TOURISM PLANNING AS A SPECIALIZATION OF URBAN PLANNING: A CRITICAL VIEW IN URBAN PLANNING AND TOURISM LITERATURE

Hairul Nizam Ismail
Lecturer at Department of Urban and Regional Planning, Faculty of Built Environment, Universiti Teknologi Malaysia, 81310 UTM, Skudai, Johor
b-hairul@utm.my

ABSTRACT: *This paper discusses tourism planning as a specialization of urban planning. It also discusses the implications of planning for tourism development in towns and cities that derived from the dimensions urban and tourism discipline. The notion of this paper appraises what is planning in the urban context and the scope of urban planning that applied in the context of tourism development. What constitute tourism planning then will be further discussed. As tourism began to be seen as an important element in planning, the reviews indicate that tourism planning or planning for tourism has emerged as specialization of town/urban planning.*

Keywords: *Tourism planning, urban planning, tourism development, urban development*

The Position of Tourism in Urban Planning

Local authorities and urban managers identified planning for tourism in late 1980's and early 1990's as a challenge in managing urban areas. This reflects a new trend in urban planning and can be seen in three ways (Jansen-Verbeke, 1992):

i.   Integrated approaches allow recreation and tourism to be developed and planned in close relationship with other urban functions rather than as a distinctive sector.

ii.   The move from a rigid approach (or controlling approach) of planning to a flexible approach that considers recreation and tourism as new initiatives and pre-conditions for development.

iii.   The increasing awareness of the regional context in urban planning that allows a focus on complementary functions of city and region consisting of recreation and tourism planning aspects.

These new directions to urban planning imply that tourism is an object for planning, which is complex and requires understanding within the urban system especially through integrated urban planning processes and a strategic policy (Jansen-Verbeke, 1992). In this context, Getz (1986) acknowledges how tourism planning relates to planning and management theory through the integrative systems model of tourism theory and practice. Both of this discipline sharing the same process that make them easy to be understood especially within geographical background.

In relation to this, urban planners in modern planning are now more likely to be involved and work in multidisciplinary teams, with policy makers from other fields related to economic, cultural and social development. In this context, Greed (2000) issues such as leisure, entertainment, sport and recreation as social issues of concern to the modern town planner. It is not only about land use and types of development but 'also in the policy making process, the broader social, economic and environmental trends in the area of plan'. This including tourism as Ward (1998) argues that every town or city sells itself for more favourable economic activities in response to changes in the urban economy in the last quarter of a century.

The Emergence of Tourism Planning

Costa (2001:425) notes that 'tourism planning has emerged recently as a specialization of town planning, and is still looking for its own approach, body of knowledge and relationship with other better established disciplines'. This provides further clues as to how tourism and town planning are related to each other. In relation to this, Costa (2001) has compared the evolution of tourism planning and town planning into three phases, which are the classical planning phase (1850-1950), the rational planning phase (1950-1980), and present planning (1980-until now). These phases are simplified in Table 1.

Based on this, Costa (2001) suggests that town planning in most cases has evolved and is supported with mature planning schools and paradigms, while tourism planning often progressed in reaction to particular situations and was directed by market interests. As a result, tourism planning 'continued to be viewed, and thus undertaken, under the umbrella of town planning' (Costa, 2001:429). However, he also stresses that there is close proximity between both disciplines in terms of their roots, aims and methods,

which can be traced back to the Industrial Revolution. In this case, the expansion of tourism was equivalent to the growth of urban development, and was clearly located in the era of rational planning (1950-1980).

Table 1: Town and tourism planning in the 'classical', 'rational' and 'present' planning phases (Costa, 2001)

Classical Planning (1850-1950) – Industrial Revolution		
	Town planning	Tourism planning
Origins	Urban chaos produced by the industrial revolution	Expansion of domestic tourism
Disciplines	Architecture and civil engineering	Business / economics
Planning solutions	Physical determinism	Variable-dependent upon practical innovators
Level of development	Strong planning school	Absence of a planning school
Rational Planning (1950-1980) – After World War II		
	Town planning	Tourism planning
Origins	Chicago school	Expansion of mass tourism
Disciplines	Architecture, civil engineering, politics, sociology, psychology, etc.	Mostly economics and some town planning
Planning solutions	Rational determinism	Short-term profit
Level of development	Strong planning school	Very weak planning school
'Present' Planning (1980-till now)		
	Town planning	Tourism planning
Origins	Neo-liberalism	Experience from mass tourist developments and neo-liberalism
Disciplines	Architecture, civil engineering, politics, sociology, psychology, IT, etc.	Economics, sociology and physical planning

Planning solutions	Rationality and corporate and social planning	Rational determinism and forms of corporate planning
Level of development	Prominence of several (often conflicting) planning schools	Emergence of a planning school

Obviously, tourism planning is in many ways a multidisciplinary area. As noted by Hall (2000:15), 'tourism must be integrated within the wider planning processes in order to promote certain goals of economic, social and environmental enhancement or maximization that may be achieved through appropriate tourism development'. Regarding this, Howie (2003:159) notes that 'tourism planning shares a great deal with planning or urban and regional planning, as practiced in the UK and many other countries, which encourage the right development in the right place to achieve the widest range of benefits for the many stakeholder'.

Nevertheless, tourism planning at an early stage was also influenced by the early ideas of town planning that focused on very specific sites and were linked to the supply-side, the physical environment and impact models (Gunn, 1988; Inskeep, 1987, 1991; Getz, 1992; Jansen-Verbeke, 1992). This perspective changed in the 1990's. In relation to this, Williams (1998) notes that the natural dynamic of tourism has encouraged planners to move away from a master plan approach such as the physical blueprint of development to more adaptable forms of planning such as an incremental/continued planning and systems approach. This is because incremental planning and systems approaches recognize a need for constant change and to be flexible, and, therefore, give more emphasis to aspects such as monitoring and revision of policy, objectives and plans.

This view is also shared by several other authors (Davidson & Maitland, 1999; Inskeep, 1991). Davidson and Maitland (1999:210) note that the growing concern of planning for tourism in the city has been 'away from the rigid grand design master plan in favour of more flexible, integrated approach, with planning for tourism taking its place alongside other forms of planning in the locality'. In this context, the idea of 'tourism planning' in the city is also a valid version of 'social town planning' (Davidson & Maitland, 1999:220).

Inskeep (1991:26) argues that a general approach can be applied in any tourism planning and should be accepted as 'a continuous process and must be flexible, depending on changing circumstances, but still achieve the basic development objectives'. He

also points out that planning for tourism should consider more comprehensive and integrated approaches that are able to serve and understand the whole system other than tourism itself. At the same time, this approach must also be able to work simultaneously with other approaches that are concerned with aspects of sustainability such as the environment and the local community.

Tourism Planning as a Discipline

The growing number of town planners specializing in tourism and recreation, and conducting research under the planning discipline in the 1990's is evidence that tourism planning in the urban context is progressing steadily (Costa, 2001). For example, Inskeep (1988) notes that tourism planning offers opportunities for professionals qualified in disciplines such as in urban and regional planning and landscape architecture to engage with managing tourism resources, which is already under their scope of theory and practice. One of the reasons why tourism is important for town/urban planners is because many historic and infrastructure resources, whether natural, built environment or social/cultural are usually public resources and are used but not owned by the tourism industry (Davidson & Maitland, 1999). These resource areas are usually under the control of city governments and therefore are part of a social responsibility that requires them to plan and manage these resources.

However, there are critics of the intentions of city governments with regard to how planning is handled, which also affects tourism planning. One example is the early idea of town/urban planning which, it has been claimed, 'places too much power in a governmental bureaucracy', and therefore 'many people resent bureaucratic control over what they believe to be their freedom' in development (Gunn, 1994:19). On the other hand, the concern for community in today's planning has made 'the majority of planning goals for legal planning agencies' general to be 'directed toward the citizenry, not visitor' (Gunn, 2002:21). This example of debate characterizes the different emphasis of planning, which reflects the need to change based on current problems and future trends. While planning for various forms of development in the city may have similar or different aims to achieve, planning for tourism has to create balance with these other forms of development. This is in order for tourism aspects such as the tourists and their behaviour toward products, that exist in the city, to be part of the major concerns for city governments, especially those attracted to a tourism economy.

Therefore, the next section will discuss further this implication of planning for tourism in towns or cities.

Implication of Planning for Tourism Development in Towns and Cities

According to Getz (1987), there are four broad traditions of tourism planning, which according to Page (1995) and Hall and Page (2002) also apply in the urban context. The first is 'boosterism', which is normally implemented through attempts to short term or direct economy benefits, and its methods are usually practiced by politicians that believe tourism must be promoted immediately for economic growth. There is less planning or even a form of non-planning, with little consideration to the potential negative economic, social and environmental impacts. Second is an economic-industry approach, where tourism is applied as an industry and government utilizes it to create income and employment. The economic goals also given priority over overall social need, but little concern is given to the issue of who actually benefits and who loses from tourism development. The third is a physical/spatial/land use approach, which attempts to protect the environment and natural resources. Within this approach, planning is applied in an environmental dimension that uses traditions of geography and planning such as physical and social carrying capacity in specific areas of the tourist destination. The fourth is a community-oriented approach, which emphasizes the role of community in having control over the tourism development process.

In response to these four broad approaches, a fifth approach has been highlighted, which is the sustainable approach to tourism (Page, 1995; Hall, 2000; Hall & Page, 2002, Page & Hall, 2003). This approach is applied with an emphasis on satisfying tourists and every actor involved, whether active or passive, and the protection of the environment and tourism resources. This has been regarded as more comprehensive and responsible tourism planning development, which avoids or minimizes resource depletion, environmental degradation, cultural disruption and social and economy instability. In this context, Williams (1998) suggests that there are clear links between planning and sustainable tourism. This is because planning allows intervention for sustainable tourism, which is not only concerned with conserving resources for the tourism industry, but also maximizing the benefits to the local population.

According to Page (1995), where tourism plans for towns and cities are undertaken, a range of elements associated with tourism and urban elements should also be considered. Tourism plans, in this context, are interconnected with tourism demand or markets. Thus, natural and socio-economic dimensions of the urban environment become the centre of tourism plans. In addition to this, Davidson and Maitland (1999) point out that tourism planning is composed of various plans, policies and strategies to guide and shape development of tourism at destinations. Some of these involve statutory and enforceable by-laws while most of them are non-statutory, in the form of agreements and guidelines for action. In this context, Davidson and Maitland (1999:212-220) highlight several measures used for planning of tourism in town and cities:

i.   Entrepreneurial planning, where planning has to create products and projects for regeneration in which tourism plays a central role. It works to combine public objectives and private sector requirements.

ii.   Local authority tourism strategies, where it provides a framework to guide local tourism developments that vary considerably in scope, content and level of details in action and initiatives. It also can be a general statement of policy and attitude towards tourism.

iii.   Local partnership arrangements, with programmes and initiatives that are able to influence private sector investment such as through marketing, promotion and subsidy.

iv.   Visitor management plans, or town centre plans, which usually are non-statutory plans focusing on particular impact issues, as a type of strategy developed in response to growing concern of the environmental and social impact of tourism.

As there are many considerations regarding planning for tourism in town and cities, Costa (2001:438-439) stresses that tourism and town/urban planners should be aware of several important aspects in future approaches. Firstly, planning should be seen as a social constructive process that supports a holistic or systems approach, where policies should no longer be produced in 'a laboratory atmosphere', and not only be designed by professionals. Secondly, planning should not only advance theory and practice but also in the organisational framework within which decisions are designed and put into practice. This requires a change of perspective towards top-down and formal (hierarchical) approaches to horizontal and flexible style. Thirdly, planning should become an activity that is oriented towards bringing knowledgeable solutions into the

core of decision-making processes, as well as in coordinating all the actors involved. In addition to this, the fourth aspect must take into account that planning for policies should be supported by public participation involving the general public and not only represent special interest groups. Therefore, the fifth aspect should consider the need to balance working groups where planners, representatives of the tourism industry and citizens actively participate in the decision-making process. Finally, planning should be aware of globalization in affecting the way in which policies are designed and put into practice.

Conclusion

Planning for tourism is a part of activity in city management, thus, tourism should be integrated within wider planning processes in order to promote appropriate tourism development. In this context, tourism is a multidisciplinary area since many of its aspects are interrelated with the wider scope of planning practice in urban development. As tourism began to be seen as an important element in planning, the reviews indicate that tourism planning or planning for tourism has emerged as specialization of town/ urban planning. In relation to this, the nature of urban policy decision-making including tourism is intended to be considered and operationalised within the structure of city government. Nonetheless, decisions in planning cannot be seen as independent responsibilities but involve policy makers from other fields such as culture and the economy.

References

Costa, C. (2001). An Emerging Tourism Planning Paradigm? A Comparative Analysis Between Town and Tourism planning. *International Journal of Tourism Research, 3*, 425-441.

Davidson, R. and Maitland, R. (1999). Planning for tourism in towns and cities. In Greed, C.H. (ed.) *Social Town Planning*, London: Routledge, 208-220.

Getz, D. (1986). Models in Tourism Planning: Towards Integration of Theory and Practice', *Tourism Management, 7*(1) 21-23.

Getz, D. (1987). Tourism Planning and Research: Traditions, Models and Futures. Paper presented at the Australian Travel Research Workshop, Bunbury, Western Australia, 5-6 November.

Getz, D. (1992). Tourism Planning and Destination Life Cycle. *Annals of Tourism Research,* 19, 752-770.

Greed, C. (2000). *Introducing Planning (3rd ed.),* London: The Athlone Press.

Gunn, C.A (1988). *Tourism Planning (2nd ed.),* London: Taylor & Francis.

Gunn, C.A. (1994). *Tourism Planning: Basic, Concepts, Cases (3rd ed.),* Washington: Taylor & Francis.

Gunn, C.A. (2002). *Tourism Planning: Basic, Concepts, Cases (4th ed.),* New York: Routledge.

Hall, C.M. (2000). *Tourism Planning: Policies, Processes and Relationships,* London: Pearson Education Limited.

Hall, C.M. and Page, S. (2000). IntroductionTourism in South and Southeast Asia – Region and Context. In Hall, C.M. and Page, S. (eds.) *Tourism in South and Southeast Asia: Issues and Cases,* Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann, 3-28.

Hall C.M. and Page S. (2002). *The Geography of Tourism and Recreation: Environment, Place and Space (2nd ed.),* London: Routledge.

Howie, F. (2003). *Managing the Tourist Destination,* London: Continuum.

Inskeep, E. (1988). Tourism Planning: An Emerging Specialization. *Journal of the American Planning Association,* 54(3) 360-372.

Inskeep, E. (1991). *Tourism Planning: An Integrated and Sustainable Development Approach,* New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.

Inskeep, E. (1987). Environmental planning for tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research,* 14, 118-135.

Jansen-Verbeke, M. (1992). Urban Recreation and Tourism: Physical Planning Issues', *Tourism Recreation Research,* 17(2) 33-45.

Page, S. and Hall C.M. (2003). *Managing Urban Tourism,* London: Pearson Education Ltd.

Page, S. (1995). *Urban Tourism,* London: Routledge.

Ward, S.V. (1998). *Selling Places: The Marketing and Promotion of Town and Cities 1850-2000,* London: E & FN Spon.

Williams, S. (1998). *Tourism Geography,* London: Routledge.