 | n = 82

SOURCE: Survey Data
future development should be restricted to prevent overcrowding and degradation of the natural resources of the area.

Only 20.0 percent of Whitianga respondents felt that services were extended to full capacity now, and a further 40.0 percent felt that stricter building codes and restrictions would be needed in Whitianga before any further development should occur.

The respondents were also asked to state what problems they could foresee as a result of any further development of second homes on the Coromandel Peninsula.

For Pauanui and Whitianga respondents 28.9 and 20.7 percent respectively could envisage no problems as a result of future second home development. The rest of the respondents did suggest six areas of concern if future development occurred (Table 7.5). Sixty-two percent of the Whitianga respondents and 26.5 percent of the Pauanui respondents felt that further development of second homes on the Coromandel Peninsula would result in an over-extension of the existing infrastructure and facilities. Nineteen percent and 12.2 percent of respondents in Pauanui and Whitianga (sample second home owners) respectively felt that increased traffic and a resulting decreased road quality would be a result of future development. A further 18.1 percent of Pauanui respondents and 14.6 percent of Whitianga respondents felt that future development would result in pollution and degradation of the natural resources, and 15.7 percent of Pauanui respondents felt that overcrowding and 'over suburbanisation' might be a resultant problem.
The problems perceived by the Whitianga respondents were an inadequate supply of infrastructure and facilities and an over-extension of their use in the future. They also noted a need for stricter building restrictions. These are problems that have been manifested because of the spontaneous and somewhat unplanned nature of Whitianga.

Pauanui respondents also noted the possibility of an over-extension of infrastructure and facilities, but they were concerned about the possibility of overcrowding and 'over suburbanisation', which might result in the degradation of the surrounding natural resources. They also felt that the planned nature of Pauanui had retained and enhanced the natural assets of the area. The Pauanui respondents were aware of the planned nature of the resort and although they have favoured this type of development by choosing to locate in Pauanui they are conscious that problems may result from 'over suburbanisation of the coastline.

When asked whether they preferred the planned type of development or a more haphazard type of development 97.9 percent of Pauanui and 22.6 percent of Whitianga respondents preferred the planned type of development (Survey data). However, 77.4 percent of Whitianga respondents, and 2.1 percent of Pauanui respondents preferred the more haphazard unplanned type of development. It is understandable that their preference reflects their locational choice, especially as a vast majority of the second homes have been purchased rather than inherited, and so involve a conscious selection of location. Yet it is
still notable that 22.6 percent of Whitianga respondents would prefer a planned type of development. They may not necessarily wish to locate in Pauanui; they may prefer more control and planning within Whitianga.

Table 7.6 lists some of the reasons for the respondents choice of either a planned or unplanned type of development. The Pauanui respondents preferred the planned development because it resulted in a more even development of a high standard (19.4 percent), there was a good provision of facilities (25.4 percent), and because of the 'overall' type of resort that resulted from such development, which they felt better utilised the surrounding area (28.4 percent).

Whitianga respondents, felt that this type of planned development resulted in a resort that was too elitist (40.7 percent), 'over suburbanised' and commercialised (23.7 percent) and too restrictive (18.6 percent).

The Pauanui respondents were conscious that they were part of a planned development that catered for all their immediate needs without any major detrimental side effects. The reasons they proffered for preferring the planned type of development possibly reflected some of the factors involved in their decision-making process to purchase at Pauanui.

The majority of Whitianga respondents preferred a spontaneous type of development. However, they did not provide any reasons in support of this type of development, rather they provided subjective and negative perceptions of a planned development.
Table 7.6: Reasons for preference of Planned versus Spontaneous second home development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOR:</th>
<th>Pauanui %</th>
<th>Whitianga %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contains development</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Even development of a high standard high values</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High standard of building - integrated with natural surroundings</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good provision of facilities</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Overall' development and better utilisation of area</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGAINST:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Over suburbanisation' and commercialised</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too elitist</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>40.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too restrictive</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More natural beauty</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>n = 67</strong></td>
<td><strong>n = 59</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: Survey Data
From the responses it can be ascertained that these comments were directed specifically at Pauanui rather than the concept of a planned development. This occurs for two reasons. Firstly an unwillingness to admit that Pauanui, as an example of a planned development, was an improvement on the more spontaneous type of second home development illustrated by Whitianga. Secondly, a natural sense of prejudice was generated as a result of a perceived 'snobbishness' despite the fact that many of the Whitianga respondents indicated that they had never actually been to Pauanui. There was an air of jealousy directed towards Pauanui because its residents signified and exhibited a socio-economic status level unattainable and possibly unobtainable by many of the Whitianga respondents. Some of the respondents stated that they could not afford a second home at Pauanui and then qualified this by saying that Pauanui was 'too snobby' for them anyway. This point may be substantiated by the lower median incomes of Whitianga second home owners, as compared to those at Pauanui (Table 6.2).

It may be concluded that the respondents from both samples generally perceived the current and future development of their respective resorts, and the Coromandel Peninsula as a whole in a positive light. The respondents from each sample had chosen to locate their second homes according to their needs and aspirations.

Generally, the perceptions of the Whitianga and Pauanui respondents reflect the structures and processes of development
associated with each resort. The perceptions of the respective second home owners as an indication of the demand for a certain type of development are important with regard to the on-going processes of development. The results show that this demand is self-perpetuating.

People perceiving a controlled development as being better will naturally opt for a planned type of second home resort. Likewise potential second home owners showing little desire for control, will locate accordingly in a less rigorously planned or controlled environment.

7.3 VISITORS PERCEPTIONS

A sample of fifty visitors to each resort was surveyed. They were questioned on their perceptions and attitudes to second homes in each area, and in the Coromandel Peninsula as a whole.

The purpose of this questionnaire survey was to determine how current and future second home development is perceived by those who may be considered potential second home owners and future participants in the development process.

7.3.1 Current Development

The sample of visitors were asked how they perceived the presence of second homes in the resort at which they were staying in respect to economic, social and environmental factors
Of the Whitianga visitors, 4.0 percent thought that Whitianga was economically worse off in some way (Table 7.7). None of the visitors to Pauanui saw that resort as economically worse off.

When questioned on the social affect, 86.0 percent of the Pauanui visitors and 94.0 percent of the Whitianga visitors felt that the areas (Pauanui and Whitianga) were the same or better off (Table 7.8).

With regard to the environmental affect 20.0 percent and 30.0 percent of the Pauanui and Whitianga visitors perceived no real change in the environmental nature of the areas, while 46.0 percent of the Whitianga visitors and only 26.0 percent of the Pauanui visitors felt that the areas were worse off (Table 7.9).

The presence of second homes in Pauanui and Whitianga was perceived by the sample of visitors as having mainly a positive effect with regard to economic, social and environmental factors.

The visitors were asked if given the choice, whether they would rather have a second home in Pauanui or in Whitianga. Sixty-eight percent of the sample of Pauanui visitors chose Pauanui, 4.0 percent chose Whitianga and 28.0 percent did not respond. Seventy-six percent of the sample of Whitianga visitors chose Whitianga, 4.0 percent chose Pauanui and 20.0 percent did not respond. The most notable
Table 7.7: Visitors perceptions of the economic impact of second homes on Pauanui and Whitianga.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pauanui %</th>
<th>Whitianga %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Much better off</td>
<td>78.0</td>
<td>68.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A little better off</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The same</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A little worse off</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much worse off</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 50  n = 50

SOURCE: Survey Data

Table 7.8: Visitors perceptions of the social impact of second homes on Pauanui and Whitianga.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pauanui %</th>
<th>Whitianga %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Much better off</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>46.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A little better off</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The same</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A little worse off</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much worse off</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 50  n = 50

SOURCE: Survey Data

Table 7.9: Visitors perceptions of the environmental impact of second homes on Pauanui and Whitianga.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pauanui %</th>
<th>Whitianga %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Much better off</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A little better off</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The same</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A little worse off</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>42.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much worse off</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 50  n = 50

SOURCE: Survey Data
reasons given for these choices by the Pauanui visitors were the social and environmental facilities and scenery (56.0 percent), Pauanui's relative location (22.0 percent) and the planned development structure of Pauanui. The reasons proffered by the Whitianga visitors were that Pauanui was too commercialised and 'snobbish' (40.0 percent), had not been to Pauanui (18.0 percent) and the social and environmental facilities and scenery of Whitianga (26.0 percent).

Once again the image of Pauanui as perceived by people at Whitianga is one of a 'snobbish' and 'over-commercialised' haven for the elite. This was a subjective appraisal often based on limited knowledge of the area and without them having visited Pauanui. The Pauanui visitors based their appraisals more on the concrete features of Pauanui that they had actually utilised and experienced during their visit to the area.

7.3.2 Future Development

Finally the two sample groups were asked to what degree they thought the future development of second homes should be restricted in Pauanui, Whitianga, and the Coromandel Peninsula as a whole. In all three cases the majority of both samples chose 'partially restricted'; the middle option of the five listed (Tables 7.10, 7.11, 7.12). The highest percentages tended to be in the 'partially restricted' to 'totally unrestricted' range with very few choosing the 'restricted' categories for the three areas.
Table 7.10: Degree of restriction needed on future second home development in Pauanui.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pauanui %</th>
<th>Whitianga %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Totally restricted</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted quite a lot</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially restricted</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted very little</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totally unrestricted</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 50

SOURCE: Survey Data

Table 7.11: Degree of restriction needed on future second home development in Whitianga.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pauanui %</th>
<th>Whitianga %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Totally restricted</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted quite a lot</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially restricted</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted very little</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totally unrestricted</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 50

SOURCE: Survey Data

Table 7.12: Degree of restriction needed on future second home development in the Coromandel Peninsula.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pauanui %</th>
<th>Whitianga %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Totally restricted</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted quite a lot</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially restricted</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted very little</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totally unrestricted</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 50

SOURCE: Survey Data
Although the popularity of the middle category may reflect a non-committal response rather more than a considered opinion, the results do reflect a consensus for limited restriction on future second home development in the Coromandel Peninsula.

In concluding, many of the similar questions answered by the second home owners and the visitors produced comparable results from each group. Both groups in the two resorts felt that the presence of second homes had a positive social and economic impact. The visitors felt that the environmental impact was also positive, while the Whitianga second home owners perceived it as being slightly more negative than the Pauanui respondents did. The Whitianga second home owners felt this was due to a lack of planning and provision of infrastructure. The Pauanui second home owners thought that the environment had been enhanced because of the care and planning used when developing Pauanui and supplying the infrastructure.

In relation to future development of second homes both groups considered there was little need for restriction. Problems related to future development were perceived and these mainly related to an over-extension of infrastructure and facilities.

When asked their preference of areas to own a second home, the visitors and second home owners came up with similar reasons for their choices. Both the visitors and
second home owners of Pauanui preferred this location because of its planned nature and relative location to their permanent residence. The Whitianga second home owners and visitors preferred Whitianga because they felt Pauanui was 'over commercialised' and 'elitist'. These perceptions were based on subjective opinions. (Once again choice was reflected in location). The visitors chose to visit these particular locations and when questioned about an alternative area, still opted for their original choice.

It is notable that similar reasons and contrasts resulted from the answers of the visitors and second home owners of each resort. This indicates that the different structures and processes of development continue to manifest themselves in the form of different perceptions of positive and negative features of each area. These perceptions are the potential basis of continued on-going disparate development paths. This reinforces the contention that as potential second home owners they will exhibit similar behaviour to that of the present second home owners in the respective locations.
CHAPTER EIGHT

CONCLUSION

8.1 SUMMARY

This thesis has compared and contrasted two different types of second home development (planned and spontaneous), in an attempt to illustrate the importance of the structures and processes of second home development in influencing the type of resort that emerges.

The initial basic assumption was that planned and spontaneous resorts would contrast markedly with regards to; the physical and social features; the characteristics of the second homes and their owners; the utilisation of the resort and environs; and the perceived image. It was argued that these differences were attributable to the strong overall influence of the original and succeeding structures and processes of development.

Traditionally the approaches to the study of second home development have been varied but lacked integration. They included studies that concentrated on the descriptive approach; the location approach in relation to relative accessibility and place utility; the sociological approach; the application of general and specific models; and the recreational land use approach. It was considered that although all of these approaches had made very worthwhile contributions to the study of the second home phenomenon, they had failed to look
retrospectively beyond the second home resort, community or location in its static state. Previous studies failed to appreciate the importance and influence of the preceding structures and processes of development on all aspects of the resulting second home areas and associated owners.

A first principle approach in any study of considering the structures and processes of development is deemed very important, as it is these that influence the type of resort that emerges. Consequently, any study considering one of the six approaches to the study of the second home phenomenon (Figure 1.1) must give due regard to the structures and processes of development of the resort. These form the baseline from which any development evolves. How this development evolves will depend strongly on the structures and processes implemented.

Two second home resorts on the Coromandel Peninsula were chosen to illustrate the importance of the differences in the structures and processes of development, and the resulting contrasts. Puauanui, a privately developed second home resort was used to illustrate the structures and processes involved in a planned and controlled resort. In contrast, Whitianga illustrated many of the characteristics of a spontaneously developed second home resort.

8.2 OBJECTIVES AND METHODOLOGY

There were three main objectives to this thesis. The first objective was to highlight the sequence and the structures and processes of development of Puauanui and Whitianga. Using
a general framework for examining the structures and processes of tourist development at the macro-scale (Pearce, 1981), two models were developed to illustrate the different sequences and structures and processes involved in the development of Pauanui and Whitianga. This objective was carried out in Chapter Five.

The second objective was to highlight the contrasts that result from different structures and processes of development, with regard to the physical and aesthetic features of the resorts, the characteristics of the second homes and their owners, and the utilisation of each resort. To fulfil this objective a sample of 125 second home owners from each resort were randomly selected and surveyed by questionnaire. The results of this survey were compared and contrasted in Chapter Six.

The final objective was to assess how current and future second home development in each resort, and in the Coromandel Peninsula as a whole, was perceived by the second home owners and by a sample of visitors to the resorts. This objective was fulfilled in Chapter Seven, using data from the survey of the second home owners.

To assess the visitors perception to the second home phenomenon, a sample of 50 visitors to each resort was randomly selected and surveyed by questionnaire. The perception of the second home owners and visitors of each resort were also compared and contrasted.
8.3 RESULTS

The two models used to illustrate the sequence and structures and processes of development of Pauanui and Whitianga highlighted a number of contrasts. The most important of these contrasts was the temporal relationship of supply and demand associated with each resort.

The natural attractions of Whitianga have drawn visitors to this location for a number of years. Consequently a demand for second home ownership was created. Since the mid-1960's, Whitianga has developed a two-fold function as a service town and as a holiday resort. As a result of Whitianga's initial function as a service town, a limited number of elements of supply were provided before the tourist demand began to reach a peak. As this demand has now exceeded supply, a number of important ramifications have resulted: Whitianga has no comprehensive method of waste water disposal (with most of the town being served by on-site septic tanks) and has only recently had its water supply upgraded to the standards set by the Department of Health.

In contrast, Pauanui has been developed exclusively as a second home resort. A number of elements of supply were provided with the initial development. These included the basic infrastructure of sewage, water and electricity reticulation and roading within Pauanui. A number of man-made recreational attractions were also supplied.
In Pauanui supply preceded demand, and the developers have endeavoured to keep the standard of the elements of supply and of development high in an attempt to retain a high level of demand.

Pauanui has been initiated and developed completely by a single private sector agent of development who's prime motive was profit-making. In contrast, many of the processes and structures of development of Whitianga have been controlled and provided by the public sector (local authority), with a small amount of dispersed and sporadic private professional subdivision.

The impetus for a spontaneous development originates from the potential second home owners who create a demand for second homes. In contrast the impetus for a planned second home resort originates from the agents of development who provide a number of elements of supply. Figure 8.1 illustrates the process and results of these two different sequences of development.

The impetus for a spontaneous second home development is generated by a demand from the potential second home owners. This type of development creates a lag in the elements of supply in relation to demand. In contrast, the agents of development actively create an impetus for a planned second home resort. Associated with a planned second home resort are the elements of supply which precede the associated demand.
CATALYSTS OF SECOND HOME DEVELOPMENT

Figure 8.1
The model stresses the influence of two different catalysts of second home development, and the resultant relationships between supply and demand.

To highlight some of the contrasts between the two resorts that were a result of the differences in the development of each, such features as the socio-economic characteristics of the second home owners, the acquisition, utilisation and characteristics of the second homes, were examined and compared.

Significant differences between the second home owners in Pauanui and Whitianga were found in relation to their occupations, incomes and the locations of their permanent residences.

Pauanui and Whitianga second home owners both exhibit the general socio-economic features typically associated with second home owners as reflected in the general literature. A higher proportion of second home owners in Pauanui were in professional-technical occupations (with associated higher incomes) than were second home owners in Whitianga.

Distance decay effects and sectoral bias were evident with regard to the location of permanent residences.

The characteristics of the second homes, in the form of acquisition and utilisation, also exhibited marked contrasts.
The reasons for location in each specific resort varied between the two groups of second home owners. These differences were seen as a response to the contrasting types of development.

The high proportion of second homes that have been built and purchased in the last ten years testifies to the recency of demand for second homes in Pauanui and Whitianga. This conclusion is substantiated by a parallel increase in second homes for the T-C.D. as evident in the New Zealand Population Census data.

Utilisation of second homes in Pauanui and Whitianga occurred predominantly during the summer months of late December through to late January. However, a high proportion of Pauanui respondents utilised their second homes throughout the whole year. This may be related to the relative accessibility of Pauanui to Auckland, the largest generating area of Pauanui second home owners.

Contrasts in the utilisation of each resort and its environs also occurred. The recreational equipment and activities of the Pauanui respondents reflects the popularity of the man-made recreational attractions of Pauanui, whereas the recreational equipment and activities of the Whitianga respondents reflected a higher utilisation of the natural attractions of Whitianga.

Entertainment facilities in Pauanui were utilised more
than those in Whitianga. It was concluded that this occurred because the Pauanui facilities were provided specifically for the second home owners, whereas the Whitianga facilities were shared with the local and visiting population.

Finally, the perceptions of the second home owners and visitors to the current and future development in Pauanui, Whitianga and the Coromandel Peninsula as a whole were examined and compared.

Pauanui second home owners expressed their desire for planned and controlled development as realised in their active decision to locate in such a resort. The Whitianga second home respondents preferred a more spontaneous, unregulated type of development. Neither of the two groups perceived a need for any major limitations on future second home development. Any problems perceived by the second home owner in considering future development reflected the resort in which their second home was located.

The perceptions of a sample of visitors to each resort were considered as the visitors may be viewed as potential second home owners. Therefore their perceptions may have important implications with regard to subsequent development process.

The visitors responses for each resort were similar to those of the second home owners and also reflected the resort in which they were located.
It was concluded that the nature of the development influenced the type of second home owners and visitors who utilised the resorts. This relationship was self-perpetuating. People perceiving an organised development as being better, will naturally opt for a planned type of second home resort. Likewise, those showing little desire for control will locate accordingly in a less rigorously planned and controlled environment. This overall behaviour is viewed in the respective models of development as self-perpetuating.

8.4 MODEL UTILITY

The utility of Pearce's framework for the study of tourist development at the macro-scale was investigated at the micro-level with regard to second home resorts. The two models, essentially comprising the same elements, differed in the sequence and importance of these events in the second home development process. The importance played by each element in the sequence has implications to the final outcome of the model.

This is perhaps best realised in the role of the agents of development. As evidenced, the degree of involvement of the public and private sector as agents of development has produced two distinct second home resorts.

A privately planned development with very little public sector involvement has produced Pauanui, a highly regulated and planned second home resort. In contrast Whitianga displays typical characteristics in which there has been piecemeal private
sector development unco-ordinated with the public sector. Neither of these have worked in harmony in Whitianga.

The consequent form and characteristics of the two second home resorts differ largely as a result of the contrasting sequence of the two models. This is best displayed by Figure 8.1, in which the relative ordering of supply in relation to demand, and the body providing impetus for second home development results in contrasting types of resorts. Where supply precedes demand as is the case when the agent of development is the major actor in providing the impetus, the opportunity for a well planned and regulated second home resort is provided. However, if demand precedes supply, as in Whitianga where the impetus for second home development is provided by potential second home owners, a situation develops in which supply lags behind demand. The onus is then placed on the public sector agent of development to provide any subsequent elements of supply, especially infrastructure, to cater or match this demand.

Pauanui Ocean Beach Resort is the product of supply preceding demand, in marked contrast to Whitianga where demand has preceded supply.

8.5 BROADER IMPLICATIONS

A first principle approach has been adopted in assessing the role of the structures and processes in the development of second home resorts. As basic differences between these structures and processes have been highlighted with respect to
planned and spontaneous second home development, there is a need to examine the broader implications of these differences. The consequent social, environmental and economic impacts of the contrasting types of development on the social and physical characteristics of the resort need to be assessed. Further, the economic flows operating in the local community and their relation to the tertiary services provided, need to be studied. As there are basic differences in the characteristics of second homes and owners in the two developments, the processes of decision-making in relation to locational choice needs further assessment.

It has been suggested that the two models are self-perpetuating and disparate. As Pauanui is perhaps the first of its type in New Zealand, it would be interesting to monitor the importance of the structures and processes of development and the continued private sector involvement, in retaining the present high standard in the future. As a result of the development of Pauanui, many other second home resorts have emerged.

Having identified the basic principles used in the development of Pauanui the degree to which these have been adopted in the subsequent development of these other second home resorts needs to be investigated.
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APPENDIX A

Questionnaire Survey:

Pauanui second home owners
PAUANUI HOLIDAY HOME OWNERS SURVEY

Instructions: Please tick the Appropriate Box (where applicable)

1. Status of Residence - are you
   - [ ] the owner
   - [ ] a friend or relative
   - [ ] renting
   - [ ] Other (please specify) ______________

Questions 2-8 to be answered by owners only. Other residents go to Question 9.

2. In which locality or town is your permanent home? (eg. Remuera, Auckland).

3. In what period did you acquire your property in Pauanui?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acquire Section</th>
<th>Erect Dwelling</th>
<th>Acquire Section &amp; Dwelling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1967-1969</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970-1972</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973-1975</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976-1978</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979-1981</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Is this the first holiday home that your household has owned?
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No

5. For what reason did you purchase your property?
   - [ ] a holiday home site
   - [ ] an investment
   - [ ] an eventual permanent home site
6. If you expect to live permanently on the property, will you:
   work locally  
   be retired  
   Other (specify) ____________

7. Is the holiday home owned by your household alone?
   Yes  No  
   (if No, please give details of ownership)

8. What were the main reasons for choosing Pauanui as the location for your holiday home?
   1. ____________________________________
   2. ____________________________________
   3. ____________________________________

9. How did you hear about Pauanui?
   Visit  
   Friends  
   Real Estate agent  
   News Media (i.e. advertising)  
   Other ways (please specify) ____________

Recreation and Social Activities

10. What recreational accessories do you use while at Pauanui? (eg. a boat, a wind-surfer, a motor bike)
   (Please specify ____________________________
11. What recreational activities do you and other members of your household pursue while at Pauanui?

Head of household

__________________________________________

Other members of the household

__________________________________________

12. What additional recreational facilities would you like to see at Pauanui?

__________________________________________

13. Do any members of the household belong to any social organisations at Pauanui?

Yes [ ] No [ ]

(if Yes, please specify)

__________________________________________

14. What entertainment facilities do members of the household use while at Pauanui?

Head of household

__________________________________________

Other members of the household

__________________________________________

15. What additional entertainment facilities would you like to see at Pauanui?

__________________________________________

16. While at Pauanui, do members of your household engage in fairly frequent social interaction with members of other households?

Yes [ ] No [ ]
Local Spending

17. Could you estimate how much money you and your family would spend in Pauanui over the year (Jan 1981 - Feb 1982) for the following items.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Approximate Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Building and maintenance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Food, groceries, beverages</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Service goods (petrol, electricity)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Professional Services (doctor etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Entertainment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Other (eg. Clothes, specify if possible)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total

18. What proportion of your household needs are brought in from outside the area?

a) Percentage brought in %

b) Type of goods brought in

19. Have you ever employed any Peninsula residents to help with the construction and/or maintenance of your holiday home?

Yes ☐ No ☐

(if Yes, state what services were provided)
20. Are any of the materials that you required for the construction and/or maintenance of your holiday home bought on the Peninsula?

Yes [ ]  No [ ]

(if Yes, please give particulars on what was purchased, and where from)

21. Do you feel that the local facilities and services are sufficient to serve the needs of holiday home owners at present?

Within Pauanui  Yes [ ]  No [ ]
Within the Peninsula  Yes [ ]  No [ ]

(if No, please state why and what facilities and services are lacking)

Perception of the Impact of Holiday Home Ownership

22. How do you feel that the presence of holiday homes affects the general area around Pauanui? (including Tairua)

(a) Economically: Do you think the area is:

Better off [ ]
About the same [ ]
Worse off [ ]

Reasons

(b) Socially: Do you think the area is:

Better off [ ]
About the same [ ]
Worse off [ ]

Reasons
(c) Environmentally: Do you think the area is:

Better off  
About the same  
Worse off  

Reasons  

23. Does the presence of other holiday homes restrict the amount of pleasure you get from your own?

Yes  
No  

(please expand on the answer)

24. Are there any factors in the area which restrict the amount of pleasure you get from your holiday home?

25. Do you feel that further development of holiday homes in your area should be restricted in any way?

Yes  
No  

(if Yes, please specify reasons)

26. What problems can you see the area facing in the future as a result of this development of more holiday homes on the Coromandel Peninsula?
27. Do you feel that this type of planned development is preferable to the longer more 'haphazard' development that has occurred in the past in many other parts of the Peninsula?

Yes ☐  No ☐

(please expand the answer)

Questions 27-35 to be answered by owners only. Other residents go to Question 36.

Patterns of Holiday Home Use

28. How many times per year do you or your family occupy your holiday home?

Once per year ☐
Twice per year ☐
Three times per year ☐
Four times per year ☐
Five times per year ☐
Six or more times per year ☐

29. Does most of the occupation occur at:

Weekends ☐
Other (specify) _____________________________

30. How many weeks in total have you spent at your holiday home in the last year?

Summer (Dec-March) _________ weeks
Winter (April-Nov) _________ weeks
Total _________ weeks
31. Does anyone outside of your immediate household use the holiday home?
   - No
   - Friends
   - Relatives
   - Others

32. Do these groups pay for the use of the holiday home?
   - Yes
   - No

33. If the house is rented please estimate for how many weeks per year.
   
   ___________ weeks

34. Are there any reasons why you rent out or don't rent out your holiday home?


35. In the following table, Cross out the months in the last year during which your holiday home was used.

   a) You and Your Family

   
   1980 1981

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>Jun</th>
<th>Jul</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sep</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

   b) Friends, relatives and others

   1980 1981

   | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | Jun | Jul | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec |
36. (For friends, relatives, renters and others)

In the following table, cross out the months in the last year during which you have stayed at this holiday home?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>Jun</th>
<th>Jul</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sep</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Socio-Economic Background to the Household

In this last brief section we would like some information about the size and make-up of your household so that we can see if our sample is a typical one.

37. What is the occupation of the head of the household?

______________________________

38. What are the occupations of the other members of the household?

Spouse

______________________________

Children

______________________________

______________________________

Others

______________________________

39. Into which income group does the head of the household belong?

Under $1,999

2,000 - 3,999

4,000 - 5,999

6,000 - 7,999

8,000 - 9,999

10,000 - 14,999

15,000 - 19,999

20,000 - 24,999

25,000 - 29,999

30,000 and over
**Household Head**

40. Sex  
- [ ] Male  
- [ ] Female

41. Marital Status  
- [ ] Never Married  
- [ ] Married  
- [ ] Widowed  
- [ ] Other (please specify) __________

---

**Household Members**

42. List the number of persons in your household in each age category.  *(Include yourself)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Immediate Family Members**

**Others (please specify)**

---

*Thank you for your co-operation.*
APPENDIX B

Questionnaire Survey:
Whitianga second home owners
WHITIANGA HOLIDAY HOME OWNERS SURVEY

Instructions: Please tick the Appropriate Box (where applicable)

1. Status of Residence - are you
   - the owner
   - a friend or relative
   - renting
   - Other (please specify)

Questions 2-8 to be answered by owners only. Other residents go to Question 9.

2. In which locality or town is your permanent home? (eg. Remuera, Auckland).

3. In what period did you acquire your property in Whitianga?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acquire Section</th>
<th>Erect Dwelling</th>
<th>Acquire Section &amp; Dwelling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before 1940</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941 - 1945</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946 - 1950</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951 - 1955</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956 - 1960</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961 - 1965</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966 - 1970</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971 - 1975</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976 - 1980</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981 -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Is this the first holiday home that your household has owned?
   - Yes [ ]
   - No [ ]

5. For what reason did you purchase your property?
   - a holiday home site
   - an investment
   - an eventual permanent home site
6. If you expect to live permanently on the property, will you:
   work locally [ ]
   be retired [ ]
   Other (specify) ________________________________

7. Is the holiday home owned by your household alone?
   Yes [ ]    No [ ]
   (if No, please give details of ownership)

   ________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________

8. What were the main reasons for choosing Whitianga as the location for your holiday home?
   1. ________________________________
   2. ________________________________
   3. ________________________________

9. How did you hear about Whitianga?
   Visit [ ]
   Friends [ ]
   Real Estate agent [ ]
   News Media (i.e. advertising) [ ]
   Other ways (please specify) ________________________________

Recreation and Social Activities

10. What recreational accessories do you use while at Whitianga? (eg. a boat, a winder-surfer, a motor bike)
   (Please specify) ________________________________

   ________________________________________________
1. What recreational activities do you and other members of your household pursue while at Whitianga?

Head of household

Other members of the household

12. What additional recreational facilities would you like to see at Whitianga?

13. Do any members of the household belong to any social organisations at Whitianga?

Yes ☐ No ☐

(if Yes, please specify)

14. What entertainment facilities do members of the household use while at Whitianga?

Head of household

Other members of the household

15. What additional entertainment facilities would you like to see at Whitianga?

16. While at Whitianga, do members of your household engage in fairly frequent social interaction with members of other households?

Yes ☐ No ☐
Local Spending

17. Could you estimate how much money you and your family would spend in Whitianga over the year (Jan 1981 - Feb 1982) for the following items.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Approximate Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Building and maintenance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Food, groceries, beverages</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Service goods (petrol, electricity)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Professional Services (doctor etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Entertainment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Other (eg. Clothes, specify if possible)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total

18. What proportion of your household needs are brought in from outside the area?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Percentage brought in</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Percentage brought in</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Type of goods brought in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Have you ever employed any Peninsula residents to help with the construction and/or maintenance of your holiday home?

Yes [ ]  No [ ]

(if Yes, state what services were provided)
0. Are any of the materials that you required for the construction and/or maintenance of your holiday home bought on the Peninsula?

    Yes ☐    No ☐

    (if Yes, please give particulars on what was purchased, and where from)

1. Do you feel that the local facilities and services are sufficient to serve the needs of holiday home owners at present?

    Within Whitianga    Yes ☐    No ☐

    Within the Peninsula Yes ☐

    (if No, please state why and what facilities and services are lacking)

'Perception of the Impact of Holiday Home Ownership'

2. How do you feel that the presence of holiday homes affects the general area around Whitianga?

   (a) Economically: Do you think the area is:

       Better off ☐
       About the same ☐
       Worse off ☐

       Reasons ____________________________

   (b) Socially: Do you think the area is:

       Better off ☐
       About the same ☐
       Worse off ☐

       Reasons ____________________________
(c) Environmentally: Do you think the area is:

- Better off
- About the same
- Worse off

Reasons

23. Does the presence of other holiday homes restrict the amount of pleasure you get from your own?

- Yes
- No

(please expand on the answer)

24. Are there any factors in the area which restrict the amount of pleasure you get from your holiday home?

25. Do you feel that further development of holiday homes in your area should be restricted in any way?

- Yes
- No

(if Yes, please specify reasons)

26. What problems can you see the area facing in the future as a result of this development of more holiday homes on the Coromandel Peninsula?
27. Do you feel that the type of planned development found at Pauanui is preferable to the longer more 'haphazard' development that has occurred in the past in many other parts of the Peninsula, i.e. Whitianga?

Yes [ ] No [ ]

(please expand the answer)

Questions 27-35 to be answered by owners only. Other residents go to Question 36.

Items of Holiday Home Use

How many times per year do you or your family occupy your holiday home?

Once per year [ ]
Twice per year [ ]
Three times per year [ ]
Four times per year [ ]
Five times per year [ ]
Six or more times per year [ ]

Does most of the occupation occur at:

Weekends [ ]
Other (specify) __________________________

How many weeks in total have you spent at your holiday home in the last year?

Summer (Dec-March) _______ weeks
Winter (April-Nov) _______ weeks
Total _______ weeks
31. Does anyone outside of your immediate household use the holiday home?

No
Friends
Relatives
Others

32. Do these groups pay for the use of the holiday home?

Yes No
Friends
Relatives
Others

33. If the house is rented please estimate for how many weeks per year.

________ weeks

34. Are there any reasons why you rent out or don't rent out your holiday home?

________________________________________________________________________

35. In the following table, Cross out the months in the last year during which your holiday home was used.

a) You and Your Family

1980 - 1981

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>Jun</th>
<th>Jul</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sep</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

b) Friends, relatives and others

1980 - 1981

| Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | Jun | Jul | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec |
36. (For friends, relatives, renters and others)

In the following table, cross out the months in the last year during which you have stayed at this holiday home?

1980  1981

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>Jun</th>
<th>Jul</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sep</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Socio-Economic Background to the Household

In this last brief section we would like some information about the size and make-up of your household so that we can see if our sample is a typical one.

37. What is the occupation of the head of the household?

_________________________________________

38. What are the occupations of the other members of the household?

Spouse  ____________________________________

Children ___________________________________

__________________________________________

Others  ____________________________________

39. Into which income group does the head of the household belong?

Under $1,999

2,000 - 3,999

4,000 - 5,999

6,000 - 7,999

8,000 - 9,999

10,000 - 14,999

15,000 - 19,999

20,000 - 24,999

25,000 - 29,999

30,000 and over

__________________________________________
Household Head

40. Sex  
   Male  
   Female  

41. Marital Status  
   Never Married  
   Married  
   Widowed  
   Other (please specify) 

Household Members

42. List the number of persons in your household in each age category. (Include yourself)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Immediate Family Members</th>
<th>Others (please specify)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you for your cooperation.
APPENDIX C

Introductory Letter
QUESTIONNAIRE TO HOLIDAY HOME RESIDENTS

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am a postgraduate student in the Department of Geography, University of Canterbury, conducting a survey on aspects of holiday home development relating to the growth and importance of holiday homes in Pauanui and Whitianga.

The object of this survey is to examine the nature of the holiday home households and their attitudes and perceptions towards the growth and development of holiday home areas. The success of my research will therefore depend upon your assistance. All information that you provide will be treated confidentially. Your interest and cooperation would be greatly appreciated.

Thank you.

Dr Pip Forer (Supervisor)  
Elspeth McMillan
APPENDIX D

Questionnaire Survey: Visitors
VISITORS PERCEPTIONS AND ATTITUDES TO HOLIDAY HOMES SURVEY

Instructions: please tick the appropriate box.

(1) Do you feel that the presence of holiday homes restricts the pleasure you get from this area?

Totally restricts  |  Restricts quite a lot  |  Partially restricts  |  Restricts very little  |  Totally unrestricted

(2) How do you feel that the presence of holiday homes affects the area ........

(a) Economically: Do you think the area is:

Much Better off  |  A little better off  |  the same  |  a little worse off  |  much worse off

(b) Socially: Do you think the area is:

Much Better off  |  A little better off  |  the same  |  a little worse off  |  much worse off

(c) Environmentally: Do you think the area is:

Much Better off  |  A little better off  |  the same  |  a little worse off  |  much worse off

(3) Do you feel that the services and facilities for visitors are adequate?

Totally adequate  |  fairly adequate  |  adequate  |  fairly inadequate  |  totally inadequate

(4) Would you like to have a holiday home here?

Yes ☐  No ☐

(Please give one reason why) __________________________

(5) Would you rather own a similar holiday home in Whitianga or Pauanui?

Whitianga ☐  Pauanui ☐

(Please give one reason why) __________________________

(6) To what degree do you think that the future development of holiday homes should be restricted in:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Totally restricted</th>
<th>restricted quite a lot</th>
<th>partially restricted</th>
<th>restricted very little</th>
<th>totally unrestricted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pauanui</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitianga</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Coromandel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peninsula as a whole</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Are you a visitor ☐  a resident ☐  a local second home owner ☐

Thank you for your cooperation.