Chapter 10
Urban Tourism and Walkability

Salvador Anton Clavé

10.1 Introduction

Urban tourism has been increasing since the 1980s (UNWTO 2012) with permanent growth in many cities around the world and the continuous emergence of new destinations. The authors of the Global Destination Index pointed out that in 2016 many of the world's fastest-growing destination cities by international overnight visitors were not among the top ranked, indicating "a strong and increasingly differentiated momentum of growth propelling many of these cities forward" (Hedrick-Wong and Choong 2017, p. 56). This expansion is especially relevant, for instance, in the Asia Pacific region, which had 14 cities in the top 20 of the world's fastest-growing destination cities by international overnight visitors in the period 2009–2016.

Powerful factors related to the current mobilities era (Urry 2007), digital context and social acceleration (Bock 2015), and access age (Rifkin 2000) are changing the world tourism dynamics deeply impacting the trajectories of cities. City implementation of infrastructural and nodal megaprojects, design of public space and landscape improvement initiatives, organization of global events, building of new specific architectural icons and creation of global image are reinforcing their attractiveness for visitors, residents and investment capital. As a result, tourism is rapidly expanding globally, with individuals, corporations and places creating new transnational, multidirectional, global, cosmopolitan and virtual interactions and new urban trajectories (Williams 2013). Paradoxically, in so doing, tourism increases the homogenization between places leading to a lack of diversity (Ritzer 2011). According to Lew (2017), Disneyfication (predictability with a lack of surprise) and McDonaldization (efficiency and the lack of risk) are other characteristics of this

S. Anton Clavé (✉)
Rovira i Virgili University, Tarragona, Spain
e-mail: salvador.anton@urv.cat

E. Fayos-Solà, C. Cooper (eds.), *The Future of Tourism*,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-89941-1_10

process. Nevertheless, as Lew states "based on the overwhelming economic success of mass tourism theme parks, cruise ships, and historic shopping streets and shopping centers, this appears to be what the majority of tourists want" (Lew 2017, p. 9). Global trends, such as the consolidation of low-cost traveling, the generalization of short breaks as the mode of discovering and exploring cities, social networks and the so-called sharing accommodation modalities helped the spread of the industry and the incorporation, development or increase of new destination places.

More interestingly, lack of diversity, lack of surprise and lack of risk also occur in city historical centers increasingly converted into visitor-oriented environments where unpredictable travelers look for customized experiences anywhere at any time (see Maciocco and Serrelli 2009). This trend also conquers neighborhoods "off the beaten track," where lifestyle-based visitors go to feel themselves "as travelers but not as tourists" as much as possible (Maitland 2008; Füller and Michel 2014). As a result, cities are experiencing the transformation of how tourists gaze and go places (Russo and Richards 2016), and most important, everyday sites of activity in cities are being transformed because of the traveler interaction (Cechini 2016). Consequently, functional, economic and social changes are increasingly in place (Litvin and DiForio 2014). Nevertheless, even though they are in transition, cities remain a powerful social engine, and walkability and walkable urban places appear as a fertile conceptual and practical arena to advocate for an enhanced sustainable future for urban tourism.

10.2 Successful Destination Challenges and Urban Walkability

Successful urban destinations around the world are currently confronting deep challenges due to their attractiveness. Because of this, traditional issues related to visitor walking flows management and tourism impact over heritage (van der Borg and Gotti 1996) are becoming general urban management challenges for most cities and conflicts between the local population and tourism activities usually explained as the consequence of having exceeded physical, ecological, economic, social and even perceived carrying capacity (Popp 2018) are key points in the agenda of current policies of many cities. Summarizing, an increasing number of conflicts surrounding urban tourism developments have been identified (based in Novy 2014, pp. 11–21), including the following:

- Immediate nuisances: congestion, noise, overcrowding, litter, privatization, mobility restrictions, unruly behavior, crime, environmental and landscape damage;
- Structural transformations: land use changes, store replacement, building conversions, rent increases, gentrification, rising prices, worsening service provisions, lack of affordable housing;

- Accommodation "conquest" of urban space: opening of hotels and hostels, increase of legal and illegal tourist apartments, social exclusion, Airbnb–sharing accommodation; and
- Cultural commodification: "tourism kills tourism" principle/myth, loss of distinctive attractiveness, distortion of cultural identity, resignification of public spaces, city life festivalization.

These challenges are evident, for instance, in the case of cities (some of them highly economically dependent on tourism) where social movement contestation, critical citizen groups and political opposition to the perceived growing undesirable effects of mass urban tourism is increasing (Colomb and Novy 2016). Interestingly, this trend could also be related to other issues linked to the structural, economic, cultural, political and social crisis of cities as well as changes in the political context, the lack of local leadership, tactics of groups of interest on different scales, class struggle, ideological confrontation, the emergence of culturally and socially stratified conflicts, the dominant role of certain types of tourism activities in some cities (e.g., cruises or mega-events), the protection of certain everyday-life local practices and privileges or the emergence of new social and cultural (sometimes transnational) elites.

In this context, a renewed debate about the seminal concept of the *right of the city* originated by Lefebvre (1967) has also emerged. Nevertheless, in the current age of hypermobility and after decades of reflection and action, his vision of the city as a "work of art" constantly in the making can be reformulated (Butler 2012). Effectively, the sense and the players of collective action and collective participation have changed and inclusion and meaningful participation in the city's collective life have other implications beyond the well-known citizen's right to conquer urban spaces. The question is how to deal with the right to the city when it affects individuals (also citizens) from other cities or even other nations (Purcell 2004). This is a debate sometimes linked with the "less tourism" principle, even though this is an option difficult to operationalize unless accepting a process of tourism market elitization. Behind it is the need to recognize that tourism dynamics in cities cannot be easily isolated from other economic, social and political processes in the urban context (Russo and Scarnato 2017).

Effectively, many of the cases documented by Colomb and Novy (2016) illustrate the imbricated relation of urban tourism with the socioeconomic restructuring of the neoliberal city and raise fundamental questions related to the current structural crisis of cities. In this vein, Florida (2017) has demonstrated how the same forces that have powered the growth of "superstar cities" are also generating their current deepest challenges (gentrification, unaffordability, segregation and inequality) threatening the conventional urban way of life. This process goes further to current debates about sustainable, smart, slow, inclusive or creative cities and is related to the unexpected evolution of the urbanity and urbanization as a way of life (Libeskind 2014). Regarding the interest of this chapter, it also relates to the role that cities have to play in the current spreading of global tourism and tourists in the shaping of cities. That means a new understanding of the current urban transition, new flexible

planning, management and governance procedures and probably new visions about the built environment, its uses and its benefits.

Urbanity and urbanization as a way of life depends on a series of factors that contribute to the quality of life, sense of place and recognition of identity (Sepe 2007). As stated by Blečić et al. (2015a, p. 2) "in such a conception, walkability has become a pivotal, and lately much debated concept" (see also Forsyth 2015). Walkability is a condition of the urban environment (Blečić et al. 2014) associated with collective social practices, community urban activities, quality of place in general and individual well-being. Related to the capacity to be in a place by foot, walkability is about how the everyday life of people is pleasant and spatially integrated with the surrounding built environment and about how good urban design stimulates interactive, creative and positive social practices of the use of space (Gehl 2010). In fact, as Burden states (2014) when thinking about cities, it is necessary to think about how individuals are, use, enjoy and create them: "Cities are fundamentally about people, and where people go and where people meet are at the core of what makes a city work. So even more important than buildings in a city are the public spaces in between them. And today, some of the most transformative changes in cities are happening in these public spaces" (s 00:12).

Even though little research has been undertaken on walkability and urban tourism, it can be stated that from the tourism perspective, walkable places are fundamental. So far, most of the activities done by tourists in destinations are taking place while walking (see, for instance, Freytag 2010 for the case of Heidelberg or Shoval et al. 2011 for the case of Hong Kong) and, in fact, all types of urban landscapes for tourism consumption, from theme parks or entertainment centers to historic city centers, can be characterized by being walking environments for the tourists that visit them. This is also the reason, as Bieri (2018) states, by which walkability has even become a desired spatial urban form of capitalism. In fact, as she discusses, with walkable urbanism, capital is creating new commodified forms of social interaction and new markets for a walkable lifestyle that is fed through conspicuous consumption. Obviously, tourism is a fertile ground to make it grow.

Thus, issues connected with visitor use of urban walkable places are evident. Being quality-built and social environments, walkable places often concentrate the main attractions and accommodation supply in cities and attract the highest numbers of visitors. In fact, the reinforcement of the capacity to move around on foot creates a positive tourist market habitat (Hall et al. 2015), and this can even increase tourist flows that sometimes can clearly exceed the number of locals. This can feed the conflictual relation between visitor expectations and community everyday life needs. Then, as Sepe (2007, p. 50) highlights, an activity like walking, which in itself is obviously "sustainable," "can become non-sustainable if the context in which it is carried out does not meet the conditions for an adequate quality of life."

Thus, given that walking and walkable places represent important constituents of the actual urban environment of many cities and a fertile ground for urban design and innovation, it is surprising that they have not been more usually considered an issue in urban tourism research (Ashworth and Page 2011). In fact, with classical interpretations of the way locals and tourists use streets and public spaces (Hoffman et al.

2003) at a moment when post-paradigmatic approaches try to conceptualize the blurring of boundaries between them (Rojek and Urry 2000), walkability and urban tourism appear to be a promising topic of research, planning and management. Hence, understanding the role of walkability in future urban tourism should be perceived as an important aspect for tourism, for cities and for future sustainability of tourism in the unexpected evolution of cities.

10.3 Urban Walkability, Place Attractiveness and Visitor Experience

Urban walkability can be broadly defined as the extent to which a built environment enables walking by providing pedestrians a network of walkable connections to different destinations, within a reasonable expenditure of time and effort and in a secure, pleasant and attractive context (Southworth 2005). So, walkable places can be characterized as high-density urban areas with a mix of diverse real estate types that are connected to surrounding places via multiple transportation options. According to Hall et al. (2018), the more relevant features of the built environment to walking include imageability, legibility, enclosure, human scale, transparency, linkage, complexity and coherence. Following Blečić et al. (2015a), walkability conditions also relate to the social and personal quality of life outcomes potentially fostered by such environments. It is increasingly observed as well that walkable urban places are desirable from the real estate perspective in terms of positive economic and social performance (Leinberger and Alfonzo 2012) and thus, currently, an important element for economic, residential and urban development strategies for cities. In this vein, mass-produced walkable urban designs are emerging, especially in the United States urban context, and a growing debate about the social and economic benefits of walkable real estate is established, while the walkable condition of the place of living is becoming an indicator of the socioeconomic status of individuals (Leinberger 2009). In this sense, as Bieri (2018) states, it is also necessary to understand designed walkable urbanism as it is currently fostered in the United States as a spatial form of capitalism.

Even though proximity and accessibility have been usually considered as being the critical factors to define a walkable built environment (Lo 2009), studies and research include significant other measures for exploring whether and how places are walkable. Obviously, the most satisfying models and methods try to combine both environmental features, such as the mix of land uses, street connectivity, aesthetics, density, form, pedestrian amenities, personal safety, recreational uses, public spaces or traffic measures, with social qualities related to individual behavior and actual motivations for walking (Alfonzo 2005; Buckley et al. 2016). However, data availability and reliability is an actual limitation when developing analytical methods. According to Blečić et al. (2014), the main differences between analytical models consist on the level of detail of measurements (macro or micro scale), data

sources (census, surveys and ad hoc audits, secondary data) and methods of data processing and evaluation (statistics, additive methods, predictive models or others). Otherwise, computer geospatial analysis advances and the availability of online maps and datasets have made possible the development of complex evaluation methods and tools. Besides their analytical capabilities, such automatized methods are also conceived as commercial rating and audit tools that provide general users with walkability geolocated scores according to their specific measurement and calculation criteria (this is the case of Walk Score but also Walk Shed, Ped Shed, Walkonomics, PERS [Pedestrian Environment Review System] or WalkYourPlace, among others). Thus, technology is used as a prescribing force contributing to the standardization of walkable urbanism in a profitable way (see Bieri 2018).

While authors such as Blečić et al. (2015a) at the Sassari University in Italy have developed a specific methodology and tool—Walkability Explorer—for analysis, planning and decision support based on the capability of people to walk, walkability commercial scores, and particularly the Walk Score index, have been widely applied and validated for a number of walkability research purposes mainly in the United States and Canada (see, for instance, Carr et al. 2010, 2011; Duncan et al. 2011, 2013, 2016; Manaugh and El-Geneidy 2011; Leinberger 2012; Hirsch et al. 2013; Leinberger and Austin 2013; Leinberger and Lynch 2015, 2016; Leinberger and Loh 2016; Leinberger and Rodríguez 2016; Leinberger et al. 2017). Ram and Hall (2018), who use the Walk Score index in a tourism walkability analysis for the case of London, emphasize that, even though some methodological assumptions have to be done to correctly understand results, this index "represents a quick, free, and easy-to-use proxy of neighborhood density and access to nearby available amenities." According to Blečić et al. (2015a, p. 4), some of the authors who validated the index in United States and Canadian cities recommended integrating it "with supplementary measures of built environment related to pedestrian friendliness, such as aesthetics, topography, security, and weather conditions in order to take into account factors which are objectively and subjectively relevant for people's propensity to walk."

As far as walkable urban places in cities are associated with spatial dynamics such as the social use of public spaces, the enhancement of pedestrian mobility, the improvement of accessibility, the development of collective resources and the expansion of recreational amenities, walkability not only safeguards and enhances the quality of life of residents but also has the capacity to increase the attractiveness of a place and, if well managed, to enhance the quality of the visitor experience and to bolster the tourist economy of the city. Nevertheless, tourism is a missing activity in most of the walkability urban studies and walking and place walkability implications for urban tourism management and planning have had little presence in tourism mainstream research, and thus few measurement tools and methodological approaches have been developed from the destination perspective. In any case, some lessons can be learned from recent approaches to the topic.

Surveying university students from the authors' university as 'virtual tourists', Samarasekara et al. (2011) evaluated the influence of landscape variables on walkability for tourists in the Japanese prefectures of Saitama and Tokyo. Analyzing

narratives of participant individuals who walked along one of 19 selected routes and participant assessment of streetscape pictures and combining inductive and deductive approaches, researchers identified 14 environmental correlates and 6 underlying components that reflected the actual concerns influencing tourists as they made walking decisions in unfamiliar environments. The six components that best predicted the walking decisions of tourists were safety from traffic, comfort of walking area, environmental appearance, activity potential, shade, and exploration potential. According to the authors "results suggest that real walkers make more finely grained walking judgments than those measured by current, conceptualized walkability scales" (p. 501). Safety, comfort, appearance and shade were perceived as positive cues for walking decisions related to the built environment and the physical geography of the location. Activity potential and exploration potential were identified as subjective factors influencing the potential behavior of walkers.

In their study regarding walkability and pedestrians' experience in the city of Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, Ujang and Muslim (2014) found that walkable tourism places increase place attachment to the visited destination. This occurred even though these places were not specifically designed for tourists' use. They analyzed visitors' feedback on city walkability related to place attachment dimensions using data obtained through surveys and interviews conducted in several attraction locations and found that accessibility, connectivity, comfort, safety, attractiveness and pleasantness are leading criteria for a walkable tourist city. Pleasantness and accessibility also affect the visitors' functional attachment to places. The emotional attachment is likewise reflected in the visitors' identification of visual attractiveness that reflects image and identity, particularly in the areas of the city with strong historical and cultural attributes. In the same location, Mansouri and Ujang (2016) found that environmental features such as accessibility, connectivity and continuity strongly determine tourists' expectation and satisfaction while walking.

Combining available open data of the street network and urban design features with direct in situ observations of environmental features to calculate a comprehensive composite walkability score and drawing inspiration from other researchers (Cervero and Duncan 2003; Porta and Renne 2005; Clifton et al. 2007; Forsyth et al. 2008; Páez et al. 2013), Blečić et al. (2015a) developed their own "Walkability Explorer" tool. They deployed their spatial multi-criteria evaluation software in the city of Alghero, Sardinia, taking into account different attitudinal variables and different urban populations that may exhibit diverse interests and different walking propensity and behavior. Blečić et al.'s (2015a, b) model offered certain advances over the more commonly used Walk Score index. Rather than evaluating how a place is walkable in itself, the "Walkability Explorer" tool yields a walkability score endowed with three components: (1) the number of available destinations (urban "opportunities") reachable by foot; (2) their distances; and (3) the quality of pedestrian routes leading toward those destinations. Interestingly, Blečić et al. (2015a) produced walkability evaluations based on the profile of pedestrians. Thus, they distinguished different walkability profiles for tourists, for parents and for users of cultural and educational services. So, the resulting spatial scores and walkability maps highlighted the need to take into account, differentiate and appropriately weigh

tourist walkability aspects when analyzing the role of walkability in urban tourism, as discussed by Ram and Hall (2018). Additionally, see Moura et al. (2017) for a discussion of the importance of knowing the purpose of walking [i.e., utilitarian or leisure] when researching urban walkability.

Research developed in 2016 at the International Institute of Tourism Studies together with the Center for Real Estate and Urban Analysis at The George Washington University for the Washington, DC metropolitan area determined that the majority of the tourism activity and, particularly, hotel revenues in the city were mostly located in walkable urban places. Based upon a methodology where the aim was to define Walking Urban Places (WalkUPs) in the metropolitan area, 50 established regionally significant and 22 emerging and potential WalkUPs with a mean surface of 92 hectares were identified (Leinberger and Loh 2016). Regionally significant WalkUPs were defined after a quantitative and in situ observation analysis taking into account that they should have a minimum Walk Score of 70 and a minimum of 1.4 million square feet of office space and/or a minimum of 340,000 square feet of retail space. Besides measuring and ranking them based on the criteria related to economic and social equity performance (Leinberger and Loh 2016), an additional analysis of WalkUPs hotel and tourism performance was done (Anton Clavé 2016). Findings indicated that the 72 identified WalkUPs in the Washington metropolitan area contained 0.8% of total metropolitan land area, 4.2% of jobs, 4.4% of population, 30.3% of hotels, 45.7% of hotel rooms, 48.3% of rooms sold, 60.4% of meeting space and 61.4% of total revenues. Additionally, the average occupancy of hotels located in the identified WalkUPs was 75.9% versus 69.6% in drivable suburban areas, while the average revenue per available room (RevPar) was US$149.53 versus US$79.42 in drivable suburban areas. Nevertheless, interestingly, results also showed that only 58.3% of WalkUPs had hotel rooms.

The Washington metropolitan area tourism WalkUP analysis also introduced two attractiveness indicators, the Sightseeing Density Index (created to measure the intensity of location of museums, memorials, buildings, gardens, historical sites and parks per WalkUP) and the Entertainment Density Index (created to measure the density of amusement attractions, sports arenas and performing arts venues and the location of the Top 100 metropolitan area restaurants per WalkUP) to observe differences in the tourism characteristics and dynamics of WalkUPs (Anton Clavé 2016). As a result, different types of WalkUPs were defined according to both hotel location trends as well as to the distribution of cultural, entertainment and leisure visitor-oriented resources. Taking these additional indexes into account, the presence of tourism activity (either hotel facilities or significant leisure entertainment and/or cultural attractions) increased to 75% of WalkUPs. Interestingly, even though most of the non-tourism WalkUPs were located outside central Washington, results also allowed the identification of different tourism-specialized WalkUPs outside the city center. This is the case of meeting tourism-oriented WalkUPs in Arlington, VA, and Prince George's County, MD, and specialty and visitor destination WalkUPs in Alexandria, Arlington and Fairfax, VA, and Montgomery County, MD. Additionally, 100% of Hotel Destination WalkUPs, 75% of Hotel Location WalkUPs, and most of the Cultural Districts WalkUPs (walkable places visited by

tourists without hotel accommodation supply) were also outside central Washington. Thus, the analysis discovered that in the case of the Washington metropolitan area, walkable urban tourism is not limited to the center of the city, but there is also tourism development in selected peripheral suburbs.

In the recently published *The Routledge International Handbook of Walking* (Hall et al. 2018), Ram and Hall (2018) went further in the analysis and understanding of walkable places to the tourism industry and urban tourism, analyzing the relationship between walkability and urban attractions in London. Ram and Hall's (2018) research aimed to explore the extent to which a link exists between the walkability of an urban tourism destination and the likability of places, as perceived by tourists and the number of visitors to tourist attractions. In their study, the authors used two popular ranking websites (TripAdvisor and Walk Score) along with official data to demonstrate how walkability is a key factor in urban tourism dynamics. According to the authors, however, it is not clear if excellent walkability attracts visitors, or if their attractiveness made attractions very accessible, or even if the level of attendance is an implicit function of density and accessibility (including public transport) walkability is positively related to the popularity of attractions (Ram and Hall 2018). Nevertheless, authors also noticed that using Walk Score as a walkability measure in destination analysis requires further examination and refinements in that it does not include critical indicators for tourism analysis, such as walking route signage, street facilities or the previously referred to aspects of tourist appeal such as cultural heritage (Ujang and Muslim 2014) or activities potential (Samarasekara et al. 2011).

Reported recent papers clearly indicate the potential research links and the promising planning and management usefulness of interconnecting urban tourism and walkability. This is an association strongly related to the place attractiveness and the visitor experience. It is also clearly related to practical issues such as the location of attractions, accommodation concentration, visitor overcrowding, public space aestheticazation, place identity, flow management, neighborhood gentrification and collective social practices transformation. All of them are central and critical key issues in the current debates about the future sustainability of tourism in cities.

10.4 Walkable Urban Places Management and Urban Tourism Sustainability

Walkability represents a major theme with respect to the tourist use of urban space. It is linked to city mobility and transportation practices and solutions, to the planning and management of the built environment and public and open spaces, to the development of creative and innovative clusters, to visitor access to accommodation facilities, resources and attractions and to the relationship between tourist expectations and the everyday life needs of permanent residents when using the city. This is also related to the main characteristics that Ashworth and Page (2011) identify

regarding the touristic use of cities: selectivity, rapidity, place collection and capriciousness. Nevertheless, even though it is generally accepted that walkability is positive for cities from many standpoints, the current understanding of the tourism-related challenges cities face regarding walkability is partial and incomplete, and the strategies and solutions to problems posed by the simultaneous walkable use of cities by visitors and residents are limited. For instance, the co-presence of different user groups results in a complex and sometimes conflictual situation (Popp 2018), walkable urban transformation strategies can entail the dismembering and reassembling of the built environment (Sepe 2007) and walkability urban design might alter conventional notions and uses about public and private spaces (Ram and Hall 2018). Therefore, paradoxes flourish when dealing, discussing, planning and managing walkability and urban tourism.

Simultaneously, as Hall et al. (2018) point out, citing Macauley (2000), walkability accentuates forms of domestication or domination. This has been, for instance, the case of the Raval in Barcelona, where the effects of whitewashing and demolishing buildings, repaving and widening streets, development and relocation of shops and attractions, and the re-imaging and resignification of the urban landscape has led to both an increasing visitor walkable use of the place as well as to the formation of a novel social geography with the arrival of new social groups, the replacement of old inhabitants and the "exclusion or inclusion of certain cultural practices and expressions in the public life of the city" (Degen 2010, p. 21). Complementarily, at least in the case of the United States, walkable reurbanization and city center revitalization processes inspired by the European dense city style undoubtedly create a more sustainable alternative to the suburb but, paradoxically, foster exclusive places of social distinction through consumption rather than through civic activity, as authors such as Bieri (2018) discuss.

Thus, to innovate using urban walkability as a tool for the construction of a more equitable and sustainable destination, it is necessary to rethink the city and to search spatial solutions while being attentive both to the individual decision-making of city user groups and, at the same time, to the different collective needs to use streets, squares and parks as public spaces and to the community feelings about landscape identity and appropriation. Walking is obviously about accessing places, but it is also about the use of the walked and accessed complex places. Taking this as a principle for policies and urban projects could help in linking walkability and urban quality of life for all (Blečić et al. 2015a). So far, if cities have to promote sustainable urban tourism, they will need to design urban solutions to fully ensure sustainable, inclusive and responsible walkable urban places across their urban geography.

This could provide a good starting point for developing suitable action policies to facilitate not only pleasant walking but also acceptable solutions to benefit both locals and tourists when using the city. Obviously, this approach supports the idea that individual behavior can be conditioned both through the adjustment of the built environment and by the constraining of the decision-making through specific regulations. This can also address classical dilemmas applied to the understanding of some universal problems that the visitors' economy pose to walkable urban places and cities in general, such as "the tragedy of the commons" in a finite

world (Hardin 1968) and the "tyranny of small decisions" (Kahn 1966), or how small individual transactions—of limited size, scope and time-perspective (such as those done by individual visitors, visitor services providers or even citizens sharing their homes through the so-called collaborative platforms)—can be a source of misallocations and may produce authentic market failures.

Thus, to address the paradoxes posed by the urban tourism and walkability association, a multidimensional strategy that is likely to be controversial could be pursued and effectively managed, including a combination of measures oriented to (1) make walkable place attractiveness profitable for all, (2) benefit from temporary walkable user individuals and groups, (3) invest in creating new density and attractiveness walkable geographies in the city, (4) approach visitor flows from a multi-scalar management perspective and (5) develop affordable housing in the most visitor-attractive city walkable places. Obviously, success in this purpose is not ensured as far as walkable place management for a more sustainable urban tourism basically means the use of limited powers to address complex challenges that are largely beyond the city's control. Additionally, solutions cannot be directly replicated between cities because evident conflicts in some of them are not necessarily obvious problems in another. This is clear, for instance when analyzing crowding perceptions (Popp 2018).

To make walkable place attractiveness profitable for all new taxation, schemes could be designed and then benefits obtained in walkable places because of flows of visitors, resident decisions or tourist-oriented services would be captured, reinvested and returned to the public. To benefit from temporary walkable users' new accessibility measures for visitors that make people pay for mobility services, appropriate facilities and infrastructure could be designed. On that basis, other pricing and regulation initiatives should also be introduced requiring pre-booking schemes and other systems to control entry to attractions (see Maitland 2006 for a discussion of this issue for the case of Cambridge) or even to specific areas of the city. To create density and attractiveness, cities can alternatively (1) invest in developing visitor offerings that complement the local heritage and culture in walkable environments outside of the most popular tourist-visited places or (2) design and transform places into fully planned tourist districts (inspired by Lew 2017). To manage flows in a multi-scalar perspective, urban managers should pay special attention to encourage visitors to go out and walk off the beaten track. In fact, evidence shows that tourists visit less attractive places if they are accessible (Ram and Hall 2018), but this is a function that relates expectation, time budget and particular perceptions about mobility. Finally, the development of intense affordable housing schemes and the provision of low-cost amenities in highly visited walkable places is a strategy oriented to avoid displacement and dislocation of less-advantaged residents, to reproduce and maintain the sense of the place and to refrain from the fully tourism transformation of the main walkable urban places. Thus, urban planning and urbanism are, in fact, at the very center of the agenda for a walkable sustainable urban tourism.

Obviously, some contradictions will remain and, depending on the characteristics of every place, conflicts will continue. For example, as reported by Lew (2017,

p. 458) "both Buser et al. (2013) and Richards (2014) suggest that creative placemaking, which has a strong arts orientation, is inherently contradictory in that the artists involved often represent political resistance to conservative social institutions, but are also complicit in urban regeneration actions that may be contrary to those goals." In the same vein, as discussed by Degen (2010, p. 31) "as bohemian gentrifiers and 'cool' tourists shun generic and commercialized spaces in search of places outside mass consumption, city councils and urban marketing professionals are consciously searching for, producing, managing and commodifying novel urban rhythms in edgy and often marginal neighborhoods from Barcelona to Paris, Tokyo to São Paolo." Nevertheless, a balanced understanding by urban policymakers about the vital economic role of walkability in the sustainable future of cities and tourism in cities, how it is impacting the city life, and who the winners and losers are when it is not regulated are essential elements for a better management.

For example, as reported by Yang and Xu (2009), Shanghai's Nanjing Road transformation experience associated to the growing influx of visitors in a context of economic and political transition has provided a number of lessons to learn. First, sound design initiatives including not only physical and economic pursuits but also social and cultural aspects have been proved necessary. Second, design strategies have to be people- and place-based. Finally, land use has to be appropriately distributed and managed for the benefit of the public. Obviously, from a tourism perspective, this experience also shows that walkability is much more than environmental design, and that the identity of place is hard to engineer as far as it arises through interactive layering and active enrolments over time (Degen 2010). In consequence, it is from this perspective that walkable urban place management for a sustainable tourism should be understood as a public purpose action, part of a larger objective of community development, bearing in mind how cities are evolving and how the traditional understanding, expectations and quest of rights that citizens have about them are also in transition.

This is a purpose that is not currently among the objectives of many of the existing urban/destination tourism organizations (Beritelli et al. 2014). In fact, unfortunately, destination marketing organizations have presently a lack of expertise to deal with urban and place complexity, problems to address specific place-level management needs, short-sightedness with regard to urban planning processes and a deep inability to connect with urban significant stakeholders outside of the tourism industry. This means a need to rethink the role of urban/destination tourism organizations, to shift resources from product development, communication and marketing to management (Sainaghi 2006) and to transform them in order to achieve greater involvement of the tourism industry in the design, development and management of urban places, as well as greater awareness among planners and place developers of the requirements and needs of the visitor economy. This would be of interest to preserve the sense of places, to actively involve the local population and to create linkages and capacity building among place-management organizations. It is, in fact, a useful path to deal with the challenging situation of tourism in successful cities, which is and will be more and more complex by nature, including actors, both insiders and outsiders, with different agendas that typically lead to contradictions and conflicts.

10.5 Conclusion: Walkability, Urban Tourism and Collective Governance

Place governance as a collective tool with an intentional effort to engage visitors and residents in place planning and management, to increase equity and inclusiveness, to develop social capital to link tourism dynamics with urban strategies, and to incorporate place management at the neighborhood level, appears to be an option to successfully develop walkable urban tourism strategies. It can match objectives such as the improvement of the quality of life of people, the creation of opportunities to share and communicate the sense of places through a balanced interaction between visitors and residents, and the making of a resilient instructive destination.

Interestingly, this collective governance has to take into account the existence of a multiplicity of actors, networks, spaces and scales (whose status and boundaries are often fuzzy) and clearly introduce a usually missing scale level of tourism governance that is at the district or micro-local level (it can be also named as neighborhood, area of interest or walkable place level among others). It should also adopt the classical idea of the community-based approach to tourism management (Murphy 1985) and build flexible and adaptative capabilities. Neighborhood associations, historic preservation districts, creative districts or community improvement districts could and should evolve to match the objectives that this collective governance needs. As has been highlighted in the case of some international world tourism destinations assessed under the UNWTO-WTCF City Tourism Performance Research project (UNWTO and WTCF 2017), the association of tourism management practices and place governance schemes is emerging as a critical tool for the achievement of a better social, cultural, economic and environmental role of tourism in the cities.

Walkability can emerge then as a powerful tool to help the development of a place-based governance tourism model based on slow, smart, seductive, safe, social, sociable and sustainable principles that can be applied at the walkable urban places scale in the general context of the continuous and unexpected transition of cities.

References

Alfonzo, M. (2005). To walk of not to walk? The hierarchy of needs. *Environment and Behavior, 37* (6), 808–836.

Anton Clavé, S. (2016). *Tourism and urban walkability: An opportunity to rethink destination planning and management.* Tourism Naturally Conference. Colorado State University, Alghero. Accessed November 20, 2016, from https://sites.warnercnr.colostate.edu/tourism-conference/videos/

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

Beritelli, P., Bieger, T., & Laesser, C. (2014). The new frontiers of destination management: Applying variable geometry as a function-based approach. *Journal of Travel Research, 53*(4), 403–417.

Bieri, A. H. (2018). Walking in the capitalist city: On the socio-economic origins of walkable urbanism. In C. M. Hall, Y. Ram, & N. Shoval (Eds.), *The Routledge international handbook of walking* (pp. 27–36). London: Routledge.

Blečić, I., Cecchini, A., Fancello, G., Talu, V., & Trunfio, G. A. (2014). Evaluating walkability: A capability-wise planning and design support system. *International Journal of Geographical Information Science, October*, 1–21.

Blečić, I., Cecchini, A., Fancello, F., Fancello, G., & Trunfio, G. A. (2015a). *An evaluation and design support system for urban walkability*. 14th International Conference on Computers in Urban Planning and Urban Management. MIT, Boston. Accessed December 20, 2016, from http://web.mit.edu/cron/project/CUPUM2015/proceedings/Content/pss/138_blecic_h.pdf

Blečić, I., Cecchini, A., Fancello, G., Talu, V., & Trunfio, G. A. (2015b). Walkability and urban capabilities: Evaluation and planning decision support. *Territorio Italia, 1*(15), 51–66.

Bock, K. (2015). The changing nature of city tourism and its possible implications for the future of cities. *European Journal of Futures Research, 3*, 20.

Buckley, P., Stangl, P., & Guinn, J. (2016). Why people walk: Modeling foundational and higher order needs based on latent structure. *Journal of Urbanism: International Research on Placemaking and Urban Sustainability*. https://doi.org/10.1080/17549175.2016.1223738.

Burden, A. (2014). *How public spaces make cities work*. Accessed July 25, 2016, from https://www.ted.com/talks/amanda_burden_how_public_spaces_make_cities_work?language=en

Buser, M., Bonura, C., Fannin, M., & Boyer, K. (2013). Cultural activism and the politics of place-making. *City, 17*(5), 606–627.

Butler, C. (2012). *Henri Lefebvre: Spatial politics, everyday life and the right to the city*. London: Routledge.

Carr, L., Dunsiger, S., & Marcus, B. (2010). Walk score as a global estimate of neighborhood walkability. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine, 39*(5), 460–463.

Carr, L., Dunsiger, S., & Marcus, B. (2011). Validation of walk score for estimating access to walkable amenities. *British Journal of Sports Medicine, 45*, 1144–1148.

Cechini, A. (2016). *I'm not a tourist. I live here*. Publica, Alghero.

Cervero, R., & Duncan, M. (2003). Walking, bicycling, and urban landscapes: Evidence from the San Francisco Bay area. *American Journal of Public Health, 93*(9), 1478–1483.

Clifton, K. J., Smith, A. D. L., & Rodriguez, D. (2007). The development and testing of an audit for the pedestrian environment. *Lanscape and Urban Planning, 80*, 95–110.

Colomb, V., & Novy, J. (Eds.). (2016). *Protest and resistance in the tourist city*. London: Routledge.

Degen, M. (2010). Consuming urban rythms. Let's Ravalejar. In T. Edensor (Ed.), *Geographies of rhythm* (pp. 21–32). Farnham: Ashgate.

Duncan, D. T., Aldstadt, J., Whalen, J., Melly, S. J., & Gortmaker, S. L. (2011). Validation of Walk Score® for estimating neighborhood walkability: An analysis of four US metropolitan areas. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 8*(11), 4160–4179.

Duncan, D. T., Aldstadt, J., Whalen, J., & Melly, S. J. (2013). Validation of Walk Scores and Transit Scores for estimating neighborhood walkability and transit availability: A small-area analysis. *GeoJournal, 78*(2), 407–416.

Duncan, D. T., Méline, J., Kestens, Y., Day, K., Elbel, B., Trasande, L., & Chaix, B. (2016). Walk score, transportation mode choice, and walking among French adults: A GPS, accelerometer, and mobility survey study. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 13*(6), 611.

Florida, R. (2017). *The new urban crisis*. New York: Basic Books.

Forsyth, A. (2015). What is a walkable place? The walkability debate in urban design. *Urban Design International, 20*(4), 274–292.

Forsyth, A., Hearst, M., Oakes, J. M., & Schmitz, K. H. (2008). Design and destination: Factors infuencing walking and total physical activity. *Urban Studies, 45*(9), 1973–1996.

Freytag, T. (2010). Visitor activities and innercity tourism mobilities: The case of Heidelberg. In J. A. Mazanec & K. W. Wober (Eds.), *Analysing international city tourism* (pp. 213–226). Dordrecht: Springer.
Füller, H., & Michel, B. (2014). Stop being a tourist! New dynamics of urban tourism at Berlin-Kreuzberg. *International Journal of Urban Regional, 38*(4), 1304–1318.
Gehl, J. (2010). *Cities for people*. Washington, DC: Island Press.
Hall, C. M., Finsterwalder, J., & Ram, Y. (2015). Shaping, experiencing, and escaping the tourist city. *LAPlus, 2*, 84–90.
Hall, C. M., Ram, Y., & Shoval, N. (2018). Introduction: Walking – More than pedestrian. In C. M. Hall, Y. Ram, & N. Shoval (Eds.), *The Routledge international handbook of walking* (pp. 1–23). London: Routledge.
Hardin, G. (1968). The tragedy of the commons. *Science, 162*(3859), 1243–1248.
Hedrick-Wong, Y., & Choong, D. (2017). *Global destination cities index 2016*. Accessed August 14, 2017, from https://newsroom.mastercard.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/09/FINAL-Global-Destination-Cities-Index-Report.pdf
Hirsch, J. A., Moore, K. A., Evenson, K. R., Rodriguez, D. A., & Roux, A. V. D. (2013). Walk Score® and Transit Score® and walking in the multi-ethnic study of atherosclerosis. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine, 45*(2), 158–166.
Hoffman, L. M., Fainstein, S. S., & Judd, D. R. (Eds.). (2003). *Cities and visitors. Regulating people, markets and city space*. Oxford: Blackwell.
Kahn, A. E. (1966). The tyranny of small decisions: Market failures, imperfections and the limits of economics. *Kyklos, 19*, 23–47.
Lefebvre, H. (1967). *Le droit à la ville*. Paris: Persée.
Leinberger, C. B. (2009). *The option of urbanism – Investing in a New American dream*. Washington, DC: Island Press.
Leinberger, C. B. (2012). *DC: The walkUP wake up call. The Nation's capital as national model for walkable urban places*. Washington, DC: CREUA.
Leinberger, C. B., & Alfonzo, M. (2012). *Walk this way: The economic promise of walkable places in Metropolitan Washington, DC*. Washington, DC: Brookings.
Leinberger, C. B., & Austin, M. (2013). *The walkUP wake up call: Atlanta*. Washington, DC: CREUA.
Leinberger, C. B., & Loh, T. (2016). *DC walkUP wake up call 2016*. Washington, DC: CREUA. (Unpublished report).
Leinberger, C. B., & Lynch, P. (2015). *The walkUP wake up call: Boston*. Washington, DC: CREUA.
Leinberger, C. B., & Lynch, P. (2016). *Foot traffic ahead. Ranking walkable urbanism in America's largest metros 2015*. Washington, DC: CREUA.
Leinberger, C. B., & Rodríguez, M. (2016). *Foot traffic ahead. Ranking walkable urbanism in America's largest metros 2016*. Washington, DC: CREUA.
Leinberger, C. B., Rodriguez, M., & Loh, T. (2017). *The walkUP wake up call: New York executive summary*. Washington, DC: CREUA.
Lew, A. A. (2017). Tourism planning and place making: Place-making or placemaking? *Tourism Geographies, 19*(3), 448–466.
Libeskind, D. (2014). *Unexpected city*. Accessed August 14, 2016, from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=q_1C5JVWf-0
Litvin, S. W., & DiForio, J. (2014). The "Malling" of Main Street: The threat of chain stores to the character of a historic city's Downtown. *Journal of Travel Research, 53*(4), 488–499.
Lo, R. H. (2009). Walkability: What is it? *Journal of Urbanism, 2*(2), 145–166.
Macauley, D. (2000). Walking the city: An essay on peripatetic practices and politics. *Capitalism Nature Socialism, 11*(4), 3–43.
Maciocco, G., & Serrelli, S. (Eds.). (2009). *Enhancing the city. New perspectives for tourism and leisure*. Dordrecht: Springer.

Maitland, R. (2006). How can we manage the tourist-historic city? Tourism strategy in Cambridge, UK, 1978–2003. *Tourism Management, 27*, 1262–1273.
Maitland, R. (2008). Conviviality and everyday life: The appeal of new areas of London for visitors. *International Journal of Tourism Research, 10*(1), 15–25.
Manaugh, K., & El-Geneidy, A. (2011). Validating walkability indices: How do different households respond to the walkability of their neighborhood? *Transportation Research Part D, 16*(4), 309–315.
Mansouri, M., & Ujang, N. (2016). 'Tourist' expectation and satisfaction towards pedestrian networks in the historical district of Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia. *Asian Geographer, 33*(1), 35–55.
Moura, F., Cambra, P., & Gonçalves, A. B. (2017). Measuring walkability for distinct pedestrian groups with a participatory assessment method: A case study in Lisbon. *Landscape and Urban Planning, 157*, 282–296.
Murphy, P. (1985). *Tourism: A community approach*. London: Routledge.
Novy, J. (2014). *Urban tourism. The end of the honeymoon*? UNWTO 3rd Global Summit on City Tourism. Barcelona. Accessed July 15, 2016, from http://cf.cdn.unwto.org/sites/all/files/pdf/session_2_keynote_johannes_novy.pdf
Páez, A., Moniruzzaman, M., Bourbonnais, P. L., & Morency, C. (2013). Developing a web-based accessibility calculator prototype for the Greater Montreal Area. *Transportation Research Part A, 58*, 103–115.
Popp, M. (2018). When walking is no longer possible: Investigating crowding and coping practices in urban tourism using commented walks. In C. M. Hall, Y. Ram, & N. Shoval (Eds.), *The Routledge international handbook of walking* (pp. 360–368). London: Routledge.
Porta, S., & Renne, J. L. (2005). Linking urban design to sustainability. *Urban Design International, 10*(1), 51–64.
Purcell, M. (2004). Excavating Lefebvre: The right to the city and its urban politics of the inhabitant. *GeoJournal, 58*, 99–108.
Ram, Y., & Hall, C. M. (2018). Walkable places for visitors: Assessing and designing for walkability. In C. M. Hall, Y. Ram, & N. Shoval (Eds.), *The Routledge international handbook of walking* (pp. 311–329). London: Routledge.
Richards, G. (2014). Creativity and tourism in the city. *Current Issues in Tourism, 17*(2), 119–144.
Rifkin, J. (2000). *The age of access*. London: Penguin.
Ritzer, G. (2011). *Globalization*. New York: Wiley.
Rojek, C., & Urry, J. (2000). *Touring cultures: Transformations of travel and theory*. London: Routledge.
Russo, A. P., & Richards, G. (Eds.). (2016). *Reinventing the local in tourism*. Bristol: ChannelView.
Russo, A. P., & Scarnato, A. (2017). 'Barcelona in Common': A new regime for the 21st century tourist city? *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 1–20. https://doi.org/10.1080/07352166.2017.1373023.
Sainaghi, R. (2006). From contents to processes: Versus a dynamic destination management model (DDMM). *Tourism Management, 27*, 1053–1063.
Samarasekara, G. N., Fukahori, K., & Kubota, Y. (2011). Environmental correlates that provide walkability cues for tourists: An analysis based on walking decision narrations. *Environment and Behavior, 43*(4), 501–524.
Sepe, M. (2007). Sustainable walkability and place identity. *International Scholarly and Scientific Research and Innovation, 1*(4), 50–55.
Shoval, N., McKercher, B., Ng, E., & Birenboim, A. (2011). Hotel location and tourist activity in cities. *Annals of Tourism Research, 38*(4), 1594–1612.
Southworth, M. (2005). Designing the walkable city. *Journal of Urban Planning and Development, 131*(4), 246–257.
Ujang, N., & Muslim, Z. (2014). Walkability and attachment to tourism places in the city of Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia. *Athens Journal of Tourism, 2*(1), 53–65.
UNWTO. (2012). *Global report on city tourism*. Madrid. Accessed February 23, 2016, from http://cf.cdn.unwto.org/sites/all/files/pdf/am6_city_platma.pdf

UNWTO, WTCF. (2017). *City tourism performance research*. Madrid. Accessed August 23, 2017, from http://destination.unwto.org/content/city-tourism-performance-research

Urry, J. (2007). *Mobilities*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

van der Borg, J., & Gotti, G. (1996). *Tourism and cities of art*. Venezia: UNESCO-ROSTE and CISET.

Williams, A. M. (2013). Mobilities and sustainable tourism: Path-creating or path-dependent relationships? *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 21*, 511–531.

Yang, Z., & Xu, M. (2009). Evolution, public use and design of Central Pedestrian districts in large Chinese cities: A case study of Nanjing Road, Shanghai. *Urban Design International, 14*(2), 84–98.