

BEFORE THE QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT COUNCIL HEARINGS PANEL

UNDER the Resource Management Act 1991

IN THE MATTER of the review of parts of the Queenstown Lakes District Council's District Plan under the First Schedule of the Act

AND

IN THE MATTER of submissions and further submissions by **QUEENSTOWN PARK LIMITED**

**STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF TIMOTHY JOHN HAZLEDINE ON BEHALF OF
QUEENSTOWN PARK LIMITED**

ECONOMICS

**CHAPTER 21 – RURAL, CHAPTER 22 – RURAL RESIDENTIAL AND RURAL
LIFESTYLE, AND CHAPTER 33 – INDIGENOUS VEGETATION**

21 APRIL 2016

**BROOKFIELDS
LAWYERS**

J D Young / R A Davidson
Telephone No. 09 379 9350
Fax No. 09 379 3224
P O Box 240
DX CP24134
AUCKLAND

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE	3
2. CODE OF CONDUCT	4
3. SUMMARY	4
4. INTRODUCTION	5
5. THE AGRICULTURAL SECTOR IN THE QUEENSTOWN-LAKES DISTRICT	6
6. FARMING'S CONTRIBUTION TO THE LANDSCAPE	8
7. OTHER FARMING-RELATED ISSUES	10
8. THE TOURISM SECTOR IN THE QUEENSTOWN-LAKES DISTRICT	12
9. SECTION 32 CONSIDERATIONS	15
ATTACHMENT A	17

1. QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE

- 1.1 My name is Timothy John Hazledine. I am a Professor of Economics at the University of Auckland.
- 1.2 I have been retained by Remarkables Park Limited to provide expert evidence in relation to economic matters raised by the Proposed District Plan.
- 1.3 I have Masters Degrees in Economics from the Universities of Canterbury and Otago and a PhD in Economics from Warwick University.
- 1.4 I have held teaching positions at the Universities of Otago, Warwick, Balliol College Oxford, Queen's University Ontario and the University of British Columbia, in Vancouver. From 1975 to 1977 I was an economist at the Federal Department of Agriculture, in Ottawa. From 1983 to 1992 I was first Associate then Full Professor in the Department of Agricultural Economics at UBC. Since 1992 I have been a Professor at the University of Auckland. I have more than one hundred refereed and peer reviewed scientific publications in various areas of applied economics.
- 1.5 I have consulted on resource management and related issues for the Electricity Commission, the NZ Institute of Economic Research, Waitakere City Council, North Shore City Council, the Auckland Regional Council, Environment Canterbury, Remarkables Park Ltd, Auckland Council, and others.
- 1.6 The key documents that I have used while preparing this brief of evidence are:
 - (a) Statement of Evidence of Philip Osborne on behalf of Queenstown Lakes District Council (**QLDC**), dated April 6, 2016;
 - (b) Statement of Evidence of Robert James Greenaway, dated March 17, 2016; and
 - (c) Section 42A Hearing Report For Hearing commencing 2 May 2016 by Mr Craig Barr for.

2. CODE OF CONDUCT

2.1 I have read and am familiar with the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses in the current Environment Court Practice Note (2014), have complied with it, and will follow the Code when presenting evidence to the Council. I also confirm that the matters addressed in this statement of evidence are within my area of expertise, except when relying on the opinion or evidence of other witnesses. I have not omitted to consider material facts known to me that might alter or detract from the opinions expressed.

3. SUMMARY

3.1 My main conclusions are as follows:

- (a) Primary agriculture is an unusually small contributor to the Queenstown and Lakes District (the District) economy;
- (b) Traditional pastoral farming (in particular) struggles to generate viable economic returns in the District, and this situation is unlikely to improve;
- (c) Farming provides a service to others (a “public good”) through its contribution to the attractiveness of the District to tourists and other visitors;
- (d) Given the financial stress facing farmers in the District, it is implausible and unreasonable to expect them to shoulder the burden of providing this important public good unless;
- (e) Farm owners are permitted to diversify their land use into commercially viable activities additional to farming;
- (f) It is unclear to what extent such diversification would necessarily in and of itself constitute a threat to the overall attractiveness of the District to tourists and other visitors;
- (g) It is likely (though not necessarily so) that such diversification would be into activities providing services to tourists and visitors, because;

- (h) The provision of services to tourists and visitors is an unusually large contributor to the District economy;
- (i) The popularity of the District to tourists and visitors rests in part on the natural attributes of the land and water, but this is multiplied by the many additional attractive services provided by firms and individuals in the District;
- (j) However, the supply of tourism services has been recently stressed by rapid growth in demand, resulting in price increases, congestion, etc;
- (k) There is thus a demonstrable need – which may become an urgent need – for provision of additional tourism and visitor services, perhaps especially innovative services which (for example) would diversify the market seasonally and across different tourist types; and
- (l) Bringing everything together, a strong economic case can be made for permitting environmentally responsible new tourism attractions to be developed on some land presently in primary agricultural use.

4. INTRODUCTION

4.1 The fortunes of agriculture and tourism have moved in opposite directions over the modern history of the Queenstown Basin. Originally, after European settlement, the predominant economic activity was farming, apart from the gold mining blip, of which the chief enduring legacy is the charming village of Arrowtown.¹ By now, however, tourism and short term visits in all their forms (domestic, foreign, second homes²) has become the major economic activity in the district, and farming has shrunk to marginal status, both as a source of employment and in terms of economic viability, at which the sector struggles.

4.2 Statistics NZ Business Demography Data reveal that the employment share of Agriculture, Forestry and Fishing in 2015 was just 2.51% of total employment in the

¹ According to *Wiki*, Arrowtown's population peaked at around 7,000 during the gold rush, subsiding to less than 200 by the 1960s. It is more than ten times that today.

² On Census day 2013, more than one quarter of QLDC dwellings were unoccupied.

District – one job in forty. This is lower than all of the 66 Districts in New Zealand, with the exception of those districts including the large cities of Auckland, Hamilton, Palmerston North, Wellington, Christchurch and Dunedin.

- 4.3 These data also reveal that the share of employment in the Queenstown-Lakes District's Accommodation and Food Services sector was, at 29.65%, the highest of any district in New Zealand, just heading off Kaikoura, Mackenzie and Westland, and well ahead of Taupo, Rotorua and Ruapehu.

5. THE AGRICULTURAL SECTOR IN THE QUEENSTOWN-LAKES DISTRICT

- 5.1 Mr Philip Osborne (at his Table 1) supplies Statistics NZ Business Demography data which, as Mr Robert Greenaway points out in his evidence at paragraph 14, only 3% of total QLD employment (500 people) was in Agriculture, compared with a national average of 6%.³ Actually, the like-for-like discrepancy is larger than this – given that around two thirds of NZ residents live in large cities, the average percentage of employment in agriculture in territorial authorities similar demographically to the QLDC (ie with no sizeable urban centres) must be of the order of 15% or more.
- 5.2 Statistics NZ data⁴ show that there were 234 farms in the QLDC district in 2012, of which more than one half were less than 60 hectares in size. Forty five of the farms were vineyards, and so the proportion of the labour force engaged in the pastoral farming activities that are the staple farm type throughout New Zealand's rural areas⁵, and which (along with vineyards) are being relied on by Mr Barr and Mr Osborne to contribute to the "Outstanding Natural Landscape" of, in particular, the Queenstown basin, must be even less than 3%.⁶
- 5.3 Thus, as Mr Osborne puts it:

"[A] number of rural activities may not of themselves make a significant contribution in real terms [to] the District's economy, but...have significant value beyond that in

³ These data are for 2016, and differ slightly from the 2015 data I reported in paras 9 and 10. This may simply be a matter of rounding errors.

⁴ Statistics NZ, Agricultural Production Statistics, June 2012 (final)

⁵ Just three of the 231 farms were dairy farms.

⁶ 126 of the 231 farms were pastoral livestock operations (sheep, beef, deer, etc)

the way that they protect or maintain the natural environment and landscapes that in turn sustain the District's economy".

- 5.4 Therein lies a problem. It is not just whether the farms make a contribution to the local economy, it is whether they make a significant contribution to their owners' economic well-being. My information is to the effect that traditional pastoral farming in and around the Queenstown basin is under considerable economic stress, to the point of being unviable as stand-alone profit-making enterprise. I note that Mr Osborne is aware of this, and at paragraph 5.4 of his evidence states that the agriculture sector in the District "continues to struggle in terms of growth and viability").⁷
- 5.5 Of the factors contributing to the economic difficulties of farming in the District, the three principal problems may be:
- (a) Lack of infrastructure;
 - (b) "Reverse sensitivity" issues; and
 - (c) Land prices.
- 5.6 With respect to infrastructure – it seems that the surviving farmers in and around the Queenstown basin are doing their best, but are increasingly isolated from the services that generally facilitate productive farming. There are no stock and station agencies, no large rural supplies facilities, no slaughter houses; and not a lot of other farmers with whom to share information and resources.
- 5.7 As for reverse sensitivity – this occurs when farming and non-farming activities in close proximity to each other get on each other's nerves. The classic textbook example is piggeries emitting noises and smells which offend neighbouring residents. Fortunately, there are no pig farms in the District, but there are deer farms, with their periodically noisy and smelly rutting stags, and there may be issues with spraying, fertiliser runoff, stock in water ways and perhaps other problems. Basically, the

⁷ I note that the run known as Queenstown Park Station was purchased by its present owner in a mortgagee sale. The owner tells me that the farm was in a quite run-down condition when purchased.

situation is now that the Queenstown basin is neither clearly urban nor clearly rural and this does tend to make farming more difficult.

- 5.8 With respect to land prices, it seems fairly clear that farm values in the District are, and must be, inflated over values in less attractive areas by the possibility that at some time the farm or part of it will be able to be developed for much more profitable non-agricultural uses.
- 5.9 That is, it does not seem plausible that the small pastoral farm economy of the Queenstown basin is economically sustainable in the long term on a stand-alone basis.
- 5.10 Nor does it seem fair to expect current or future farmers to put up with poor economic returns so that they can provide for tourists and everybody else a “public good” contribution to the maintenance of the “Outstanding Natural Landscape” (**ONL**), to which I now turn.

6. FARMING’S CONTRIBUTION TO THE LANDSCAPE

- 6.1 With respect to farming’s contribution to the ONL, and to the ONL itself – I do have some difficulties with the information or lack of such provided in the submissions of Mr Barr and Mr Osborne. I do not, of course, disagree that the Queenstown area landscape – say, the landscape that is visible from the basin – is outstanding by any reasonable criterion. I do not dispute that significant – probably major – ingredients of this outstanding-ness are natural features – in particular:

- (a) The peaks and upper slopes of The Remarkables;
- (b) Some of the mountains lining Lake Wakatipu;
- (c) This lake and Lake Hayes; and
- (d) The compactness of the basin, which gives presence to the more ordinary surrounding hills and peaks.

- 6.2 However, it is not made clear by Mr Barr and Mr Osborne how pastoral farms contribute to this (and consequently, how non pastoral use of some rural land would detract from the attractiveness of the landscape). Farms are, of course, not “natural” landscapes in themselves, being the result of the elimination of native flora and fauna and their replacement by exotic species, grasses, and (very noticeable in the basin) conifer trees planted as shelter belts. And I really do doubt whether a significant number of tourists come to the District to admire the farms. Perhaps, their landscape contribution is basically to keep non-urban land tidy – the animals graze the grass, weeds and pests are kept down, properties fenced, etc.
- 6.3 I note that farm tracks scar the sides of all or nearly all the hills and mountains in the basin, as do even more intrusive fully formed roads on the Crown Range, the Remarkables, and Coronet Peak. I note that the latter mountain has a substantial group of commercial buildings just above the snow line, visible from many points in the basin. The ONL is evidently able to absorb a certain amount of unnatural interference.
- 6.4 I don’t claim expertise in the formal evaluation of landscapes, and am happy to accept that the surviving farms have some important role to play in the maintenance of quality landscapes in the District. My point as an economist is that:
- (a) The farmers aren’t being paid to provide this service; and
 - (b) Even their ability to do so – should they generously so wish, is probably increasingly limited by the intrinsic difficulties in making a decent profit from pastoral farming in the Queenstown basin.
- 6.5 So, what is to be done? One possibility is that the QLDC purchases the farms and runs them as public utilities, and/or that rate-payers subsidise the present owners to carry on farming. I do not believe that these possible policies have been seriously canvassed, and perhaps they should not be, given that there is an alternative which does not involve the spending of public money.
- 6.6 The alternative is that the Council adopts (perhaps, in effect, continues to adopt) a permissive or even encouraging regulatory stance to allow farm owners to generate other income streams from utilising parts of their land in non-agricultural activities. It

seems likely that many or most of such activities would be tourism-related, and there are special benefits from this, as I will explain below.

- 6.7 It has not been demonstrated that such activities would necessarily detract significantly from the quality of the landscape.

7. OTHER FARMING-RELATED ISSUES

- 7.1 Before turning to the tourism sector, I would like to clear up two minor matters, raised in this Hearing, concerning agricultural land use in the District: the intrinsic merits of food production, and the precautionary motive for retaining land in rural use.

- 7.2 In most parts of NZ, and the world, land use planning involving competition between urban and agriculture activities is strongly influenced, even sometimes, dominated by an almost moral sensibility of the assumed inherent superiority of using land “productively”, which word is taken to mean limiting land use to producing food or perhaps textiles for clothing. This attitude is particularly virulent when the land in question is highly fertile such as what are called Class I and Class II soils in New Zealand.

- 7.3 Economists are perhaps in a (small?) minority in generally not sharing an emotional preference for the farmed use of land. We don’t see reason to grant any particular greater virtue in using land to feed people, over using it to give them shelter, or even just to have fun with. Therefore, it is something of a relief to me that the reports and submissions that I have to deal with in the present issue do not rely on intrinsic superiority of agricultural use of rural land. This may be partly because there isn’t much Class I and II soil in the District. It may also be because everyone really does understand that farming is a marginal activity on its own in the District, such that, if we were concerned about producing more food, we would surely wish to look elsewhere for the land to do this on.

- 7.4 However, there are vestiges of the “food at any cost” attitude in the texts. Mr Osborne quite often uses the adjective “productive” as apparently limited to food or

wool production.⁸ Mr Barr, at paragraph 8.18 of his s42a Hearing Report rather loftily ordains that “elevating tourism or other commercial activities to the same status as farming is not supported”. I would say, why not? In the Proposed Plan, at 21.2.2 we read as an Objective: “to sustain the life-supporting [*sic*] capacity of soils”. I would suggest possibly changing the adjective to ‘life-enhancing’.

7.5 In my opinion, this line of thinking is at best anachronistic and should not clutter up the analysis of the issue at hand.

7.6 I turn to the other relatively minor issue, which concerns the ‘precautionary’ motive for not doing anything new with land. Mr Osborne brings this in at paragraph 3.8 of his evidence, perhaps as something of an afterthought:

"I consider that it is appropriate to take a precautionary approach to the management of this resource [ie, the local landscape] as both its intrinsic value and profile are extremely difficult to retroactively repair if damage does occur."

7.7 It is well understood and accepted in the use of formal planning and policy instruments such as Benefit-Cost Analysis, that when a proposed outcome of a policy or program is (a) irreversible, or only reversible at significant cost, and (b) of uncertain future benefit or cost, then some additional burden of proof should be placed on such a policy or program. Specifically it should be required to show a higher expected net benefit than some other policy or program which is either easily reversible and/or rather certain in its net benefits.

7.8 Examples of legitimate precautionary considerations that I have come across (in the Auckland District) include (i) restricting quite large “life-style” sections in rural residential areas where the Council envisages possibly wishing in the future to encourage more intensive “hamlets” of urban development; (ii) restricting development of privately held land in native bush areas for which the Council envisages possible future aggregation of titles to create or enhance a Regional Park.

⁸ Cf his paragraphs 5.3(b), 5.5, 5.7, 5.9.

- 7.9 However, I find it difficult to rationalise the precautionary approach in the current QLDC situation. Non-agricultural uses of presently farmed land might well make it difficult to restore this land to farming in the future, but given the deep intrinsic disadvantages -- documented above -- of farming in the Queenstown basin in particular, there does not to me seem to be any significant risk of anyone wishing to do this.
- 7.10 I note that there are actual examples of present or potential tourism activities making uses of agricultural land that need not rule out contemporaneous farming or other primary use of the land – never mind any irreversible “choice”. Such examples include: 4wd tours through sheep farms; mountain bike trails through forest; paintball tournaments, and the proposed Gondola through Queenstown Park Station and beyond.
- 7.11 In any case, Mr Osborne provides no concrete support for his proposition quoted above, and I do not think it is entitled to be taken seriously in the Hearing.

8. THE TOURISM SECTOR IN THE QUEENSTOWN-LAKES DISTRICT

- 8.1 Mr Greenaway (para 14) notes from Mr Osborne’s Table 1 the strikingly high proportion of the District workforce directly employed in the “Accommodation and Food Services” sector – around 30%, against a national average of 7%. Employment in many other sectors, including Retail Trade and others, will be largely tourism related. This just documents what we all know – that the QLDC economy is dominated by one industry: Tourism. We also know that the sector has been growing dramatically – both nationally and in this District – such that inbound visitor tourism has now surpassed Dairy Products as NZ’s largest export industry.
- 8.2 We surely do all know this, yet documents submitted to this Hearing reveal – in my opinion – superficial and misleading presumptions about (a) the reasons for the popularity of the District amongst tourists and other short- and long-term visitors; (b) the pressing issues generated by recent substantial growth in tourists.
- 8.3 Mr Osborne, in his Evidence, simplistically ties the attractiveness of the District to its Outstanding Natural Landscape – ie, without giving due credit to the contribution of those thousands of local employees and their employers to the tourist experience.

(And then, as documented above, he goes on to simplistically and incorrectly link diversion of land from primary agricultural use to threats to the ONL.)

8.4 His most egregious mis-statement, in my opinion, comes in his Conclusion:

The competitive advantage exhibited by the Queenstown market is based on its outstanding natural landscape and *to a less degree* [emphasis added] the agglomeration of visitor related activities (para 8.4).

8.5 This statement is egregious because it is the first time in his Evidence that Mr Osborne has explicitly recognised what he calls the “agglomeration of visitor related activities”, much less established the “degree” to which such contribute to the visitor appeal of the District compared with the unadorned natural landscape.

8.6 I note that Mr Osborne’s Table 1 listing employment by industry is used by him to demonstrate the usefulness of visitors in generating employment in the District -- as if this part of New Zealand *needs* any more workers crowding in – not to demonstrate the importance of the workers to generating the visitors.

8.7 The ONL of the Queenstown District is surely no more outstanding now than it was, say, fifty years ago when far fewer visitors turned up. What has, crucially, changed is the number and attractiveness of things for the visitors to do – some linked to the waterways and mountains, some not. There is only so long that a visitor will be content to sit gazing admiringly at the Remarkables. Then they will want to *do* something -- climb the mountain; ski on it; jump off it, or just head off to a nice restaurant somewhere to enthuse about how great everything is.

8.8 The ONL of Queenstown is, arguably, no more outstanding than the environs of the other great southern lakes, which attract far fewer visitors. Queenstown is just different from them. I can vividly recall from the 1950s, on family visits over the Crown Range from Wanaka, that Queenstown and its basin had something very special – a real glamour and buzz to it. This glamour is generated in part by the landscape, but -- even 60 years ago -- also by the people using it, and the places and activities they created – for example: the Earnslaw, Eichardt’s Hotel and other exciting watering holes; the compact urban form of Queenstown town centre; the houses dotted around the slopes above Queenstown Bay and Frankton Arm, in true

Alpine village style; the quaintness of Arrowtown; the exotic appearance of the different nationalities of tourists in the streets.

- 8.9 The glamour and excitement of Queenstown and its basin is, I believe, unique in New Zealand, and rare in the wider world – perhaps even matching (albeit on a smaller scale) the appeal of the French Riviera and some of the Swiss ski resorts. It has been hugely enhanced over the past half century by innovative entrepreneurs introducing the wide suite of activities that attract and entertain visitors today. I don't need to name them, but their contribution and its continuation should be recognised as central to the current situation.
- 8.10 However, the very success of Queenstown as a tourist and visitor destination is generating its own problems. Again, these are well known, but they have not been given their due in evidence provided by the Council.
- 8.11 Basically, the supply of things to do and see and look at in the Queenstown area has not matched the increase in the demand for them, as revealed by visitor numbers. The inevitable consequence is some deterioration in the quality of the visitor experience, reflected in (a) prices, and (b) non-price factors.
- 8.12 I believe there has been recent pressure on hotel and other accommodation occupancy rates, reflected in a “firming” of prices in this sector.
- 8.13 It's not all bad that prices have gone up – it's good for the vendors, it chokes off some of the demand, it rations supply efficiently to those who value it most, and it sends a signal to increase supply in the future. But what are bad for everyone are the consequences of excess demand that can't easily be mediated through price increases – in particular, the discomfort and disutility of added congestion on roads; crowding of the airport; queues at popular restaurants and cafes; possibly longer line-ups and less choice for various visitor amenities.
- 8.14 There is no magic solution to this problem, and of course it is a nicer problem to have than an alternative of slack demand. What it does point to, however, is the value of finding *additional* attractive activities for tourists and other visitors -- shifting out the supply curve, in economists' parlance. By increasing the quality of the visitor

experience package, such innovations would benefit not just their operators but other businesses and residents in the district as a whole.

- 8.15 It may be for this reason that the proposal of a gondola going up to the Remarkables ski field seems to have met with widespread approval. It would be the sort of innovation that would not simply expand the overall supply of activities on offer, but do so in a particularly advantageous way, by diversifying the supply– it would be a year-around attraction, and it would appeal in particular to the segment of the inbound tourist market who prefer something gentler than the famous adventure tourism activities of the region.
- 8.16 On this particular matter, I will give the last word to Mark Quickfall -- Chairman of the nominally competing operator of the existing Skyline gondola in Queenstown. Mr Quickfall was reported as saying that:

"Competition is a reality, and if Skyline was afraid of it we wouldn't be in business. Queenstown was in competition with the rest of the world, and offering visitors more options was good for tourism in the area (Otago Daily Times, created 20/11/2015)."

9. SECTION 32 CONSIDERATIONS

- 9.1 Section 32 of the Resource Management Act requires a consideration of costs and benefits. It states (relevantly):

“(a) identify and assess the benefits and costs of the environmental, economic, social and cultural effects that are anticipated from the implementation of the provisions, including the opportunities for;

- (i) economic growth that are anticipated to be provided or reduced;
- (ii) employment anticipated to be provided or reduced;

(b) if practicable, quantify the benefits and costs referred to in paragraph (a); and

(c) assess the risk of acting or not acting if there is uncertain or insufficient information about the subject matter of the provisions”

- 9.2 Assuming that “provisions” here means provisions in the Proposed Plan limiting the use of rural land for tourism and other activities, I would say that the evidence I have given above would support the following statements:

- (a) Such provisions will limit economic growth and value creation in the District's most important (by far) economic activity, being the provision of services to tourists and other visitors to the district; and

- (b) The creation of employment is not in itself a positive in the setting of the QLD economy. Unemployment is very low, and housing and other costs are high for wage and salary earners, relative to other Districts. What then is key is that people who do work in the region are employed in the highest value-creating activities;
 - (i) I have not had time to carry out a quantitative benefit/cost analysis:
and

 - (ii) I believe that lack of information does not constrain us in this matter.

Timothy John Hazledine

21 April 2016

ATTACHMENT A

	number employees 2015	total	agriculture	accom etc	share agri- culture, etc	share accom etc
0	Total New Zealand (Territorial	2045610	117190	144750	5.73	7.08
1	Far North District	17860	2000	1960	11.20	10.97
2	Whangarei District	31690	1470	1820	4.64	5.74
3	Kaipara District	5830	1460	250	25.04	4.29
4	Auckland	694620	5790	47780	0.83	6.88
5	Thames-Coromandel District	9480	480	1450	5.06	15.30
6	Hauraki District	5530	910	360	16.46	6.51
7	Waikato District	16400	4580	820	27.93	5.00
8	Matamata-Piako District	14150	2310	460	16.33	3.25
9	Hamilton City	81270	440	4990	0.54	6.14
10	Waipa District	16900	2790	1080	16.51	6.39
11	Otorohanga District	3540	1200	140	33.90	3.95
12	South Waikato District	7890	1540	340	19.52	4.31
13	Waitomo District	4550	980	300	21.54	6.59
14	Taupo District	15000	1740	2320	11.60	15.47
15	Western Bay of Plenty District	14150	4440	670	31.38	4.73
16	Tauranga City	55080	1920	3550	3.49	6.45
17	Rotorua District	29580	2300	3410	7.78	11.53
18	Whakatane District	12900	1650	710	12.79	5.50
19	Kawerau District	2500	..	40	0.00	1.60
20	Opotiki District	3000	960	140	32.00	4.67
21	Gisborne District	20510	4760	940	23.21	4.58
22	Wairoa District	3530	1040	110	29.46	3.12
23	Hastings District	40150	8290	1810	20.65	4.51
24	Napier City	23950	1170	2100	4.89	8.77
25	Central Hawke's Bay District	5370	1810	130	33.71	2.42
26	New Plymouth District	35500	1280	2460	3.61	6.93
27	Stratford District	2940	480	180	16.33	6.12
28	South Taranaki District	12530	2200	490	17.56	3.91
29	Ruapehu District	5050	1160	580	22.97	11.49
30	Wanganui District	16880	920	1040	5.45	6.16
31	Rangitikei District	5660	1640	360	28.98	6.36
32	Manawatu District	8490	1540	390	18.14	4.59
33	Palmerston North City	46680	570	2850	1.22	6.11
34	Tararua District	6130	1920	300	31.32	4.89
35	Horowhenua District	8250	1410	450	17.09	5.45
36	Kapiti Coast District	12120	340	1250	2.81	10.31
37	Porirua City	14690	70	860	0.48	5.85
38	Upper Hutt City	10550	45	700	0.43	6.64
39	Lower Hutt City	41870	40	2620	0.10	6.26
40	Wellington City	146380	65	10170	0.04	6.95
41	Masterton District	10490	1330	740	12.68	7.05
42	Carterton District	2720	540	100	19.85	3.68
43	South Wairarapa District	3040	840	440	27.63	14.47
44	Tasman District	19860	5250	1610	26.44	8.11
45	Nelson City	25770	950	1900	3.69	7.37
46	Marlborough District	22160	3990	1750	18.01	7.90
47	Kaikoura District	1530	160	400	10.46	26.14

48	Buller District	4320	460	420	10.65	9.72
49	Grey District	6790	450	550	6.63	8.10
50	Westland District	3980	400	960	10.05	24.12
51	Hurunui District	4520	1630	560	36.06	12.39
52	Waimakariri District	13650	1090	900	7.99	6.59
53	Christchurch City	203360	1690	12800	0.83	6.29
54	Selwyn District	16190	2860	860	17.67	5.31
55	Ashburton District	16630	3640	890	21.89	5.35
56	Timaru District	22830	2100	1190	9.20	5.21
57	Mackenzie District	2210	410	640	18.55	28.96
58	Waimate District	2370	1080	65	45.57	2.74
59	Chatham Islands Territory	330	70	30	21.21	9.09
60	Waitaki District	9700	1470	800	15.15	8.25
61	Central Otago District	12240	4210	730	34.40	5.96
62	Queenstown-Lakes District	19930	500	5910	2.51	29.65
63	Dunedin City	54500	960	4650	1.76	8.53
64	Clutha District	8470	3070	330	36.25	3.90
65	Southland District	15900	6210	1120	39.06	7.04
66	Gore District	6560	1370	430	20.88	6.55
67	Invercargill City	26390	730	1590	2.77	6.03

Dataset: Geographic units by region and industry 2000-15

ANZSIC06		Total			
Area		Total New Zealand	Far North District	Whangarei	Kaipara District
Measure		Empl			
Year					
total all industries		2045610	17860	31690	5830
agriculture etc		117190	2000	1470	1460
accommodation food services		144750	1960	1820	250

ANZSIC06		Total			
Area		Auckland	Thames-	Hauraki District	Waikato District
Measure		Empl			
Year					
total all industries		694620	9480	5530	16400
agriculture etc		5790	480	910	4580
accommodation food services		47780	1450	360	820

ANZSIC06		Total			
Area		Matamata-Piako	Hamilton City	Waipa District	Otorohanga
Measure		Empl			
Year					
total all industries		14150	81270	16900	3540
agriculture etc		2310	440	2790	1200
accommodation food services		460	4990	1080	140

ANZSIC06		Total			
Area		South Waikato	Waitomo District	Taupo District	Western Bay of
Measure		Empl			
Year					
total all industries		7890	4550	15000	14150
agriculture etc		1540	980	1740	4440
accommodation food services		340	300	2320	670

ANZSIC06		Total			
Area		Tauranga City	Rotorua District	Whakatane	Kawerau District
Measure		Empl			
Year					
total all industries		55080	29580	12900	2500
agriculture etc		1920	2300	1650 ^(c)	..
accommodation food services		3550	3410	710	40

ANZSIC06		Total			
Area		Opotiki District	Gisborne District	Wairoa District	Hastings District
Measure		Empl			
Year					
total all industries		3000	20510	3530	40150
agriculture etc		960	4760	1040	8290
accommodation food services		140	940	110	1810

ANZSIC06				
Area	Napier City	Central Hawke's	New Plymouth	Stratford District
Measure				
Year				
total all industries	23950	5370	35500	2940
agriculture etc	1170	1810	1280	480
accommodation food services	2100	130	2460	180

ANZSIC06				
Area	South Taranaki	Ruapehu District	Wanganui District	Rangitikei District
Measure				
Year				
total all industries	12530	5050	16880	5660
agriculture etc	2200	1160	920	1640
accommodation food services	490	580	1040	360

ANZSIC06				
Area	Manawatu District	Palmerston North	Tararua District	Horowhenua
Measure				
Year				
total all industries	8490	46680	6130	8250
agriculture etc	1540	570	1920	1410
accommodation food services	390	2850	300	450

ANZSIC06				
Area	Kapiti Coast	Porirua City	Upper Hutt City	Lower Hutt City
Measure				
Year				
total all industries	12120	14690	10550	41870
agriculture etc	340	70	45	40
accommodation food services	1250	860	700	2620

ANZSIC06				
Area	Wellington City	Masterton District	Carterton District	South Wairarapa
Measure				
Year				
total all industries	146380	10490	2720	3040
agriculture etc	65	1330	540	840
accommodation food services	10170	740	100	440

ANZSIC06				
Area	Tasman District	Nelson City	Marlborough	Kaikoura District
Measure				
Year				
total all industries	19860	25770	22160	1530
agriculture etc	5250	950	3990	160
accommodation food services	1610	1900	1750	400

ANZSIC06				
----------	--	--	--	--

ANZSIC06		Buller District	Grey District	Westland District	Hurunui District
Area					
Measure					
Year					
total all industries		4320	6790	3980	4520
agriculture etc		460	450	400	1630
accommodation food services		420	550	960	560

ANZSIC06		Waimakariri	Christchurch City	Selwyn District	Ashburton
Area					
Measure					
Year					
total all industries		13650	203360	16190	16630
agriculture etc		1090	1690	2860	3640
accommodation food services		900	12800	860	890

ANZSIC06		Timaru District	Mackenzie	Waimate District	Chatham Islands
Area					
Measure					
Year					
total all industries		22830	2210	2370	330
agriculture etc		2100	410	1080	70
accommodation food services		1190	640	65	30

ANZSIC06		Waitaki District	Central Otago	Queenstown-	Dunedin City
Area					
Measure					
Year					
total all industries		9700	12240	19930	54500
agriculture etc		1470	4210	500	960
accommodation food services		800	730	5910	4650

ANZSIC06		Clutha District	Southland District	Gore District	Invercargill City
Area					
Measure					
Year					
total all industries		8470	15900	6560	26390
agriculture etc		3070	6210	1370	730
accommodation food services		330	1120	430	1590

ANZSIC06		Area Outside	Total New Zealand
Area			
Measure			
Year			
total all industries		(c) ..	2045610
agriculture etc		(c) ..	117180
accommodation food services		..	144760