

**Tourism, gentrification and neighbourhood change: an analytical framework.
Reflections from Southern European cities**

Agustín Cocola-Gant, Centre of Geographical Studies, Universidade de Lisboa¹

Ana Gago, Centre of Geographical Studies, Universidade de Lisboa

Jaime Jover, Department of Human Geography, University of Seville

Original citation:

Cocola-Gant, A; Gago, A; & Jover, J (2020). Tourism, gentrification and neighbourhood change: an analytical framework. Reflections from Southern European cities. In Jeroen Oskam (Ed). *The Overtourism Debate. NIMBY, Nuisance, Commodification*. Bingley: Emerald. p. 121-135.

Abstract

In the twenty-first century, tourism has grown in cities in an unprecedented way and, importantly, takes place in residential areas that were not planned to be tourist spaces. The sharing of space between residents and tourists is a source of conflict that revolves around competition for resources, facilities and the rights of access to these, resulting in an increased community opposition to urban tourism at an international scale. To understand this opposition, an exploration of the effects that tourism has on cities is needed. This is the principal aim of this chapter. Based both on the discussion of the international literature in the field and on empirical research conducted in the cities of Barcelona, Lisbon and Seville, this chapter provides a framework towards understanding the socio-spatial impacts of urban tourism. We suggest that tourism has an impact on both housing market dynamics and neighbourhood life. First, in these three cities we will show how tourism undermines the right to housing for numerous reasons. Second, the fact that residential neighbourhoods become spaces of entertainment and consumption for visitors leads to a daily pressure that dramatically undermines the quality of life of residents. We suggest that it is the combination of the impacts on both housing and neighbourhoods which makes tourism an increased topic of contention. Based on our framework, in the conclusion we discuss whether the impacts of tourism should be considered a form of gentrification.

Keywords: tourism, gentrification, touristification, Southern Europe.

¹ This research received financial support from Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia (FCT) within the scope of the SMARTOUR project (Ref: PTDC/GESURB/30551/2017).

1. Introduction

In the twenty-first century, tourism has grown in an unprecedented way and, importantly, increasingly takes place in cities. While early forms of mass tourism focused on the consumption of staged coastal resorts and on spaces built for tourism (Mullins, 1991), today tourists increasingly consume urban experiences. Urban tourism flourished in traditional cultural cities in Europe (Richards, 1996) as well as in globalised world cities (Ashworth and Page, 2011), and spread further to other destinations primarily due to their cultural attractions. In addition, tourism in cities has moved from a previous phase – in which it usually took place in tourist bubbles or precincts isolated from the rest of the city (Judd, 1999) – to a new era of urban tourism that evolves ‘off the beaten track’ (Novy and Huning, 2009; Quaglieri-Domínguez and Russo, 2010). In other words, tourists consume residential areas that were not planned to be tourist spaces. Furthermore, the consumption of residential areas by visitors has intensified following the growth of low-cost airlines and the success of digital platforms such as Airbnb or Booking.com, leading to an increase in the number of short-term rentals. All of this has happened since 2008 in a post-crisis context in which many urban economies – and increasingly regional and national economies in the periphery of core countries – have refocused their economies towards the tertiary sector, in some cases to rely almost exclusively on tourism.

The increasing dependence on tourism for local, regional and national economies has led to the rise of the concept of ‘overtourism’. Generally, overtourism describes an excessive flow of visitors into certain areas, thus, among other things, undermining the quality of life of residents (Goodwin, 2017; Milano et. al., 2019). Therefore, the important point is that the sharing of space between residents and tourists may be a source of conflict that revolves around competition for resources, facilities and the rights of access to these (Robinson, 2001). As a result, there has been increased community opposition towards urban tourism at an international scale (Colomb and Novy, 2016). Urban social movements that support the right to housing, such as tenants’ unions and support groups, have increasingly aimed to set the focus on the effects of tourism on the real estate market of their cities, highlighting it as one of the key drivers behind price increases and dispossession. Simultaneously, in Europe new movements have formed to oppose the growth of tourism and the enlargement of those facilities and infrastructures related to it, such as ports for cruise ships and airports. The right to the city is the central aim of these movements because the impacts of tourism in their urban contexts stretch beyond housing and affect issues related to public space and health, labour instability and precariousness, or the quality of the environment (Jover et. al., 2018). Although urban-based, many of these movements (involving different collectives in areas such as Barcelona, Lisbon, Mallorca, Malta or Venice) have tried to widen their scale of action and centre around an international network called ‘Southern Europe facing Touristification’, or ‘SET-Net’ for short. However, to understand the growing community opposition to tourism, an exploration of the effects that tourism has on cities is needed. This is the principal aim of this chapter. We propose an analytical framework which is based on

qualitative research conducted by the authors in Barcelona, Lisbon and Seville between 2015 and 2018. We implemented 72 semi-structured interviews and direct observation. Interviewees were primarily residents living in areas of intense tourism activity, but key informants such as local politicians, urban planners and activists were also interviewed.

It is undeniable that tourism has an impact on both housing market dynamics and neighbourhood life in urban destinations that are popular worldwide. Based both on the discussion of the international literature in the field and on the empirical research conducted by the authors, we want to provide a framework towards understanding the socio-spatial impacts of urban tourism. The three cities under examination represent cases that have evolved differently through time, but that share the success of being top urban destinations. Despite its status as a regional capital, Barcelona is considered one of the most important tourist hotspots in the world, employing explicit policy strategies to consolidate tourism which date back to the 1980s as part of its transition to a post-industrial economy (Russo and Scarnato, 2018). Lisbon, the capital of Portugal and the country's most populated city, has in the past ten years become one of the main recipients of tourist flows in Europe. Meanwhile, Seville has doubled the number of visitors it received during the same period, mainly due to its rich heritage and successful marketing campaigns. First, in these three cities we will show how tourism undermines the right to housing for several reasons. Second, the fact that residential neighbourhoods become spaces of entertainment and consumption for visitors leads to a daily pressure that dramatically undermines the quality of life of residents. We suggest that it is the combination of the impacts on both housing and the neighbourhood which makes tourism an increased topic of contention. Finally, based on our framework, in the conclusion we discuss whether the impacts of tourism should be considered as a form of gentrification.

2. Tourism and neighbourhood change: an analytical framework

2.1. Tourism and housing dynamics

The housing market cannot be isolated from tourism, especially in urban destinations that rely mostly on this form of economic activity. The most common process noted in several cases is that tourism and the resulting intensification of land use increases property prices (Fainstein and Gladstone, 1999; Gotham, 2005; Logan and Molotch, 2007). In Western economies, this process has been noted since the 1980 – several years before the rise of digital platforms advertising short-term rentals such as Airbnb. Because of this, authors suggested that tourism can be a cause of displacement and gentrification in certain neighbourhoods. This stems from the fact that increased house prices make it more difficult for low income renters to remain in a tourist area, allowing only the arrival of middle-class residents to the area concerned. For instance, this process was noted in New Orleans by Gotham (2005) and by Gladstone and Préau (2008) and in New York by Fainstein and Gladstone (1999).

The way in which tourism can provoke displacement and affect housing prices and supply has been exacerbated in recent years with the increased conversion of housing into tourist accommodation, in the form of both short-term rentals and hotels. In central areas of Barcelona, for instance, as there is no space left for new developments, the increasing demand for visitor accommodation and the expansion of hotels has meant changing apartment buildings into accommodation for visitors. This change involves the displacement of residents as the majority of the buildings recently converted into hotels were apartment blocks which had tenants living in them (Cocola-Gant and Pardo, 2017). Notwithstanding, the international literature has particularly focused on the rise of short-term rentals. First, cases in which landlords replace tenants with visitors have been widely documented (Cocola-Gant, 2016; Cocola-Gant and Gago, 2019; Füller and Michel, 2014; Wachsmuth and Weisler, 2018). Put simply, tenants have been forced to move out so that housing units can be converted into tourist accommodation. Second, the growth of short-term rentals severely reduces the supply of apartments available for long-term occupation to such an extent that people are unable to find units listed on the private rental market. For instance, Schäfer and Braun (2016) found that in some streets of central Berlin all of the available flats are let out to tourists. Similarly, Cocola-Gant and Gago (2019) found that while 25% of the housing stock in central Lisbon is listed on Airbnb, apartments to rent for long-term occupation are almost non-existent. Importantly, the shortage of housing stock available for long-term occupation raises rent prices and thus severely restricts housing opportunities for residents reliant on (affordable) rental properties. In this sense, the deregulation of the housing market –including the refusal to introduce rent controls– as well as the lack of social housing are both factors to consider because state intervention used to be the only method public authorities had to control rising prices. In conclusion, the growth of short-term rentals and hotels increasingly reduces housing alternatives for many residents, causing displacement (involuntary out-migration from the area) and ultimately making tourist areas unaffordable for both the working and middle-classes.

We have focused so far on how tourism affects the cost and supply of housing. However, to further understand the role of tourism in provoking gentrification, it is also key to explore how tourism affects the demand for housing. First, the development of digital platforms such as Airbnb opens residential real estate markets to the world. By using Airbnb and similar platforms, landlords can easily connect with a global demand of visitors willing to pay high rents for short stays. Furthermore, it has been noted that tourism destinations also often become popular destinations for lifestyle migrants and transnational mobile populations (Benson and O'Reilly, 2009; Hayes, 2018; Malet-Calvo, 2018). The leisure-led restructuring of tourist cities and their effective international representation as places to have fun or enjoy a good quality of life not only triggers the arrival of visitors but also transnational migrants. This has been particularly important in Southern Europe, where as a consequence of the spatial division of labour within Europe in which the peripheral South

has historically targeted consumers from core accumulation areas, the region has become a leisure space for transnational mobile populations –usually from Western Europe– which includes visitors, second home buyers, lifestyle migrants and, more recently, digital nomads and international students. The important point is that while tourism causes an escalation of property values and diminishes the housing stock available for long-term occupation, it also increasingly contributes to a higher demand for housing. Under such conditions, it makes sense to assume that tourism may drive gentrification (Cocola-Gant, 2018; Jover and Díaz-Parra, 2019), particularly transnational gentrification. In fact, recent demographic research in Barcelona (Sales, 2019) shows that the areas highly impacted by tourism and Airbnb are also the areas that have experienced the highest levels of transnational gentrification, that is, the displacement of low-income residents (mainly Spanish residents) by younger European individuals with university degrees and employed in white-collar occupations.

Finally, while tourism does cause displacement and out-migration, there are nonetheless some residents who stay put, normally because they own a property and are not affected by fluctuations in the real estate market. But, how do they cope with the growth of tourism? Qualitative research on the impacts of short-term rentals found that the sharing of apartment buildings with tourists is a daily disruption for residents which also affects the right to housing (Cocola-Gant, 2016; Gago, 2018; Gurran and Phibbs, 2017). The fact that apartment buildings combine residential and tourist uses is the cause of daily cohabitation troubles that have become the main form of displacement pressure experienced by residents in areas highly impacted by tourism. The most frequent issue is noise and difficulties in terms of resting and sleeping at night. Importantly, in some cases the sharing of apartment buildings with visitors undermines the quality of life and mental health of people to such an extent that for many it has been the main reason for moving (Cocola-Gant, 2016). Ironically, the pressure of sharing apartment buildings with visitors contradicts the rhetoric of Airbnb, which states that the experience of sharing houses with locals is the company's *raison d'être*. Furthermore, the conversion of accommodation from residential to tourist use also disrupts the familiarity and references by which people control their private environment. The loss of neighbours and their substitution for unknown users is the cause of fears and concerns that affect the lives of several residents, especially the elderly. As a resident in Barcelona put it:

“When you know your neighbours you feel secure, but when you see scores of different people in front of your door you do not know what is going on”.

This lack of control causes many elderly residents to be fearful of going outside unless a relative or a friend goes to help them. In Table 1 we summarise the way in which tourism and short-term rentals may affect housing market dynamics and displacement processes. In this regard, we use the conceptualisation of displacement suggested by Marcuse (1985), who distinguished between direct displacement, exclusionary displacement and displacement pressures. Direct displacement is the involuntary dislocation of a household

from a housing unit. Exclusionary displacement refers to the impossibility of finding housing in a neighbourhood despite the willingness to do so. Displacement pressure refers to the lack of both affordable facilities and social networks available to residents during and after the transformation of the neighbourhoods in which they live. Marcuse (1985) suggested that those who avoid direct residential displacement may suffer the displacement of their community, traditional retailers, public facilities, as well as the upgrading of stores and services. These pressures mean that areas become less and less liveable for the community.

Table 1. Tourism and housing market dynamics.

Tourism increases property values	Direct displacement	Residents (renters) with low incomes are forced to move out.
	Exclusionary displacement	Residents are unable to find affordable housing.
Hotels	Direct displacement	Tenants are forced to move out.
Short-term rentals	Direct displacement	Tenants are forced to move out.
	Exclusionary displacement	Lack of available housing in the private rental market. Further increases in rent prices.
	Displacement pressures	Daily disruptions. Some residents move out. People who remain may experience health problems.

2.2. Tourism and neighbourhood life

We have shown how tourism affects the right to housing and can be the cause of the displacement of residents. However, our findings suggest that to understand the impacts of tourism, closer attention must be paid to changes at the neighbourhood scale. This is related to the fact that the development of tourism in residential areas implies the mutation of residential infrastructures into spaces for visitors. This section focuses on how such a mutation takes place and the way in which it affects the daily lives of residents. The hypothesis is that the excessive growth of tourism causes daily disruptions that make everyday life increasingly unpleasant, to such an extent that some tourist areas may experience a progressive population and household decline. This was suggested by Ap and Crompton (1993), who concluded that in mature tourist destinations, one strategy which residents may follow is withdrawal, meaning that residents move out of the community. This idea echoes Doxey's (1975) 'irritation index' model, by which all communities at a

tourist destination go through four stages, the final one being an antagonism towards visitors. Despite criticism and even examples where this was not the case (Faulkner and Tideswell, 1997), recent qualitative studies in neighbourhoods highly affected by tourism have found that residents move out due to the daily disruptions that it produces (Cocola-Gant, 2018; Colomb and Novy, 2016; Pinkster and Boterman, 2017; Jover et. al., 2018). In this section we suggest an analytical framework that may be useful to understand the impacts of tourism at the neighbourhood scale. In Table 2 we summarise the disruptions caused by tourism in residential areas:

Table 2. Daily disruptions caused by tourism.

Economic	Loss of consumption facilities used by residents. Commodification of consumption facilities that now cater to visitors. General rise in the cost of living.
Physical-spatial	Overcrowding and mobility disruptions. Privatisation of public space. Noise. Loss of meeting places.
Socio-cultural	Exclusion from places dominated by visitors. Loss of community and social bonds.

Consumption facilities and affordability. As visitors demand spaces for entertainment and consumption, changes in retail facilities have been noted as the most pronounced consequence of tourism in cities. In fact, the first examples of ‘commercial gentrification’ noted by research in the 1980s and 1990s took place in tourist areas (Fainstein and Gladstone, 1999; Sandford, 1987; Zukin, 1990). In addition, the rising land value noted in tourist cities also affects commercial properties and, consequently, local businesses are unable to compete for space with large corporations and franchises, resulting in their displacement (Cocola-Gant, 2015; Gotham, 2005; Jover, 2019). This is also visible in traditional retail and food markets, which often transform into ‘gourmet’ spaces – a trend which is becoming an increasing concern (González and Waley, 2013; Salinas, 2016). The important point is that this commercial change means that residents lose the stores that they need and rely on for their daily lives. As a resident in Barcelona stated:

“When you see that something so basic like having a place to have breakfast or a drink is something that you simply cannot do in your neighbourhood, then you wonder: why do I live in this place?”

Ironically, despite the growth of bars and restaurants in tourist areas, we found that residents complain that they do not have places to go to have a drink or snack. Businesses are oriented towards visitors, and this not only makes residents feel uncomfortable, but also

means that what these businesses sell is unaffordable for them. Furthermore, the increase in the number of bars and restaurants for visitors implies a decrease in the quality of food available in such places. Although many bars claim to sell 'authentic local food', locals find it increasingly expensive and 'inauthentic'. As a resident in Lisbon described:

"I would love to go out for dinner. But where?! These restaurants only sell bizarre food like canned sardines and tuna! We don't eat that kind of food. And we don't have enough... we don't have what they ask for it [makes signs with her fingers indicating money]".

Finally, commercial change also means that residents lose their traditional meeting places. The role of local stores as spaces for encounters with other members of the community is a crucial issue for their resilience. We found that retail change has resulted in the loss of practices and relationships that are central to the everyday life of residents, especially the elderly. As one resident in Seville says:

"For the elderly it is upsetting to lose their bartender or the greengrocer you've known for ages, a shop where, if you forgot your wallet, you can go and pay some other day... The elderly are losing their place, and it has a wider impact on their well-being".

Overcrowding and mobility disruptions. The large number of visitors causes mobility problems for the local community which are particularly relevant for the elderly, children and residents with mobility difficulties. Overcrowding of public space becomes a significant problem in historic cities where streets are narrow and spaces to socialise are scarce. Furthermore, despite this lack of physical space, several cities have witnessed an increase in the use of bikes, scooters, Segway rental shops and apps (such as Uber Jump, Lime, Bird, etc.), which means that groups of visitors travel around the place using these vehicles and sometimes park them anywhere, for example, on pavements or tied to railings, blocking the way of neighbours with mobility issues. As a resident of Seville puts it:

"In some places there is real overcrowding. It's very difficult to walk, not to mention for people in wheelchairs or with pushchairs. It's difficult to navigate so many objects!"

In the three cities under scrutiny, the continuous movement of transient visitors has been described by some residents as a permanent 'tsunami' that 'needs to be avoided'. Interviews with elderly residents reveal that they tend to be isolated at home simply because walking on their own is dangerous in such places. Similarly, for children it is unsafe to gather with friends and play in such areas even if they are traffic-free. Finally, mobility is also affected by the intense influx of tourist buses, taxis and increasingly Uber concentrated in tourist hotspots, and more importantly on public transport that residents need to use on a daily basis. In this regard, they are sometimes restricted in their ability to use public transport because certain lines have become popular with tourists as a means of travelling

from one attraction to another, or have become an attraction in themselves such as tram number 28 in Lisbon (Figure 1).

Figure 1. Tourists queuing for tram number 28 (public transport) in Lisbon, June 2019.



Source: Photo by Jaime Jover.

Privatisation of public space. Tourism in cities involves a notable and visible management by the private sector of sections of squares and streets that are rented to cafes and restaurants. Paradoxically, local governments launched policies of pedestrianisation under the assumption they would increase urban liveability, but in many areas those spaces have become key for tourism-related businesses. This contributes to overcrowding and, importantly, results in a lack of meeting places for residents. As a resident of Seville states:

“The idea of pedestrianisation is great, the problem is that straight after everything becomes touristic... In my case, there are areas of the city that have been abandoned to tourism. I increasingly feel they aren’t for me, so I’ve stopped walking around there”.

The private ownership and management of public areas that were once used as free communal facilities was first introduced as a central policy in the 1990s in several cities. However, because the neoliberal answer to the post-2008 crisis has been the promotion of further tourism growth and liberalisation of commercial activities, we found that in Lisbon, Seville and Barcelona, the number of hotel, bar and restaurant terraces has increased dramatically since 2010. Furthermore, in some cases this policy has been implemented in

tandem with the removal of public benches and other similar street furniture, which was mainly used by younger people with alternative (informal) consumption patterns (e.g. chatting and drinking), and the elderly. In addition, these policies are often accompanied with social control strategies towards homelessness in tourist contexts (Mitchell, 2003). In cases such as Southern European cities, where streets and squares are often places in which important aspects of community life occurs, their privatisation reduces the potential for social encounters between residents and limits community development. We further explore below why the lack of meeting places is a central issue for residents.

Loss of community and social bonds. We have seen that the excessive growth of tourism involves a process of displacement of permanent populations that are replaced by transient users, namely tourists and transnational mobile populations. We found that for many long-term residents this process precipitates the loss of their social networks and, importantly, the mutual aid and solidarity that such social bonds provide. This disintegration of the community has been highlighted as a key concern by residents in Lisbon, Barcelona and Seville. In understanding the connection between tourism and the loss of community we must consider two points. First, as we stated, the destruction of gathering places is crucial. These were typically traditional markets, bars, shops, and ultimately the streets. However, many of these places tend to disappear because residents are displaced as soon as these are turned into venues for visitors. Second, for long-term residents the loss of community is linked to the lack of mixing between them and both visitors and transnational mobile populations, although some of the latter may integrate into their new communities and culture with time. These transient users do not generally speak the local language – many do not even make the effort to learn it, as they do not need to use it – and engage in a tourist lifestyle marked by the desire to have fun. Therefore, tourist-oriented commercial change leads to an increase in the number of places from which residents are excluded, not only because of affordability issues, but because they feel uncomfortable in terms of language, aesthetics or use of space. This refers to private leisure businesses as well as public squares dominated by the consumption practices of wealthy foreigners. As stated by several participants, residents tend to avoid such places as they do not feel comfortable in them. Tourists and residents do not share the same way of life and, as the latter feel outnumbered, this causes social instability in neighbourhoods highly impacted by tourism. In this regard, a resident in Lisbon gave the following example:

“For years we used to sit on the doorsteps talking and laughing while the children played in the street. Now my neighbours have moved there are not many of us left. And now tourists say they are bothered by us! They tell us to move out of the way. Nowadays we do not gather there anymore because we feel intimidated and uncomfortable”.

The important point is that as networks of solidarity and care disappear, long-term residents feel increasingly isolated and vulnerable, particularly the elderly. In Lisbon, an elderly woman sharing her apartment building with visitors stated:

“I don’t think we even speak Portuguese around here anymore. My neighbours moved out; tourists have occupied the place (...). We used to be there for each other. We used to shout from the window whenever we had a problem. Now the tourists, they simply don’t care”.

Finally, the manager of the Department of Social Services in Ciutat Vella (Barcelona’s central district) has stated that more than a thousand residents a year use the service and in most cases, users are elderly residents lacking social bonds and relatives or friends that can assist them. She stresses that for the elderly, a lack of social relationships is the main cause of exclusion. Some residents also share this view, for instance one Barcelona resident explains:

“Living with neighbours is not the same as living with transient people. My dad is 82. I was not too worried because I knew I had Eva [his next-door neighbour]. But now he does not have her anymore. In the building there are tourists and newcomers from Europe. They are probably nice people, but my dad does not feel he has company in the neighbourhood. That mutual help is crucial. The elderly person is left without a familiar environment, without a neighbour. It is the rupturing of social bonds”.

Noise. This is probably the most dramatic disruption that undermines the quality of life of residents and is a public health issue. The leisure industry causes significant levels of noise pollution, constituting not only noise produced by people but also music played in clubs and parties that take place in holiday apartments. Such pollution may also be caused by ambulances, workers and vehicles belonging to cleaning services, or from the delivery of supplies to restaurants early in the morning. In Barcelona, Lisbon and Seville, we have identified cases in which residents have moved out primarily because they were unable to sleep, and thus noise was having a severe impact on their daily personal and professional lives. This acoustic pressure is linked significantly to low cost and ‘party tourism’ which appears to have grown as a result of Airbnb and the liberalisation of tourism activities after the 2008 economic crisis as mentioned earlier. In Barcelona, a resident stated:

“Trying to live here is almost heroic, especially because of what happens at night. There are travel agencies that offer ‘stag and hen’ parties in Barcelona. But if you look at what they offer it is just the flights and information about where to buy alcohol. They spend all night singing in the street, and they use the lobbies of apartment buildings to have sex. In the summer, you have this situation every day”.

Consequently, in assessing the impacts of tourism it is important to note that all the disruptions that we have analysed coexist at the same time. It is a cumulative process that leads to a situation in which neighbourhoods become less and less liveable. People are

unable to sleep and even walk in their neighbourhoods without distress; residents do not have places where they can do their daily shopping nor where they can have a drink and meet their friends. The overall feeling is that transient users have increasingly appropriated the places and services of residents that are key to social reproduction. A participant in Barcelona explained:

“Most of the people I know have gone because they are tired of living here. It is not down to a single reason. It is because of everything”.

3. Conclusions: Tourism, gentrification and neighbourhood change

We have shown how tourism impacts both housing dynamics and neighbourhood life. It is the combination of these two fields that explains why several communities around the world have put tourism onto the political agenda and claim that it severely undermines their right to the city (Colomb and Novy, 2016). It seems clear that when very few housing alternatives exist and daily life in the neighbourhood becomes unbearable local authorities should question whether tourism is a sustainable form of economic growth. It is also apparent that most people would not want to live in such an environment. This leads us to ask: should we consider tourism as a driver of gentrification? Or should we view the impacts of tourism as something conceptually different than gentrification and call it ‘touristification’? Both ideas are not exclusive of each other.

First, authors have extensively documented that tourist areas experience processes of gentrification, that is, the arrival of young middle-class adults at the expense of low-educated and low-income individuals, particularly the elderly and manual labourers (Cocola-Gant, 2018; Gladstone and Préau, 2008; Gotham, 2005; Sales, 2019). The difference from classical examples of gentrification depicted in global cities by Anglo-Saxon literature is that the subjects leading the process are not only the local middle-classes, but particularly transnational migrants and those wanting to live in an area on a short-term basis. These gentrifiers tend to be migrants from advanced economies, and other transnational users such as digital nomads and international students that stay in the destination for a short period of time. As King (2018) suggests regarding young middle-class European people, the experience of being in a vibrant and cosmopolitan place for a few months or some years is now a prerequisite in their transition to adulthood. Importantly, our findings suggest that these transnational users share areas and feel comfortable in spaces consumed by visitors, meaning that the tourist-led transformation of the neighbourhood that is so traumatic for local long-term residents is actually a pull factor for these transient individuals.

Furthermore, the short-term living preferences of transnational gentrifiers, together with the floating character of visitors, are key to understanding the impacts of the socio-spatial transformation processes in terms of the loss of community life and mutual aid that a more permanent community once provided.

Second, the conversion of those areas into leisure and tourist-only places –in which daily life becomes more difficult due to the problems caused by tourism– may be at odds with the arrival of local upper and middle-classes. Those gentrifiers that once took over declining neighbourhoods, displacing their indigenous communities, may now feel less attracted to the places they helped to upscale due to the rapid increase in tourism. That is why some authors have placed emphasis on the touristic nature of these transformations and conceptualise it as touristification (Jover and Díaz-Parra, 2019; Sequera and Nofre, 2018). Likewise, these authors also meet the demands of social movements because many of them, including SET-Net, have identified touristification as their main concern following the dismantling of communities and neighbourhood change. Touristification refers to a scenario in which tourism has become monopolistic in the urban space, filtering all social relations and making the social reproduction of communities and therefore long-term residential life difficult. In this sense, it affects various segments of the local population regardless of class and status. However, touristification impacts low-income working-class residents more severely than those with greater purchasing power, whether they were previously gentrifiers (national and foreign) or not. In any case, tourism and gentrification seem to be working together to transform urban spaces into privileged areas in which land and housing values have skyrocketed after having entered an increasingly financialised global real estate market. This chapter has offered an analytical framework that can be used to understand the impacts of tourism on housing and neighbourhood change. Future research might include other topics – such as environmental issues – or be conducted using different perspectives (for example, through the lens of feminism or postcolonialism). The analysis could also be broadened in terms of scale and context, for example beyond Europe, particularly by focusing on the Global South.

4. References

- Ap J and Crompton JL (1993) Residents' strategies for responding to tourism impacts. *Journal of Travel Research* 32(1): 47–50.
- Ashworth G and Page S (2011) Urban tourism research: Recent progress and current paradoxes. *Tourism Management* 32: 1-15.
- Benson M and O'Reilly K (2009) Migration and the search for a better way of life: a critical exploration of lifestyle migration. *The Sociological Review* 57(4): 608–625.
- Cocola-Gant, A (2015). Tourism and commercial gentrification. In *The Ideal City. RC21 International Conference*. Urbino, 27th-29th August, ISA.
- Cocola-Gant A (2016) Holiday Rentals: The New Gentrification Battlefront. *Sociological Research Online* 21(3): 10.
- Cocola-Gant, A and Pardo, D (2017) Resisting tourism gentrification: the experience of grassroots movements in Barcelona. *Urbanistica Tre, Giornale Online di Urbanistica*, Vol 5 (13): 39-47.

- Cocola-Gant A (2018) Tourism gentrification. In: Lees L and Phillips M (eds), *Handbook of Gentrification Studies*, Cheltenham and Northampton: Edward Elgar Publishing, pp. 281–293.
- Cocola-Gant A and Gago A (2019) Airbnb, buy-to-let investment and tourism-driven displacement. *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space*. 1-18.
- 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.
- 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.
- Faulkner B and Tideswell C (1997) A framework for monitoring community impacts of tourism. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 5(1): 3-28.
- 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.
- Gago A (2018) *O aluguer de curta duração e a gentrificação turística em Alfama, Lisboa*. IGOT: Lisboa.
- 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.
- Goodwin H (2017) The challenge of overtourism. *Responsible Tourism Partnership Working Paper 4*.
- Gotham KF (2005) Tourism gentrification: The case of new Orleans' vieux carre (French Quarter). *Urban Studies* 42(7): 1099–1121.
- González S and Waley P (2013) Traditional retail markets: the new gentrification frontier? *Antipode*, 45(4): 965–983.
- Gurran N and Phibbs P (2017) When Tourists Move In: How Should Urban Planners Respond to Airbnb? *Journal of the American Planning Association* 83(1): 80–92.
- Hayes M (2018) *Gringolandia: Lifestyle Migration under Late Capitalism*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Jover J (2019) Geografía comercial de los centros históricos: entre la gentrificación y la patrimonialización. *Boletín de la Asociación de Geógrafos Españoles* 82(2788): 1-33. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.21138/bage.2788>
- Jover J, Berraquero L, Barrero M and Jiménez A (2018) Turistización y movimientos urbanos de resistencia: experiencias desde Sevilla. In Milano C and Mansilla J (eds), *Ciudad de vacaciones*, Barcelona: Pol.len, pp. 389-422.
- Jover J and Díaz-Parra I (2019) Gentrification, transnational gentrification and touristification in Seville, Spain. *Urban Studies*. DOI: 10.1177/0042098019857585
- 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.
- King R (2018) Theorising new European youth mobilities. *Population, Space and Place* 24(1): 1–12.

- Logan JR and Molotch HL (2007) *Urban fortunes: The political economy of place*. 2nd ed. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Malet-Calvo D (2018) Understanding international students beyond studentification: A new class of transnational urban consumers. The example of Erasmus students in Lisbon (Portugal). *Urban Studies* 55(10): 2142–2158.
- 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.
- Milano C, Novelli M and Cheer JM (2019) Overtourism and tourismophobia. *Tourism Planning & Development*, 16(4): 353-357.
- Mitchell D (2003) *The right to the city: Social justice and the fight for public space*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Mullins P (1991) Tourism urbanization. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 15(3): 326–342.
- 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.
- Pinkster FM and Boterman WR (2017) When the spell is broken: gentrification, urban tourism and privileged discontent in the Amsterdam canal district. *Cultural Geographies* 24(3): 457–472.
- Quaglieri-Domínguez A and Russo AP (2010) Paisajes urbanos en la época post-turística. Propuesta de un marco analítico. *Scripta Nova: revista electrónica de geografía y ciencias sociales* 14(323).
- Richards G (1996) Production and Consumption of European Cultural Tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 23(2): 261-283.
- 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.
- Russo, A.P. & Scarnato, A. (2018). 'Barcelona in Common': a new urban regime for the 21st century tourist city? *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 40/4, 455-474.
doi:10.1080/07352166.2017.1373023
- Sales J (2019) *Especialització turística, gentrificació i dinàmiques residencials en un entorn urbà madur, el cas de Barcelona*. PhD Dissertation: Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona.
- Salinas L (2016) Transformación de mercados municipales de Madrid. *Revista INVI*, 31(86): 179-201.
- Sandford MR (1987) Tourism in Harlem: Between negative sightseeing and gentrification. *Journal of American Culture* 10(2): 99–105.
- Schäfer P and Braun N (2016) Misuse through short-term rentals on the Berlin housing market. *International Journal of Housing Markets and Analysis* 9(2): 287–311.
- Sequera J and Nofre J (2018) Shaken, not stirred: New debates on touristification and the

limits of gentrification. *City* 22(5–6): 843–855.

Wachsmuth D and Weisler A (2018) Airbnb and the Rent Gap: Gentrification Through the Sharing Economy. *Environment and Planning A* 50(6): 1147–1170.

Zukin S (1990) Socio-spatial prototypes of a new organization of consumption: The role of real cultural capital. *Sociology* 24(1): 37–56.