ResearchGate

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/323696032

Tourism gentrification

Chapter · April 2018

CITATIONS
3

READS
997

1 author:

Agustin Cocola-Gant
University of Lisbon

22 PUBLICATIONS **94** CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE

Some of the authors of this publication are also working on these related projects:

Project Tourism-driven gentrification View project

All content following this page was uploaded by Agustin Cocola-Gant on 12 March 2018.

The user has requested enhancement of the downloaded file.

Tourism gentrification*

Agustin Cocola-Gant
Centre of Geographical Studies, University of Lisbon

* This chapter is to appear in

Cocola-Gant, A (2018) Tourism gentrification. In Lees, L and Phillips, M (Eds) *Handbook of Gentrification Studies*. Cheltenham and Northampton: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Gentrification caused by tourism is increasingly affecting a number of places around the world. Although some scholars have noted that tourism threatens the right to 'stay put' of existing populations (e.g. Colomb and Novy, 2016; García-Herrera et al., 2007; Gladstone and Préau, 2008; Gotham, 2005), a conceptualisation of how this phenomenon occurs has not been fully considered. This chapter brings into conversation the literature on tourism and gentrification and shows how both processes intersect in several ways. Special attention is given to the extent to which tourism can be interpreted as a gentrifying process that causes different forms of displacement. Although tourism gentrification has especially been noted in cities, the process also affects non-urban spaces, in particular the coast and rural contexts. In this regard, tourism gentrification can be seen as an example of 'other geographies of gentrification' (Phillips, 2004).

The growth of tourism is a worldwide phenomenon and residents experience tourism-driven gentrification in both the North and the South. However, the way in which the process occurs is different in different places. The literature highlights two scenarios in which tourism gentrification takes place. First, in advanced capitalist economies research notes that tourism and gentrification tend to coexist and, moreover, that both processes feed each other. Although research has traditionally regarded tourism as an isolated phenomenon

implicitly assuming it takes place in tourist bubbles or precincts (Judd, 1999), in recent years the development of tourism has generally occurred in places that have not been planned as tourist spaces. Instead, tourism tends to overlap with gentrified areas, especially because of the fact that gentrification provides consumption facilities and a middle class sense of place that attacks further consumers. I explore this literature in the first section of the chapter. In this regard, I suggest that the attraction of visitors accelerates the pressure of gentrification as the intensification of land use pushes up the value of commercial and residential properties. New spaces of consumption have the ability to increase land values and this process explains why property owners are particularly interested in promoting local tourism growth (Logan and Molotch, 2007).

Second, research highlights that tourism gentrification is particularly important in peripheral economies that rely on tourism as a factor for development and growth. In other words, in places where the lack of highly paid professional jobs offers less possibilities for the occurrence of classical gentrification but, instead, where spaces are dominated by the purchasing power of visitors. In the Mediterranean, Caribbean or the Asia-Pacific region the arrival of visitors opens up new investment opportunities in the built environment and leads to a process of tourism urbanisation that includes not only large-scale resorts and second homes but also housing rehabilitation in historic areas. From a postcolonial perspective, this geography explains why tourism has been neglected in a gentrification literature that has traditionally focused on cities from advanced capitalist economies in the North. In this regard, the chapter shows a geography of gentrification (Lees, 2012) that challenges the conventional ways of theorising about the process in the Anglo-American world.

Finally, in the last section I bring together different examples from the North and the South and suggest that tourism causes three forms of displacement: residential displacement, commercial displacement and

place-based displacement. While residential and commercial displacement are related to the power of tourism to increase land values, place-based displacement refers to the loss of place experienced by residents as the consumption of space by visitors effectively displaces them from the places they belong to. In this regard, displacement is economic, but also cultural and it has to be linked to the introduction of new lifestyles that undermine the use value of neighbourhoods as residential spaces.

Tourism and gentrification in advanced economies

A starting point in conceptualising the process of urban tourism gentrification is to recognise that tourism does not exist in isolation from the rest of the city but instead overlaps and coexists with other processes of consumption and production of urban space. In this regard, some scholars have studied the emergence of urban tourism in relation to, and as a result of, other contemporary processes of urban restructuring, of which gentrification plays a crucial role. For example, in the explanation of urban tourism, research has often referred first, to interurban competition for mobile capitals and consumers to cope with the economic and fiscal problems brought on by suburbanisation and deindustrialisation (e.g. Judd, 1999; Meethan, 2001). Second, studies have pointed to the emergence of a new middle class increasingly concerned with the consumption of pleasure and entertainment (e.g. Fainstein and Gladstone, 1999; Judd, 1999; Mullins, 1991). Together these two strands of research suggest that the emergence of urban tourism is linked to the implementation of revitalisation strategies aimed at bringing capital and people back to cities, residents and visitors alike. In other words, the explanation of urban tourism mirrors the logic of the 'back to the city movement' used to explain the advent of gentrification (Lees et al., 2008): the reinvestment of capital in disinvested working class areas and the consumption power of the new middle class and their demand for urban living. As a result, the occurrence of both tourism and gentrification needs to be regarded as the

consequence of the same process of economic and spatial restructuring in which changes in the political economy of cities have been matched by changes in patterns of consumption and employment.

In addition, research shows that tourism and gentrification tend to coexist in similar urban environments and indeed that they mutually reinforce each other. Some authors notes that gentrification usually becomes a precursor for the promotion of the place (Fainstein and Gladstone, 1999; Judd, 2003; Maitland and Newman, 2008; Novy and Huning, 2009). The proliferation of gentrified landscapes creates tourist-friendly spaces as they provide visitors with sanitised areas, consumption opportunities and a middle class sense of place. For instance, Terhorst et al. (2003) found that in Amsterdam the amenities and services that emerged with gentrification – restaurants, trendy bars, antique shops, or art galleries – played an important role in improving Amsterdam's image, causing these areas to become "more attractive to day-trippers and tourists, particularly those who are themselves gentrifiers in their home country" (2003: 85). By way of contrast, other authors show that extensive investment in the promotion of tourism eventually led to the creation of considerable housing demand and encouraged gentrification (Spirou, 2011; Torres and Momsen, 2005).

From a cultural political economy perspective, the simultaneity of tourism and gentrification results from the key role that culture and consumption activities play in urban economic development strategies (Amin and Thrift, 2007; Ribera-Fumaz, 2009; Zukin, 1995). The crisis of deindustrialisation expanded the consumption functions of urban centres and the interurban competition in order to attract mobile capital and 'the consumer dollar' (Harvey, 1989). In such a post-industrial context, the future of most cities would depend on them being desirable places for consumers to live in or visit and, accordingly, revitalising urban cores usually involves the rebranding of cities as spaces of leisure and pleasure. Phillips (2002) reminds us how culture-side explanations of gentrification have emphasised the importance of amenities and consumption activities in order to attract new middle class residents, and how residential gentrification is

actually associated and stimulated by the development of commercial spaces and entertainment facilities such as gourmet restaurants, museums, marinas or art galleries. In a similar way, authors such as Florida (2002) and Lloyd and Clark (2001) suggest that economic innovation and growth occur where highly-skilled mobile workers wish to locate and, for this reason, urban policies should focus on quality of life concerns, cultural amenities, and opportunities for consumption and recreation. Although culture-side approaches to gentrification such as those of Ley (1996) or Mills (1988) did not link the development of amenities and recreation facilities to notions of tourism, such environments are precisely the spaces consumed by visitors. In this regard, Judd (2003: 31) notes that "it is increasingly difficult to distinguish visitor from 'local' spaces because leisure, entertainment, and cultural sectors are sustained as crucially by local residents as by out-of-town visitors". Consequently, urban revitalisation strategies have produced new services and amenities catered to middle-class consumers and, in doing so, they have marketed the tourist and the gentrified city at the same time.

However, there are other ways to examine the intersection between tourism and gentrification that complicates the classed dynamics of visitors and gentrifiers as middle-class users. Research on gender, ethnicity or sexuality shows how people are always more than undifferentiated consumers. For instance, the literature on sexuality and the city reveals that consumption practices are also gendered and framed by heteronormative identities. Regarding gay-friendliness, several authors explore how it has come to be used as a form of cultural capital that makes cities more desirable for the 'creative class' and how it also plays a crucial role in the production of events and spectacles to attract tourism (Bell and Binnie, 2004; Hubbard and Wilkinson, 2015; Waitt et al., 2008). However, those authors also show that a heteronormative cultural economy tolerates gay identities only if they conform to an acceptably commodified expression. Some forms of sexual diversity, such as gay male subcultures, are considered intolerable and only a respectable notion of gay identity is promoted as a safe form of exotic difference. Other authors illustrate how forms

of consumption of space are framed by the norms of masculinity and gender divisions. Chapuis (2016) shows how the gentrified Red-Light district of Amsterdam is consumed by male visitors as an opportunity to adopt an accentuated virile posture while, in contrast, female visitors generally describe their consumption experience as uncomfortable or dangerous.

The overlap of tourism and gentrification has also been noted in non-urban contexts, particularly in rural areas (Donaldson, 2009; Phillips, 2002) and in coastal villages (Freeman and Cheyne, 2008). On the one hand, both rural and coastal gentrification are linked to the charm and natural environment that those locations provide for people who seek a place to retreat from the urban milieu or to retire to. Not surprisingly, for Hines (2010), rural gentrification is a form of 'permanent tourism'. On the other hand, rural and coastal areas have been restructured into having a primarily tourist economic base. Here both recreational facilities and the expansion of second homes play a crucial role. As Phillips (2002) highlights, in the context of a post-productivist countryside many rural areas have become valorised for leisure facilities to serve both resident and visiting middle-class people.

I have shown that the literature explains the coexistence of tourism and gentrification as a consequence of firstly, the tendency of the middle classes to consume similar environments and, secondly, the importance of culture and consumption facilities in strategies for economic development. In either case, it is important to note how this coexistence affects real estate markets and leads to the displacement of low-income communities. I argue that tourism accelerates the pressures of gentrification as the demands of visitors increases rent extraction possibilities. The coexistence of tourism and gentrification means that the arrival of new consumers to areas that were already affected by gentrification intensifies land uses and so pushes up both residential and commercial property values. For instance, in the case of Berlin, several authors show how the pressure of gentrification can be exacerbated by visitors (Füller and Michel, 2014; Häussermann and Colomb, 2003; Novy and Huning, 2009). Tourism has contributed to rising rents and

evictions and has caused lower-income residents to blame visitors for a new wave of gentrification. The specific way in which tourism increases rent extraction possibilities and consequently exacerbates the pressure of gentrification-induced displacement will be explored below.

So far I have showed that tourism and gentrification can be considered co-actors in the production of post-industrial landscapes. I have explored a literature that focuses predominantly on advanced capitalist economies. The next section will explore a different scenario and it will consider peripheral economies that have barely experienced classical gentrification. I will explore a literature that focuses on places in which the leisure industry has been the most feasible way of engaging in territorial competition and where the lack of a local middle-class is supplanted by the purchasing power of visitors.

Tourism gentrification in peripheral economies

Tourism gentrification is especially important in places where tourism represents a central factor for development and growth. An overview of case studies on tourism gentrification shows a geography that covers secondary cities in the North such as New Orleans or San Diego (Gladstone and Préau, 2008; Gotham, 2005; Spirou, 2011) but especially the global South from Latin America (Hayes, 2015b; Hiernaux and González, 2014; Janoschka et al., 2014; Janoschka and Sequera, 2016; Nobre, 2002; Scarpaci, 2000) to the Mediterranean, including Spain (Cocola-Gant, 2016; Franquesa, 2011; García-Herrera et al., 2007; Morell, 2009; Vives Miró, 2011), Portugal (Nofre, 2013; Pavel, 2015), and Croatia (Kesar et al., 2015), and from South Africa (Donaldson, 2009) and Mauritius (Wortman et al., 2016) to the Asia-Pacific region (Liang and Bao, 2015; Pleumarom, 2015). I argue that in these places, as the consumption power of the middle-classes are smaller than in advanced economies, tourism comes to supplant the lack of local demand

that real estate capital needs for the realisation of surplus value. The purchasing power of visitors stimulates real estate markets and, in such a context, the classical gentrifier is supplanted by visitors as consumers of places. Although visitors have a crucial role to play, this is more as consumers rather that producers of the process. In this sense, it is worth noting that authors have stressed the agency of the state and capital for whom the creation of tourist destinations is a key element for the geographical expansion of capitalism (Britton, 1991; Gotham, 2005; Janoschka et al., 2014).

In understanding this geography of tourism gentrification several points need to be stressed. First, a starting point should consider the different role that places play in the spatial division of labour. For peripheral economies, tourism represents the easiest way of attracting capital and consumers. For instance, the history of urban tourism in Spain shows that the phenomenon started at the end of the nineteenth century when cities promoted their historic centres as a way of compensating for their lack of industrialisation (Cocola-Gant, 2014; Cocola-Gant and Palou i Rubio, 2015). In recent decades, the spatial division of labour intensified as a result of the territorial competition and economic restructuring that emerged after deindustrialisation. Harvey (1989) argues that cities can compete in regards to key command functions in finance or information as well as with the spatial division of consumption. He notes that whereas competition within the former is peculiarly tough, less advanced economies can still compete to attract mass consumption and tourism. For instance, in regards to Bilbao, Vicario and Martínez Monje (2005) illustrate how the 'Guggenheim effect' has failed to attract strategic services and professionals. Rather, it has increased the importance of urban leisure activities and the result has been a new landscape of entertainment that has multiplied the number of visitors.

Second, and as a consequence of this uneven development of capitalism, the progression of gentrification in places that focuses on tourism as a tool of engaging in territorial competition is less related to the

consumption demand of a local middle class and more to the effects of tourists as consumers of places. The gap between the purchasing power of visitors and local residents leads to a market pressure on both housing and services that makes places increasingly unaffordable for the indigenous population. In Latin America, for instance, where the middle-classes are far smaller than in the North (Díaz-Parra, 2015; Lees et al., 2016) and urban workers are incorporated into the labour market in degrees and forms that include high levels of self-help and informality (Betancur, 2014), research shows that gentrification "is more the result of their 'touristification' and the urban politics of local governments, than of processes based on the actions of middle class gentrifiers" (Hiernaux and González, 2014: 55). In Rio de Janeiro, for instance, in the context of the preparation of the city's 'mega-events' in which favelas has been targeted for redevelopment (see Ascensão in this volume), the new consumers of place increasingly are young Americans and Europeans that are attracted to the favela experience (Cummings, 2015).

In regards to tourists as consumers of places, it is worth noting the relevance of transnational lifestyle migrants. Lifestyle migration has been conceptualised as a hybrid form of mobility between migration and permanent or residential tourism (Janoschka and Haas, 2014; Williams and Hall, 2000). Because lifestyle migrants possess higher economic capital than the indigenous inhabitants, they have been targeted as a way of boosting economies in several locations (Hayes, 2015b; Janoschka and Haas, 2014). Although research on the links between lifestyle migration and gentrification remains in its infancy, processes of gentrification in which lifestyle migrants acted as pioneer gentrifiers have been noted in a number of places, including urban, rural and seaside contexts (Blázquez-Salom, 2013; Hayes, 2015a; Sigler and Wachsmuth, 2016; Van Noorloos and Steel, 2015; Wortman et al., 2016). The important point is that the demand of these 'transnational gentrifiers' creates possibilities for profitable real estate reinvestment in markets where such opportunities would not have existed on the basis of local demand

(Sigler and Wachsmuth, 2016). Research shows that in these places lifestyle migrants play a central role in the real estate market, both as purchasers of homes for personal consumption and as investors.

Finally, in peripheral economies the demand of visitors is crucial in opening up new real estate opportunities as it supplant the lack of local middle-classes. In the 1970s, Lefebvre (1991: 353) noted that in the Mediterranean "tourism and leisure become major areas of investment and profitability, adding their weight to the construction sector, to property speculation, to generalized urbanization". Processes of tourism urbanisation has especially been noted in seaside and rural areas via the construction of large-scale tourist infrastructures and second homes (Blázquez-Salom, 2013; Mullins, 1991; Wortman et al., 2016). However, it is also important to note how the link between tourism and production of space also affects urban spaces that have traditionally been the focus of gentrification research, that is, housing rehabilitation and historic preservation. For instance, with the demise of the Soviet Union, Scarpaci (2000) shows that Cuba had to turn to tourism development in order to attract foreign direct investment. As a consequence, the historic city ─ La *Habana Vieja* ─ was rehabilitated in the 1990s via investment which came principally from hard-currency operations in tourism. The result was the relocation of residents outside the area, the construction of tourist infrastructures and the provision of consumption services for visitors. The rehabilitation of housing by tourism investors needs to also be related with the change from housing as shelter towards housing as an investment vehicle and the potential to convert housing into tourist accommodation. In recent years, such a conversion has been linked to the phenomenon of holiday rentals (Cocola-Gant, 2016; Pavel, 2015). In the case of Lisbon, for instance, where the growth of tourism was seen as a 'fast policy' solution towards overcoming the post-2008 crisis, and where the liberalisation of the housing market took place in 2012 as a condition of the European Union's bid to 'rescue' Portuguese banks and the state, the result has been a wave of housing rehabilitation in which local residents have been evicted in order to open new hotels and short-term

leases. The way in which tourism-oriented rehabilitation threatens the residents' right to stay needs to be related with a wider conceptualisation of tourism-driven displacement. I move to this point below.

Tourism gentrification and displacement

Tourism gentrification is a process in which the growth of visitors threatens the existing population's right to 'stay put'. In this regard, a conceptualisation of tourism gentrification needs to explain how tourism-driven displacement takes place. This conceptualisation is crucial for gentrification research but especially for public policy as it challenges the assumption that the growth of visitors is inherently positive. In this section, I bring together several examples from both the North and the South in order to better understand why the growth of tourism is displacing communities and local businesses.

I suggest that tourism gentrification causes three interrelated forms of displacement: residential displacement; commercial displacement and place-based displacement. In regards to residential displacement, the growth of tourism affects the housing market in several ways. First, as Logan and Molotch (2007) highlight, the intensification of land use surges property prices and, accordingly, new spaces of tourism consumption have the ability to increase land values. In this regard, tourism accelerates gentrification as the increase of house prices, on the one hand, makes it more difficult for low income residents to remain, and, on the other, enables only affluent users to move into the area concerned. This process has been noted by research in several destinations in both the North and the South (Cocola-Gant, 2009; Fainstein and Gladstone, 1999; Franquesa, 2011; Gladstone and Préau, 2008; Gotham, 2005; Morell, 2009; Spirou, 2011; Vives Miró, 2011; Wortman et al., 2016). For instance, in New Orleans, Gotham (2005) and Gladstone and Préau (2008) show that as a result of the growth of tourism the city centre experienced

an increased escalation of property values, and such an escalation resulted in the conversion of affordable single-family residences into expensive condominiums that has pushed out lower-income people.

Second, the growth of tourist accommodation accelerates processes of residential displacement, especially because it involves an increasing conversion of housing into accommodation for visitors. Here both traditional tourist infrastructures such as hotels and the current expansion of holiday rentals must be considered. On the one hand, in places where historic preservation has been fuelled by tourism, and consequently where housing rehabilitation has been driven by tourism investors, the opening of hotels tends to involve the rehabilitation of previous residential buildings (Pavel, 2015; Vives Miró, 2011). On the other hand, the spread of holiday rentals is seen by different communities as a new threat that is accelerating the difficulties in accessing housing (Cocola-Gant, 2016; Colomb, 2012; Füller and Michel, 2014; Kesar et al., 2015; Opillard, 2016; Peters, 2016). The phenomenon of holiday rentals needs to be related to the role that the housing market plays as an asset in which money can be invested and stored. As tourism has the ability to rise property values, it allows investors to store their surplus capital in the residential market of tourist destinations and in the meanwhile rent them to visitors. Indeed, research reveals that, far from 'sharing', behind Airbnb there is a new opportunity for capital accumulation in which the suppliers are less single families that occasionally rent the homes in which they live and more investors and landlords that are renting out residential properties permanently (Arias-Sans and Quaglieri-Domínguez, 2016). In this sense, again housing in historic cities is being rehabilitated by tourism investors in a process in which tenants are supplanted by transient visitors as the former represent barriers to capital accumulation.

In this change from housing to tourist accommodation it is important to note how displacement takes place. On the one hand, both the opening of hotels and vacation rentals involves the direct displacement of residents (Cocola-Gant, 2016). On the other hand, the process takes housing units off the market and, in

doing so, accelerates the escalation of house prices (Cocola-Gant, 2016; Opillard, 2016; Peters, 2016). In central areas of Barcelona, for instance, 16.8% of housing units are listed on Airbnb and in 2015 rent prices rose by 18% (Cocola-Gant, 2016). Although the occurrence of direct displacement could be more visible, crucially the process makes it increasingly difficult for residents to find affordable accommodation. This is an example of what Marcuse (1985) calls 'exclusionary displacement' (see also Slater, 2009). In this sense, the difficulties in finding affordable accommodation accelerates 'classical' gentrification as only middle- and upper-class individuals can afford to move to the area.

In regards to commercial displacement, during the 1980s and 1990s the literature observed that the main consequence of tourism in processes of neighbourhood change was commercial gentrification (Fainstein and Gladstone, 1999; Sandford, 1987; Zukin, 1995). As a consumption activity, the demands of visitors results, on the one hand, in the expansion of retail facilities, restaurants, nightlife pubs and other opportunities for entertainment and, on the other, to the displacement of the working class and local stores used by the indigenous residents. After the growth of tourism in 2000, the commercial gentrification caused by tourism has been observed world-wide (Bromley and Mackie, 2009; Cocola-Gant, 2015; Gotham, 2005; Häussermann and Colomb, 2003; Hoffman, 2003; Liang and Bao, 2015; Nofre, 2013; Spirou, 2011; Terhorst et al., 2003). The rising land value observed in tourist areas also affects commercial properties, and this increase is central to understanding the substitution of local stores by amenities for visitors. Research shows that local businesses are replaced by franchises as the former cannot afford the escalation of property values. As Gotham (2005: 1112) notes in regards to New Orleans, "the last of the corner cafes and local coffee shops are today competing for space with some of the largest corporations in the world".

Finally, I suggest that tourism gentrification needs to be regarded as a process of place-based displacement. The experience of living in spaces of tourism consumption is the cause of everyday tensions at the

neighbourhood scale that makes residential life increasingly difficult. Although residents may not experience residential displacement, the domination of space by visitors can displace them from the places they belong to. In regards to this, the conceptualisation of displacement proposed by Davidson (2008, 2009) and Davidson and Lees (2010) is crucial. The authors argue that although displacement tends to be reduced to the specific moment in which a resident moves out, this understanding leaves important aspects of space silenced. In particular, the authors suggest that gentrification creates a new social and cultural context in which the indigenous residents feel a sense of dispossession from the places they inhabit or 'loss of place': "the places by which people once defined their neighbourhood become spaces with which they no longer associate" (Davidson, 2008: 2392). Although this theme needs further empirical studies, in the case of tourism gentrification research has documented a number of issues.

First, tourism-driven commercial gentrification removes the services and local stores that residents need on a daily basis (Cocola-Gant, 2015; Terhorst et al., 2003). Second, regarding the privatisation of public spaces that tends to occur in tourist areas, several authors note that residents complain that there is an increasing lack of space left for non-commercial activities (Degen, 2004; Häussermann and Colomb, 2003). Importantly, both local stores and public areas tend to be spaces of encounters for long-term residents. Their displacement means that meeting-places disappear and that residents lose gathering areas that are central for community life. Third, a central concern of residents in several tourist destinations is a perceived reduction in their quality of life. In particular, research has documented conflicts resulting from noise and night-time activities (Gravari-Barbas and Jacquot, 2016; Nofre, 2013); over-densification of public spaces, which especially affects the elderly (Cocola-Gant, 2015; Peters, 2016); or environmental pressures such as the production of waste or air pollution, which is particularly important in cruise destinations (Colomb and Novy, 2016; Vianello, 2016). Finally, in the context of residential tourism, authors note that transnational migrants are visibly distinct from the local population in term of status, behaviour, language or cultural

values and that this social and cultural differentiation is leading to polarised and fragmented urban environments (Hayes, 2015b; Van Noorloos and Steel, 2015; Wortman et al., 2016).

As a consequence, tourism gentrification involves a deep mutation of the place in which long-term residents can lose the resources and references by which they define their everyday life. Although place-based displacement is still an unexplored topic, I suggest that the loss of place experienced by residents could be the cause of a progressive out-migration from tourist areas that affects both low- and middle-income people, including those who were gentrifiers in earlier rounds of the process. The cultural dimension of displacement poses new questions for research as traditionally the process has been analysed from the lens of the housing market and not from place-based dynamics.

Conclusions

This chapter has brought together the tourism and gentrification literatures with the intention of providing a conceptualisation of tourism gentrification. I have shown that in advanced economies the literature has generally adopted a cultural economy approach and has explored the relationship between visitors and gentrifiers as consumers of similar environments. In peripheral economies, however, research has taken a political economy perspective in which the creation of destinations by the state and private capital is central for economic development. In either case, tourism opens up possibilities for real estate investment, introduces differentiated lifestyles and poses several rinks for indigenous residents. In other words, tourism plays a crucial role in the production and consumption of space and leads to different forms of displacement. It is for this reason that tourism needs to be seen as a form of gentrification.

As a first attempt to put into conversation different cases from both the North and the South that have noted the role that tourism plays in processes of gentrification, this chapter is not a final theory. Rather, it may be a starting point for future cases in different contexts. In fact, for a better understanding of tourism gentrification we need empirical and comparative studies. I suggest that we need to pay attention to several issues that are particularly relevant. The first one is the relationship between housing and tourism. Housing supply and affordability are becoming central issues worldwide but the role played by tourism has been overlooked. In this chapter, however, I have shown different examples in which tourism exacerbates the difficulties in accessing housing. In this regard, empirical studies about the impacts of holiday rentals are needed. But also, it is especially important to explore the extent to which investors store their surplus capital in the residential market of tourist destinations. A political economy of housing (Aalbers and Christophers, 2014) has neglected this fact. It seems that residents in tourist areas may be competing for housing not only with visitors but with the super-rich.

A second point of interest are the cultural effects of tourism and how the arrival of visitors to residential areas has the potential to disrupt the everyday lives of residents. The implication of such effects has increased in the 21st century as a result of the growth of low-cost and party tourism. Several cities in Europe, for instance, are now destinations for young visitors that seek sex, cheap alcohol and night clubs (Nofre, 2013). In my experience of doing fieldwork in Barcelona, residents are selling their properties to tourism investors but a critical reason for moving out is simply noise. The host and guest relationship poses relevant questions for research. However, and probably because tourism research has a strong tradition on the analysis of tourism management and planning, authors have traditionally focused on visitor satisfaction and consumer experience (Ashworth and Page, 2011). Only few narratives have focused on the host's experience of the encounter (Robinson, 2001). Cultural geographers interested in ideas of encounter have also overlooked the interactions between visitors and host communities (Gibson, 2010). Critical research,

however, should reverse this lack of consideration and focus more on the way in which the host community space and cultural practices are exposed to the arrival of visitors.

Finally, in recent years there has been an increased concern among communities and local authorities regarding evidence that shows a progressive population decline in tourist areas (Kesar et al., 2015; Pavel, 2015). This is clearly seen in places such as Venice which has lost half its population in the last thirty years. Empirical studies are needed in order to build a stage model of tourism gentrification. I suggest, however, that although in the first stage tourism may be seen as a solution to bring capital and consumers back to cities, it has the potential to result in a final substitution of residential life by tourism. In understanding this process we have to take into account that all forms of displacement analysed earlier take place at the same time and mutually reinforce each other. The pressure on the housing market, the lack of commercial services that residents need and the loss of place resulted from the encounter with visitors makes it increasingly difficult for residents to use neighbourhoods as spaces for social reproduction. In such a scenario, displacement is not just the out-migration from a place, but it also means the impossibility for, and lack of willingness of, residents to access to tourist areas. The occurrence of displacement is not simply more intense than in classical processes of gentrification, but it may lead to a situation in which long-term residents would be replaced by transient consumers and tourism investors.

References

Aalbers MB and Christophers B (2014) Centring housing in political economy. *Housing, Theory and Society* 31(4): 373–394.

Amin A and Thrift N (2007) Cultural-economy and cities. *Progress in Human Geography*, Sage Publications 31(2): 143–161.

Arias-Sans A and Quaglieri-Domínguez A (2016) Unravelling Airbnb. Urban perspectives from

Barcelona. In: Russo P and Richards G (eds), *Reinventing the local in tourism. Travel communities and peer-produced place experiences*, London: Channel View, pp. 209–228.

Ashworth G and Page SJ (2011) Urban tourism research: Recent progress and current paradoxes. *Tourism Management* 32(1): 1–15.

Bell D and Binnie J (2004) Authenticating queer space: citizenship, urbanism and governance. *Urban studies* 41(9): 1807–1820.

Betancur JJ (2014) Gentrification in Latin America: Overview and Critical Analysis. *Urban Studies Research* 4: 1–14.

Blázquez-Salom M (2013) More villas and more barriers: Gentrification and the enclosure of rural land on Majorca. *Méditerranée. Revue géographique des pays méditerranéens* (120): 25–36.

Britton S (1991) Tourism, capital, and place: Towards a critical geography of tourism. *Environment and planning D: society and space* 9(4): 451–478.

Bromley RDF and Mackie PK (2009) Displacement and the new spaces for informal trade in the Latin American city centre. *Urban Studies* 46(7): 1485–1506.

Chapuis A (2016) Touring the immoral. Affective geographies of visitors to the Amsterdam Red-Light district. *Urban Studies* online.

Cocola-Gant A (2009) EL MACBA y su función en la marca Barcelona. *Ciudad y Territorio: Estudios Territoriales* (159): 87–101.

Cocola-Gant A (2014) The Invention of the Barcelona Gothic Quarter. *Journal of Heritage Tourism* 9(1): 18–34.

Cocola-Gant A (2015) Tourism and commercial gentrification. In: *The ideal city. Between myth and reality. RC21 Conference*, Urbino: ISA, pp. 1–25.

Cocola-Gant A (2016) Holiday Rentals: The New Gentrification Battlefront. *Sociological Research Online* 21(3): 10. Available from: http://www.socresonline.org.uk/21/3/10.html.

Cocola-Gant A and Palou i Rubio S (2015) Tourist promotion and urban space in Barcelona. Historic perspective and critical review, 1900 – 1936. *Documents d'Anàlisi Geogràfica* 61(3): 461–482.

Colomb C (2012) A city for whom? urban tourism, neighbourhood conflicts and planning policy in Berlin and Barcelona. In: *The Second ISA Forum of Sociology (August 1-4, 2012)*, CONF, Buenos Aires: ISA.

Colomb C and Novy J (2016) Urban tourism and its discontents: an introduction. In: Colomb C and Novy J (eds), *Protest and Resistance in the Tourist City*, London: Routledge, pp. 1–30.

Cummings J (2015) Confronting favela chic: the gentrification of informal settlements in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. In: Lees L, Shin HB, and López-Morales E (eds), *Global gentrifications: uneven development and displacement*, Bristol: Policy Press, pp. 81–99.

Davidson M (2008) Spoiled mixture: where does state-led positive'gentrification end? *Urban Studies* 45(12): 2385–2405.

Davidson M (2009) Displacement, space and dwelling: Placing gentrification debate. *Ethics, Place and Environment* 12(2): 219–234.

Davidson M and Lees L (2010) New-build gentrification: its histories, trajectories, and critical geographies. *Population, Space and Place* 16(5): 395–411.

Degen M (2004) Barcelona's Games: the Olympics, urban design, and global tourism. In: Sheller M and Urry J (eds), *Tourism Mobilities: Places to play, places in play*, London: Routledge, pp. 131–142.

Díaz-Parra I (2015) A back to the city movement by local government action: gentrification in Spain and Latin America. *International Journal of Urban Sciences*, JOUR, Routledge (ahead-of-print): 1–21.

Donaldson R (2009) The making of a tourism-gentrified town: Greyton, South Africa. *Geography* 94(2): 88–99.

Fainstein SS and Gladstone D (1999) Evaluating Urban Tourism. In: Judd DR and Fainstein S (eds), *The tourist city*, New Haven and London: Yale University Press, pp. 21–34.

Florida RL (2002) *The rise of the creative class: and how it's transforming work, leisure, community and everyday life*. Book, New York: Basic Books.

Franquesa J (2011) 'We've Lost Our Bearings": Place, Tourism, and the Limits of the "Mobility Turn". *Antipode* 43(4): 1012–1033.

Freeman C and Cheyne C (2008) Coasts for sale: gentrification in New Zealand. *Planning Theory & Practice* 9(1): 33–56.

Füller H and Michel B (2014) 'Stop Being a Tourist!' New Dynamics of Urban Tourism in Berlin-Kreuzberg. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 38(4): 1304–1318.

García-Herrera LM, Smith N and Mejías Vera MÁ (2007) Gentrification, displacement, and tourism in Santa Cruz de Tenerife. *Urban Geography* 28(3): 276–298.

Gibson C (2010) Geographies of tourism:(un) ethical encounters. *Progress in Human Geography* 34(4): 521–527.

Gladstone D and Préau J (2008) Gentrification in tourist cities: Evidence from New Orleans before and after Hurricane Katrina. *Housing Policy Debate* 19(1): 137–175.

Gotham KF (2005) Tourism gentrification: The case of new Orleans' vieux carre (French Quarter). *Urban Studies* 42(7): 1099–1121.

Gravari-Barbas M and Jacquot S (2016) No conflict? Discourses and management of tourism-related tensions in Paris. In: Colomb C and Novy J (eds), *Protest and Resistance in the Tourist City*, London: Routledge.

Harvey D (1989) From managerialism to entrepreneurialism: the transformation in urban governance in late capitalism. *Geografiska Annaler* 71: 3–17.

Häussermann H and Colomb C (2003) The New Berlin: marketing the city of dreams. In: Hoffman L, Fainstein S, and Judd DR (eds), *Cities and Visitors: Regulating People, Markets, and City Space*, Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 200–218.

Hayes M (2015a) Into the Universe of the Hacienda: lifestyle migration, individualism and social dislocation in Vilcabamba, Ecuador. *Journal of Latin American Geography* 14(1): 79–100.

Hayes M (2015b) Introduction: the emerging lifestyle migration industry and geographies of transnationalism, mobility and displacement in Latin America. *Journal of Latin American Geography* 14(1): 7–18.

Hiernaux D and González I (2014) Turismo y gentrificación: pistas teóricas sobre una articulación. *Revista de Geografía Norte Grande* 58: 55–70.

Hines JD (2010) Rural gentrification as permanent tourism: the creation of the 'New' West Archipelago

as postindustrial cultural space. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 28(3): 509–525.

Hoffman LM (2003) Revalorizing the Inner City: Tourism and Regulation in Harlem. In: Hoffman LM, Fainstein S, and Judd DR (eds), *Cities and Visitors: Regulating People, Markets, and City Space*, Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 91–112.

Hubbard P and Wilkinson E (2015) Welcoming the world? Hospitality, homonationalism, and the London 2012 Olympics. *Antipode* 47(3): 598–615.

Janoschka M and Haas H (2014) Contested spatialities of lifestyle migration. Approaches and research questions. In: Janoschka M and Haas H (eds), *Contested spatialities, lifestyle migration and residential tourism*, New York: Routledge, pp. 1–12.

Janoschka M and Sequera J (2016) Gentrification in Latin America: addressing the politics and geographies of displacement. *Urban Geography* online: 1–20.

Janoschka M, Sequera J and Salinas L (2014) Gentrification in Spain and Latin America—a Critical Dialogue. *International journal of urban and regional research* 38(4): 1234–1265.

Judd DR (1999) Constructing the Tourist Bubble. In: Judd DR and Fainstein S (eds), *The tourist city*, New Haven and London: Yale University Press, pp. 35–53.

Judd DR (2003) Visitors and the spatial ecology of the city. In: Hoffman L, Fainstein S, and Judd DR (eds), *Cities and visitors: Regulating people, markets, and city space*, Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 23–38.

Kesar O, Dezeljin R and Bienenfeld M (2015) Tourism Gentrification In The City Of Zagreb: Time For A Debate? *Interdisciplinary Management Research* 11: 657–668.

Lees L (2012) The geography of gentrification: Thinking through comparative urbanism. *Progress in Human Geography* 36(2): 155–171.

Lees L, Slater T and Wyly E (2008) *Gentrification*. London and New York: Routledge.

Lees L, Shin HB and López-Morales E (2016) *Planetary gentrification*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Lefebvre H (1991) *The production of space*. Book, Oxford: Blackwell.

Ley D (1996) *The new middle class and the remaking of the central city*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Liang Z-X and Bao J-G (2015) Tourism gentrification in Shenzhen, China: causes and socio-spatial consequences. *Tourism Geographies* 17(3): 461–481.

Lloyd R and Clark TN (2001) The city as an entertainment machine. In: Gotham KF (ed.), *Critical perspectives on urban redevelopment*, New York: Elsevier, pp. 357–378.

Logan JR and Molotch HL (2007) *Urban fortunes: The political economy of place*. 2nd ed. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Maitland R and Newman P (2008) Visitor-host relationships: conviviality between visitors and host communities. In: Hayllar B, Griffin T, and Edwards D (eds), *City Spaces–Tourist Places: Urban Tourism Precincts*, New York and London: Elsevier, pp. 223–242.

Marcuse P (1985) Gentrification, abandonment, and displacement: Connections, causes, and policy responses in New York City. *Journal of Urban and Contemporary Law* 28: 195–240.

Meethan K (2001) *Tourism in global society. Place, culture, consumption*. New York: Palgrave.

Mills CA (1988) 'Life on the upslope': the postmodern landscape of gentrification. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 6(2): 169–190.

Morell M (2009) Fent barri: heritage tourism policy and neighbourhood scaling in Ciutat de Mallorca. *Etnográfica* 13(2): 343–372.

Mullins P (1991) Tourism urbanization. *International journal of urban and regional research* 15(3): 326–342.

Nobre EAC (2002) Urban regeneration experiences in Brazil: Historical preservation, tourism development and gentrification in Salvador da Bahia. *Urban Design International* 7(2): 109–124.

Nofre J (2013) 'Vintage Nightlife': Gentrifying Lisbon downtown. *Fennia-International Journal of Geography* 191(2): 106–121.

Novy J and Huning S (2009) New tourism areas in the New Berlin. In: Maitland R and Newman P (eds), *World tourism cities: Developing tourism off the beaten track*, London and New York: Routledge, pp. 87–108.

Opillard F (2016) From San Francisco's 'Tech Boom 2.0' to Valparaíso's UNESCO World Heritage Site: resistance to tourism gentrification in a comparative political perspective. In: Colomb C and Novy J (eds), *Protest and Resistance in the Tourist City*, London: Routledge, pp. 129–151.

Pavel F (2015) *Transformação urbana de uma área histórica: o Bairro Alto. Reabilitação, Identidade, Gentrification*. PhD Dissertation. Lisbon: Universidade de Lisboa.

Peters D (2016) Density wars in Silicon Beach: the struggle to mix new spaces for toil, stay and play in Santa Monica, California. In: Colomb C and Novy J (eds), *Protest and Resistance in the Tourist City*, London: Routledge.

Phillips M (2002) The production, symbolization and socialization of gentrification: impressions from two Berkshire villages. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 27(3): 282–308.

Phillips M (2004) Other geographies of gentrification. *Progress in Human Geography* 28(1): 5–30.

Pleumarom A (2015) Tourism: a driver of inequality and displacement. *Resurgence. Special Issue: Global tourism growth: remedy or ruin?* 301(1): 5–10.

Ribera-Fumaz R (2009) From urban political economy to cultural political economy: rethinking culture and economy in and beyond the urban. *Progress in Human Geography* 33(4): 447–465.

Robinson M (2001) Tourism encounters: Inter-and intra-cultural conflicts and the world's largest industry. In: AlSayyad N (ed.), *Consuming tradition, manufacturing heritage: Global norms and urban forms in the age of tourism*, London and New York: Routledge, pp. 34–67.

Sandford MR (1987) Tourism in Harlem: Between negative sightseeing and gentrification. *Journal of American Culture* 10(2): 99–105.

Scarpaci JL (2000) Reshaping Habana Vieja: Revitalization, historic preservation, and restructuring in the socialist city. *Urban Geography* 21(8): 724–744.

Sigler T and Wachsmuth D (2016) Transnational gentrification: Globalisation and neighbourhood change in Panama's Casco Antiguo. *Urban Studies* 53(4): 705–722.

Slater T (2009) Missing Marcuse: on gentrification and displacement. *City* 13(2–3): 292–311.

Spirou C (2011) *Urban tourism and urban change: Cities in a global economy*. New York and London: Routledge.

Terhorst P, Ven J van de and Deben L (2003) Amsterdam: it's all in the mix. In: Hoffman L, Fainstein S, and Judd DR (eds), *Cities and visitors: regulating people, markets, and city space*, Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 75–90.

Torres RM and Momsen JD (2005) Gringolandia: The construction of a new tourist space in Mexico. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 95(2): 314–335.

Van Noorloos F and Steel G (2015) Lifestyle migration and socio-spatial segregation in the urban(izing) landscapes of Cuenca (Ecuador) and Guanacaste (Costa Rica). *Habitat International*: 1–8.

Vianello M (2016) The 'No Grandi Navi' campaign. Protests against cruise tourism in Venice. In: Colomb C and Novy J (eds), *Protest and Resistance in the Tourist City*, London: Routledge.

Vicario L and Martinez Monje PM (2005) Another 'Guggenheim effect'? Central city projects and gentrification in Bilbao. In: Atkinson R and Bridge G (eds), *Gentrification in a Global Context. The New Urban Colonialism*, Book Section, London and New York: Routledge, pp. 151–167.

Vives Miró S (2011) Producing a 'Successful City': Neoliberal Urbanism and Gentrification in the Tourist City—The Case of Palma (Majorca). *Urban Studies Research*: 1–13.

Waitt G, Markwell K and Gorman-Murray A (2008) Challenging heteronormativity in tourism studies: locating progress. *Progress in Human Geography* 32(6): 781–800.

Williams AM and Hall CM (2000) Tourism and migration: new relationships between production and consumption. *Tourism Geographies* 2(1): 5–27.

Wortman T, Donaldson R and Westen G (2016) 'They are stealing my island': Residents' opinions on foreign investment in the residential tourism industry in Tamarin, Mauritius. *Singapore Journal of Tropical Geography* 37(2): 139–157.

Zukin S (1995) *The cultures of cities*. Oxford: Blackwell.

View publication stats