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1. Introduction

- Tourism and especially city tourism are fast growing industries (KAGERMEIER 2008)
- Tourism is an important economic factor for cities (FREYTAG/POPP 2009)
- Many different actors are involved (TIMUR/GETZ 2008)
- City tourism also has negative impacts (CHRIST 2017)

Source: Bonnreno 2018.

1. Introduction

Leads to the questions:

- How important is city tourism for German spatial planning practices and policies?
- How do German spatial planning practices and policies take city tourism into account?

2. Theoretical background

- Urban planning as an important component of the municipal self-government (Section 28 Paragraph 2 of the German basic law)
- Differentiation into formal and informal urban planning instruments
- Since the 1980s neoliberal city development (MÜLLER/STRÄTER 2011)
- Civil countermovement against neoliberalization

2. Theoretical background

- City tourism not important in German spatial planning science
- Urban planning not important in German tourism science
- Nearly no synthesis between tourism and spatial planning in research and literature (HAASS 2017)
- Spatial planning accuses tourism of "disneyfication" public spaces (RICHTER 2012)
2. Theoretical background

- Mix of different attractors and activities as an important characteristic of city tourism (KAGERMEIER 2008)
- Search for the authentic and real life in the cities (*New Urban Tourism*) (DIRKSMIEIER/HELBRECHT 2015)
- Creation of involuntary interaction between residents and tourists (FREYTAG/GLATTER 2017)

2. Theoretical background

- VAN DER BORG 1991 – Tourism and Urban development in Venice
- COSTA 2001 – Comparison between town and tourism planning paradigms
- ROEDER 2002 – City tourism and urban planning in Aachen; Frankeberger Viertel
- HARTZ et al. 2003 – Analysis of leisure planning on the regional level in Saarland
- RICHTER 2012 – Interdependencies between tourism and urban spaces in Berlin
- HAASS 2017 – Tourism architecture

3. Methodology

- Population of 2668 municipal spatial planning offices
- Creation of a mailing list
- In many cases → direct contact person
- In some cases → info@examplecity.de
- Pre-test in October 2017
- Survey in November 2017
- 404 finished records (15.14 % of German cities)

Overview about participant cities by federal state

Source: Own draft
Size distribution of participant cities

- Small small-sized towns (Pop. ≤ 10,000) 22; 5%
- Big small-sized towns (Pop. 10,001 - 20,000) 18; 4%
- Small medium-sized towns (Pop. 20,001 - 50,000) 149; 37%
- Big medium-sized towns (Pop. 50,001 - 100,000) 99; 25%
- Small big-sized towns (Pop. 100,001 - 500,000) 112; 28%
- Big big-sized towns (Pop. ≥ 500,001) 22; 5%

Source: Own draft

Future intensity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Future intensity</th>
<th>Yes, the cooperations should be more intensive</th>
<th>The cooperations should stay as intensive as they are right now</th>
<th>No, the cooperations could even be less intensive</th>
<th>∑</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very intensive</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensive</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediocre intensive</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less intensive</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not intensive</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No cooperations</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>∑</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>331</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Own draft

Cooperation intensity of municipal administrations and tourism actors, as well as future cooperation intensity

Stated instruments to solve problems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stated instruments</th>
<th>Absolute</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cooperations</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>22.2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concepts, plans, etc</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>20.2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic planning (individual- and mass transportation)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>10 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make effective use of public spaces</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>9.2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing brownfields for tourism purposes</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>8.2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism guiding systems (e.g. through signpostings)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating new attractors</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning plans</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating in funding programs</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.4 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating parking spaces</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land-use plan</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.9 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public participation</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.9 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyzing and using touristic data (e.g. guest arrivals)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgrading public spaces</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.6 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business development</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>6.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>∑</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>100 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: own draft
5. Practical implications

• Expertise must be implemented
• Cooperations should be fostered
• Existing instruments must be used
• New instruments must be created

6. Conclusion

• Tourism and especially urban tourism should get more attention in theoretical and practical spatial planning
• As a first step, tourism and spatial science should develop a mutual understanding for each other
• In the long term, administrative actors (EU, national, federal state, municipal) need to formulate strategies
• On the other hand, tourism needs to be further established as a cross-sectoral issue (politics, media, etc.)

Thank you for your attention!

Questions?

Julius.Brandt@uni-greifswald.de
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